THIS BOOK
MUST NOT BE REMOVED
FROM THE LIBRARY

UNIVERSITY OF LONDON LIBRARY

REFERENCE ONLY

PARL. PAPERS
FOR REFERENCE ONLY.

Parl. Papers.

Presented by
the Worshipful Company
of Goldsmiths.
1903.

620109

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2026

https://archive.org/details/parliamentary-debates_march-3-28-1879_244

HANSARD'S

PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES,

THIRD SERIES:

COMMENCING WITH THE ACCESSION OF

WILLIAM IV.

42° VICTORIÆ, 1879.

VOL. CCXLIV.

COMPRISING THE PERIOD FROM

THE THIRD DAY OF MARCH 1879,

TO

THE TWENTY-EIGHTH DAY OF MARCH 1879.

Second Volume of the Session.

LONDON:
PUBLISHED BY CORNELIUS BUCK,
AT THE OFFICE FOR "HANSARD'S PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES,"
22, PATERNOSTER ROW. [E.C.]

1879.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TO

VOLUME CCXLIV.

THIRD SERIES.

LORDS, MONDAY, MARCH 3.

Page

Bankruptcy Law Amendment Bill (No. 8)—

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª,"—(*The Lord Chancellor*) .. 1

After short debate, Motion *agreed to* :—Bill read 2ª accordingly, and *committed* to a Committee of the Whole House on *Monday* next.

Debtors Act, 1869, Amendment Bill (No. 9)—

Bill read 2ª (according to Order) and *committed* to a Committee of the Whole House on *Monday* next.

COMMONS, MONDAY, MARCH 3.

QUESTIONS.

Elementary Education Act, 1870—Inspection of Board Schools—Holbeach — Question, Mr. Chamberlain ; Answer, Lord George Hamilton 8

Army Estimates, 1879-80—Regimental Establishments at Home and Abroad—Question, Sir Alexander Gordon ; Answer, Colonel Stanley 9

Island of Cyprus—Consular Jurisdiction—Question, Sir Charles W. Dilke ; Answer, Mr. Bourke 10

Contagious Diseases (Animals) Act, 1878—Cattle Disease in the United States—Question, Mr. J. W. Barclay ; Answer, Lord George Hamilton 10

Elementary Education Acts — School Boards — Question, Viscount Emlyn ; Answer, Lord George Hamilton 11

Colonial Possessions — Jamaica—Question, Mr. Knatchbull-Hugessen ; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach 11

Metropolis — Victoria Embankment — The New Mint — Question, Mr. Rylands ; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer 12

South Africa — The Zulu War — The Papers — Question, Mr. Chamberlain ; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach 12

CUSTOMS — REPORT OF COMMITTEE — OFFICIAL STATISTICS—Question, Sir Henry Peek; Answer, Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson 13

CRIMINAL LAW — PENAL SERVITUDE ACTS — Question, Mr. O'Connor Power; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross 13

PUBLIC WORKS LOAN COMMISSIONERS — LOANS FOR PUBLIC WORKS — Question, General Sir George Balfour; Answer, Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson 14

PARLIAMENT — BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE — COUNTS OUT—Question, Mr. Anderson; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer 14

AFGHANISTAN—REPORTED DEATH OF SHERE ALI—Question, Mr. Onslow; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer 16

ORDERS OF THE DAY.

SUPPLY—Order for Committee read; Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair:"—

ARMY—RETIREMENT OF OFFICERS—RESOLUTION—Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "in the opinion of this House, it is desirable that the paragraphs numbered 86, 87, and 88 of Clause 124 of the Army Circular of 1st September 1877, and Clause 92 of the Army Circular of 1st May 1878, should be modified,"—(*Colonel Arbuthnot,*)—instead thereof 16

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question:"—After short debate, Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

ARMY—FIRST CLASS ARMY RESERVE—RESOLUTION—

Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "this House having regard to the response made by the men of the First Class Army Reserve when called out last year, is of opinion that that Force should be increased by at least 10,000 men during the present year, with a view to a reduction of the Army Estimates,"—(*Mr. John Holms,*)—instead thereof .. 26

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question:"—After short debate, Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Main Question, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair," put, and *agreed to.*

SUPPLY—*considered* in Committee—ARMY ESTIMATES.

(In the Committee.)

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a number of Land Forces, not exceeding 135,625, all ranks, be maintained for the Service of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, at Home and Abroad, excluding Her Majesty's Indian Possessions, during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1880,"—(*Colonel Stanley*) 37

After long debate, Question put, and *agreed to.*

Resolution to be reported.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £4,598,000, be granted to Her Majesty, to defray the Charge of the Pay, Allowances, and other Charges of Her Majesty's Land Forces at Home and Abroad (exclusive of India), which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1880" 104

Moved, "That the Chairman do report Progress, and ask leave to sit again,"—(*Mr. Parnell:*)—After short debate, Question put, and *agreed to.*

Resolution to be reported *To-morrow;* Committee also report Progress; to sit again upon *Wednesday.*

[*March* 3.] Page

WAYS AND MEANS—REPORT—Resolutions [February 28] *reported* .. 105
After short debate, Resolutions *agreed to.*
Ordered, That a Bill be brought in upon the First Three Resolutions; and that *Mr. Raikes*, *Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer*, and *Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson* do prepare and bring it in.
Ordered, That a Bill be brought in upon the Fourth Resolution; and that *Mr. Raikes*, *Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer*, and *Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson* do prepare and bring it in.

Racecourses (Metropolis) Bill [Bill 48]—
Bill *considered* in Committee [*Progress, Clause* 1, 17*th February*] .. 108
[House counted out.]

LORDS, TUESDAY, MARCH 4.

City of Glasgow Bank Bill—
Order of the Day for the Second Reading read 109
After short debate, Order *discharged*, and Bill to be read 2ª on *Tuesday* the 29*th of April* next.

PRIVATE BILLS—
Ordered, That no Private Bill brought from the House of Commons shall be read a second time after *Tuesday* the 10*th day of June* next: [and other Orders] .. 117

Supreme Court of Judicature Acts Amendment Bill (No. 11)
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª,"—(*The Lord Chancellor*) .. 117
Motion *agreed to*:—Bill read 2ª, and *committed* accordingly.

ARMY—DESERTIONS—REPORT OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL OF RECRUITING, 1878—Question, Observations, Lord Abinger, Lord Truro; Reply, Viscount Bury:—Short debate thereon 118
INDIA—SCARCITY OF GRAIN IN THE PUNJAB—Question, Observations, Lord Walsingham; Reply, Viscount Cranbrook 125
ARMY—THE AUXILIARY FORCES—THE YEOMANRY—Question, Observations, The Marquess of Bath; Reply, Viscount Bury 127

COMMONS, TUESDAY, MARCH 4.

QUESTIONS.

SOUTH AFRICA—THE ZULU WAR—OFFICERS' BAGGAGE—Question, Colonel Tottenham; Answer, Colonel Stanley 129
RAILWAY PASSENGER DUTY—WANTAGE TRAMWAY COMPANY—Question, Mr. J. Cowen; Answer, The Attorney General 130
CRIMINAL LAW—CASE OF STEVENSON—Question, Mr. P. A. Taylor; Answer, The Lord Advocate 130
INLAND REVENUE—THE INCOME TAX—CO-OPERATIVE STORES—Question, Mr. Blake; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer 132
INLAND REVENUE—LEGACY AND SUCCESSION DUTY—Question, Mr. O'Clery; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer 132
THE TREATY OF BERLIN—SERVIA AND ROUMANIA—Question, Mr. Serjeant Simon; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer 133
NAVAL EXPENDITURE—THE VOTE OF CREDIT, 1878—Question, Mr. Shaw Lefevre; Answer, Mr. W. H. Smith 133
CANAL BOATS ACT, 1877—Question, Mr. Price; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth 134
THE OFFICIAL CORN RETURNS—Question, Mr. Clare Read; Answer, Mr. J. G. Talbot 134

Contagious Diseases (Animals) Act, 1878—Dairies and Cowsheds—Question, Mr. Clare Read; Answer, Lord George Hamilton .. 135

Public Business—County Courts Bill—Question, Mr. Clare Read; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth 135

Parliament—Public Business—The Select Committee on Parliamentary Reporting—Question, Mr. Newdegate; Answer, Mr. W. H. Smith 136

Parliament—Public Business—Army Discipline and Regulation Bill—Question, The Marquess of Hartington; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer 136

Ireland—The Cork and Macroom Railway Accident—Question, Major O'Gorman; Answer, The Attorney General for Ireland .. 136

MOTIONS.

Household Suffrage (Counties)—Resolutions—

Moved, "That, in the opinion of this House, it would be desirable to establish throughout the whole of the United Kingdom a Household Franchise similar to that now established in the English boroughs,"—(*Mr. Trevelyan*) 137

Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "this House is of opinion that it is inexpedient to reopen the question of Parliamentary Reform at the present time,"—(*Lord Claud Hamilton,*)—instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question:"—After long debate, Question put:—The House *divided;* Ayes 226, Noes 291; Majority 65.

Division List, Ayes and Noes 252

Question proposed,

"That the words 'this House is of opinion that it is inexpedient to reopen the question of Parliamentary Reform at the present time,' be there added."

Amendment proposed to the said proposed Amendment, to leave out the words "at the present time,"—(*Mr. Lowe.*)

Question, "That the words 'at the present time' stand part of the said proposed Amendment," put, and *negatived.*

Words, as amended, *added.*

Main Question, as amended, put, and *agreed to.*

Resolved, That this House is of opinion that it is inexpedient to reopen the question of Parliamentary Reform.

Libel—

Select Committee *appointed,* "to inquire into the Law in relation to Libels in newspapers and journals, and as to the mode of proving the publication of such Libels, and the means of rendering the proprietors and publishers of newspapers and journals responsible civilly and criminally for the Libels contained therein; with power to make any proposals for the alteration of the Law with regard to the above matters, or any of them,"—(*Mr. Attorney General.*)

Registration of Births, Deaths, and Marriages (Army) Bill—*Ordered* (*Colonel Lindsay, Mr. Secretary Stanley, Lord Eustace Cecil*); *presented,* and read the first time [Bill 95] 256

Wormwood Scrubs Regulation Bill—*Ordered* (*Colonel Lindsay, Mr. Secretary Stanley, Lord Eustace Cecil*); *presented,* and read the first time [Bill 96] 256

Drainage and Improvement of Lands (Ireland) Provisional Order Confirmation Bill—*Ordered* (*Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson, Mr. James Lowther*); *presented,* and read the first time [Bill 94] 256

Blind and Deaf-Mute Children (Education) Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Wheelhouse, Sir Andrew Lusk, Mr. Scott, Mr. Isaac, Mr. Benjamin Williams*); *presented,* and read the first time [Bill 93] 257

COMMONS, WEDNESDAY, MARCH 5.

Page

ORDER OF THE DAY.

Married Women's Property (Scotland) Bill [Bill 1]—
Moved, "That the Bill be now read a second time,"—(*Mr. Anderson*) .. 257
After short debate, Question put, and *agreed to*:—Bill read a second time, and *committed* for *Thursday* 13th March.

LORDS, THURSDAY, MARCH 6.

South Africa—Sir Bartle Frere and Mr. Joubert—Question, Observations, The Earl of Carnarvon; Reply, Earl Cadogan 264
Railways — Continuous Brakes — Question, Observations, The Earl of Belmore, Lord Norton; Reply, Lord Henniker 266
Army Regulations —Non-commissioned Officers—Question, The Earl of Galloway; Answer, Viscount Bury 273

COMMONS, THURSDAY, MARCH 6.

QUESTIONS.

Catholic University (Ireland) — Speech of Mr. W. Johnston — Question, Mr. Sullivan; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer .. 273
Public Works (India)—Construction of Indian Railways—Question, Sir Charles W. Dilke; Answer, Mr. E. Stanhope 274
Poor Law (Ireland)—Removal of Irish Paupers—Question, Major Nolan; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth 275
Army — War Office Contracts — Question, Mr. Macdonald; Answer, Colonel Stanley 276
Post Office—The Book Post—Question, Mr. Mitchell Henry; Answer, Lord John Manners 276
"General Statistical Abstract" — Foreign Tariffs on British Produce—Question, Mr. W. E. Forster; Answer, Mr. J. G. Talbot .. 277
Ireland — Attendance of Irish Resident Magistrates at Petty Sessions—Question, Mr. Cogan; Answer, Mr. J. Lowther .. 277
Poor Law Guardians (Ireland)—Question, Mr. O'Connor Power; Answer, Mr. J. Lowther 278
Turkey — Appointment of a Finance Commissioner — Question, Mr. Cogan; Answer, Mr. Bourke 278
Army — Half-Pay Service — Question, Sir Eardley Wilmot; Answer, Colonel Stanley 278
Imprisonment for Debt — Legislation — Question, Mr. M. T. Bass; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross 279
India—The North-Western Frontier—The Occupation of Quettah—Question, Mr. Dillwyn; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer .. 279
South Kensington—Natural History Museum—Question, Lord Arthur Russell; Answer, Mr. Gerard Noel 280
The Treaty of Berlin—Eastern Roumelia—Questions, Mr. Whitwell, Mr. E. Jenkins; Answers, Mr. Bourke 280
South Africa—The Re-inforcements—Question, Colonel Mure; Answer, Colonel Stanley 281
Afghanistan — Operations in Khost Valley — Question, Mr. Onslow; Answer, Mr. E. Stanhope 282
Afghanistan—Disturbances in Burmah—Questions, The Marquess of Hartington; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer .. 282
Ireland — Waterford Harbour Board — Question, Major O'Gorman; Answer, The Attorney General for Ireland 283
Army Discipline and Regulation Bill—The Mutiny Bill—Observations, Colonel Stanley 283

ORDERS OF THE DAY.

SUPPLY—Order for Committee read; Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair:"—

KEW GARDENS—RESOLUTION—Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "in the opinion of this House, it is desirable that the Royal Gardens at Kew should be opened to the public at 10 a.m. on week-days, with such reservations as may be found expedient,"—(*Sir Trevor Lawrence*,)—instead thereof .. 284

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question:"—After short debate, Question put:—The House *divided;* Ayes 196, Noes 94; Majority 102.—(Div. List, No. 36.)

MERCANTILE MARINE—BREACH OF CONTRACT BY SEAMEN—LEGISLATION—Observations, Mr. Gorst, Mr. Burt; Reply, The Chancellor of the Exchequer 297

IRELAND—DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION—Observations, Mr. O'Shaughnessy; Reply, Mr. J. Lowther:—Short debate thereon 299

Main Question, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair," put, and *agreed to.*

SUPPLY—*considered* in Committee—CIVIL SERVICE SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES, 1878-9.

(In the Committee.)

CLASS I.—PUBLIC WORKS AND BUILDINGS.

(1.) £3,771, Houses of Parliament.
(2.) £8,417, Public Buildings.—After short debate, Vote *agreed to* 317
(3.) £400, Furniture of Public Offices.
(4.) £724, New Home and Colonial Offices, &c.—After short debate, Vote *agreed to* .. 319
(5.) £650, British Museum Buildings.—After short debate, Vote *agreed to* .. 319
(6.) £12,800, Natural History Museum.—After short debate, Vote *agreed to* .. 320
(7.) £1,900, Harbours, &c. under the Board of Trade.—After short debate, Vote *agreed to* 320

CLASS II.—SALARIES AND EXPENSES OF PUBLIC DEPARTMENTS.

(8.) £3,500, Treasury.—After short debate, Vote *agreed to* 321
(9.) £2,300, Home Office.—After short debate, Vote *agreed to* 327
(10.) £3,350, Foreign Office.—After short debate, Vote *agreed to* 334
(11.) £925, Colonial Office.
(12.) £327, Lunacy Commission, England.
(13.) Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a Supplementary sum, not exceeding £33,000, be granted to Her Majesty, to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1879, for Stationery, Printing, Binding, and Printed Books for the several Departments of Government in England, Scotland, and Ireland, and some Dependencies, and for Stationery, Binding, Printing, and Paper for the two Houses of Parliament, including the Salaries and Expenses of the Stationery Office" 334
After debate, Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a Supplementary sum, not exceeding £23,000, be granted, &c.,"—(*Mr. Biggar*) 351
After further short debate, Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*
After further short debate, Original Question put, and *agreed to.*
(14.) Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a Supplementary sum, not exceeding £206, be granted to Her Majesty, to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1879, for the Salaries of the Officers and Attendants of the Household of the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland and other Expenses" 354
Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a Supplementary sum, not exceeding £15, be granted, &c.,"—(*Mr. Parnell:*)—After short debate, Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*
Original Question put, and *agreed to.*
(15.) £390, Chief Secretary for Ireland, Offices.—After short debate, Vote *agreed to* .. 357
(16.) £560, Public Works Office, Ireland.—After short debate, Vote *agreed to* .. 357

Resolutions to be reported.

Supply—Civil Service Supplementary Estimates, 1878-9—Committee—*continued.*

Class III.—Law and Justice.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a Supplementary sum, not exceeding £6,200, be granted to Her Majesty, to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1879, for the Salaries of the Law Officers; the Salaries and Expenses of the Department of the Solicitor for the Affairs of Her Majesty's Treasury, and of the Department of the Queen's Proctor for Divorce Interventions; the Costs of Prosecutions, including those relating to the Coin, and to Bankruptcy, and of other Legal Proceedings conducted by those Departments; and various other Legal Expenses, including Statute Law Revision, and Parliamentary Agency" 362

Moved, "That the Chairman do report Progress, and ask leave to sit again,"—(*Mr. Dillwyn*:)—Motion *agreed to.*

Resolution to be reported *To-morrow;* Committee also report Progress; to sit again *To-morrow.*

Exchequer Bonds (No. 1) Bill [Bill 92]—

Moved, "That the Bill be now read a second time,"—(*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer*) 362

After short debate, Motion *agreed to*:—Bill read a second time, and *committed* for *To-morrow.*

Racecourses (Metropolis) Bill [Bill 48]—

Bill *considered* in Committee [*Progress Clause* 1, 17*th February*] .. 364

After short time spent therein, Bill *reported;* as amended, to be considered upon *Tuesday* next.

Commons—Nomination of Select Committee—

Moved, "That Mr. Stephen Cave be a Member of the Select Committee on Commons,"—(*Sir Matthew Ridley*) [House counted out.]

LORDS, FRIDAY, MARCH 7.

British Burmah—Question, Earl Granville; Answer, Viscount Cranbrook 367

Street Accidents—Address for a Return—

Moved, "That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty for a Tabular statement by months of the accidents which have occurred in the streets of the Metropolis and its suburbs referable to the passage of vehicles, bicycles, or horsemen from 1st January 1878 to 31st January 1879, showing the circumstances under which each accident has occurred, its issues, and results,"—(*Viscount Templetown*) .. 367

After short debate, Motion *agreed to.*

Rivers Conservancy Bill—

Bill to make provision for the Conservancy of Rivers—*Presented* (*The Lord President*) 368

Moved, That the Bill be now read 1ª:—After short debate, Motion *agreed to;* Bill read 1ª (No. 20.)

Railways (Ireland)—Question, Viscount Lifford; Answer Lord Henniker 374

Then—Copy of Letter respecting narrow gauge railways in Ireland from the Board of Trade to the Chairman of Committees: Ordered to be laid before the House.

COMMONS, FRIDAY, MARCH 7.

Page

PRIVATE BUSINESS.

Lower Thames Valley Main Sewerage Board Bill (*by Order*)—
Moved, "That the Bill be now read a second time,"—(*Mr. Gorst*) .. 375
Amendment proposed, to leave out the word "now," and at the end of the Question to add the words "upon this day six months,"—(*Mr. Isaac.*)
Question proposed, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question:" —After debate, Question put:—The House *divided;* Ayes 146, Noes 168; Majority 22.—(Div. List, No. 38.)
Words *added:*—Main Question, as amended, put, and *agreed to:*—Second Reading *put off* for six months.

QUESTIONS.

Criminal Law—Case of Seth Evans—Question, Mr. Hopwood; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross 401
Criminal Law—Case of Theodoridi—Question, Mr. P. A. Taylor; Answer, Mr. Bourke 402
Inspectors of Mines Reports, 1878—Question, Mr. Macdonald; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross 402
Registrars of County Courts (Ireland)—Questions, Mr. Meldon; Answers, The Attorney General for Ireland 403
National Teachers (Ireland)—Question, Mr. Meldon; Answer, Mr. J. Lowther 404
India—Disturbances in Burmah—Explanation, Mr. E. Stanhope .. 404
Poor Law Amendment Act (1876) Amendment Bill—Question, Sir Charles W. Dilke; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth 404

ORDERS OF THE DAY.

Supply—Order for Committee read; Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair:"—

Electoral Disabilities of Women—Resolution—Amendment proposed,
To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "in the opinion of this House it is injurious to the best interests of the Country that women who are entitled to vote in municipal, parochial, and school board elections, when possessed of the statutory qualifications, should be disabled from voting in Parliamentary elections, although possessed of the statutory qualifications; and that it is expedient that this disability should be forthwith repealed,"—(*Mr. Courtney,*)—instead thereof 405

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question:"—After long debate, Question put:—The House *divided;* Ayes 217, Noes 103; Majority 114.

Division List, Ayes and Noes 505

Main Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair:"—Motion, by leave, *withdrawn:*—Committee *deferred* till *Monday* next.

Supply—Report—Resolutions [6th March] *reported* 507
Resolutions 1 to 12 *agreed to.*
Resolution 13:—After short debate, Resolution *agreed to.*
Resolutions 14 to 16 *agreed to.*

MOTIONS.

POOR REMOVAL—

Select Committee *appointed*, "to inquire into the operation of the existing Laws in the United Kingdom relating to the settlement and irremovability of Paupers, with special reference to the case of removals to Ireland, and with power to make any proposals for the alteration, repeal, or assimilation of such Laws:"—Power to send for persons, papers, and records; Five to be the quorum,—(*Mr. Salt*) 511

Parliamentary Burghs (Scotland) Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. James Cowan, Mr. M'Laren, Mr. Trevelyan, Mr. John Holms*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 97] .. 511

LORDS, MONDAY, MARCH 10.

AFGHANISTAN—FURTHER PAPERS—ADDRESS OF GENERAL ROBERTS TO THE CHIEFS OF KURRAM—Questions, Observations, Earl Granville, The Marquess of Ripon; Reply, Viscount Cranbrook:—Short debate thereon 511

Local Government Provisional Order (Ireland) Confirmation (Downpatrick) Bill [H.L]—*Presented* (*The Lord President*); read 1ª, and *referred* to the Examiners (No. 21) 516

Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders (Cashel, &c.) Bill [H.L]—*Presented* (*The Lord President*); read 1ª, and *referred* to the Examiners (No. 22) .. 516

COMMONS, MONDAY, MARCH 10.

QUESTIONS.

AFGHANISTAN—YAKOOB KHAN—Questions, Mr. Onslow, The Marquess of Hartington; Answers, The Chancellor of the Exchequer .. 517
THE LAW COURTS—VENTILATION IN THE COURT OF QUEEN'S BENCH—Question, Mr. J. Cowen; Answer, Mr. Gerard Noel 518
KHAN OF KHELAT—TREATIES, &c.—Question, General Sir George Balfour; Answer, Mr. E. Stanhope 518
ALKALI ACTS—REPORT OF INSPECTOR—Questions, Mr. Rathbone; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth 518
ARMY—EMPLOYMENT OF INDIAN NATIVE TROOPS—Question, Sir George Campbell; Answer, Colonel Stanley 519
BOARD OF TRADE RETURNS—Question, Mr. Mac Iver; Answer, Mr. J. G. Talbot 519
THE ABERCARNE COLLIERY EXPLOSION—Question, Mr. Macdonald; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross 520
SELECT COMMITTEE ON PARLIAMENTARY REPORTING — Question, Dr. Cameron; Answer, Mr. W. H. Smith 520
INLAND REVENUE—LEGACY AND SUCCESSION DUTY—Question, Mr. O'Clery; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer 521
MERCANTILE MARINE—BUOYAGE—Question, Mr. Gourley; Answer, Mr. J. G. Talbot 521
CIVIL SERVICE (INDIA)—ADMISSION OF NATIVES—Question, Mr. Fawcett; Answer, Mr. E. Stanhope 522
EGYPT—FINANCE—Question, Mr. Puleston; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer 523
ENGLISH SUBJECTS IN FRANCE—CONSULAR CONVENTION—Question, Colonel Arbuthnot; Answer, Mr. Bourke 523
NAVY—OFFICERS OF THE ROYAL MARINES—Question, Mr. Sampson Lloyd; Answer, Mr. W. H. Smith 524

EDUCATION DEPARTMENT—THE LONDON SCHOOL BOARD—Question, Mr. Heygate; Answer, Lord George Hamilton 525

THE NEW NATIONAL GALLERY—INJURY TO THE PICTURES—Question, Mr. Ritchie; Answer, Mr. Gerard Noel 525

TRINITY COLLEGE, DUBLIN—THE DIVINITY SCHOOL—Question, Mr. Plunket; Answer, Mr. J. Lowther 526

SOUTH AFRICA—THE ZULU WAR—THE MARINES—Questions, Mr. Goschen; Mr. A. Mills; Answers, Mr. W. H. Smith 526

COLONIAL MARRIAGES BILL—Question, Mr. Beresford Hope; Answer, Mr. Knatchbull-Hugessen 528

EAST INDIA FREIGHT—Question, Mr. E. Jenkins; Answer, Mr. E. Stanhope 528

ORDER OF THE DAY.

SUPPLY—Order for Committee read; Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair:"—

NAVY—EXPLOSION ON BOARD H.M.S. "THUNDERER"—Questions, Observations, Mr. Gourley 529

NAVY—SHIP CARPENTERS—Observations, Mr. Samuda:—Short debate thereon 530

NAVY—PROMOTION—RESOLUTION—Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "the present and progressively increasing stagnation of promotion in the Royal Navy is injurious to the public service, and that the present system of retirement has failed to secure a sufficient amount of promotion, and ought to be extended,"—(*Mr. Vans Agnew*) 533

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question:"—After short debate, Question put, and *agreed to.*

NAVY—MEN-OF-WAR'S MEN—Observations, Lord Charles Beresford, Mr. Goschen 544

NAVY—NAVAL DISCIPLINE ACT, 1866—Observations, Mr. Hopwood; Reply, Mr. A. F. Egerton:—Short debate thereon 549

Main Question, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair," put, and *agreed to.*

SUPPLY—*considered* in Committee—NAVY ESTIMATES—DEPARTMENTAL STATEMENT.

(In the Committee.)

(1.) Motion made, and Question proposed, "That 58,000 men and boys be employed for the Sea and Coast Guard Services for the year ending on the 31st day of March 1880, including 13,000 Royal Marines,"—(*Mr. W. H. Smith*) 557

After short debate, Question put, and *agreed to.*

(2.) Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £2,708,695, be granted to Her Majesty, to defray the Expense of Wages, &c. to Seamen and Marines, which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1880" 614

Moved, "That the Chairman do report Progress, and ask leave to sit again,"—(*Mr. Parnell*:)—After short debate, Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Original Question put, and *agreed to.*

Resolutions to be reported *To-morrow;* Committee to sit again upon *Wednesday.*

MOTION

Clare County Writ—Re-appointment of Select Committee—

Ordered, That a Select Committee be re-appointed to inquire whether Sir Bryan O'Loghlen, Member for the County of Clare, has, since his election, accepted an office or place of profit under or from the Crown, and that they be directed to report their opinion whether he has vacated his seat by the acceptance of the said office:—List of the Committee 615

Moved, "That Mr. Butt be another Member of the Committee,"—(*Mr. Assheton Cross*:)—After short debate, Question put, and *negatived*:—Other Members nominated.

LORDS, TUESDAY, MARCH 11.

West Donegal Railway Bill—

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª,"—(*The Viscount Lifford*) .. 616

After short debate, on Question? *Resolved* in the *Affirmative*:—Bill read 2ª accordingly.

Medical Act (1858) **Amendment Bill** (No. 16)—

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª,"—(*The Lord President*) .. 625

After short debate, Motion *agreed to*:—Bill read 2ª accordingly, and *committed* to a Committee of the Whole House on *Thursday* the 20*th instant*.

Intemperance—Report of the Select Committee—Question, The Earl of Wharncliffe; Answer, Lord Aberdare 625

COMMONS, TUESDAY, MARCH 11.

PRIVATE BUSINESS.

Liverpool Lighting Bill (*by Order*)—

Order for Second Reading read 626

After short debate, Bill read a second time.

Moved, "That the Bill be committed to a Select Committee of Seven Members, Four to be appointed by the House and Three by the Committee of Selection,"—(*Mr. Raikes.*)

Motion *agreed to*.

Moved, "That it be an Instruction to the Committee that they have power to inquire whether it is desirable to authorise any schemes for lighting by Electricity or other improved methods; to consider how far and under what conditions, if at all, the use of such modes of lighting should be sanctioned by Parliament in the case of Municipal Corporations, other local authorities, or Public Companies, and to report their opinion to the House; and that such of the Petitioners against the Bill as pray to be heard by themselves, their Counsel, or Agents be heard upon their Petitions (if presented on or before the 17th day of March), and Counsel heard in favour of the Bill against such Petitions:—That the Committee have power to send for persons, papers, and records:—That Four be the quorum of the Committee,"—(*Mr. Raikes.*)

Motion *agreed to*:—And, on March 13, Committee *nominated*:—List of the Committee 628

QUESTIONS.

ARMY—THE MILITIA—Question, Earl Percy; Answer, Colonel Stanley .. 628
SOUTH AFRICA—THE ZULU WAR—SIR BARTLE FRERE'S DESPATCH—Question, Mr. Chamberlain; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach .. 629
MINES ACT—THE ACCIDENT AT WAKEFIELD—Question, Mr. Macdonald; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross 629
CRIMINAL LAW—CASES OF THEODORIDI AND GORLERO—Question, Mr. Callan; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross 629
SCOTCH BANKS—EXTRAORDINARY DIRECTORS—THE SCOTCH JUDGES—Question, Mr. Callan; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross 631
HIGHWAYS ACT, 1878—FORMS OF ACCOUNTS—Question, Mr. Clare Read; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth 631
MERCANTILE MARINE—FOREIGN STEAMERS—Question, Mr. Bates; Answer, Mr. J. G. Talbot 632

MOTIONS.

INTOXICATING LIQUORS (LICENCES)—RESOLUTION—

Moved, "That, inasmuch as the ancient and avowed object of licensing the sale of intoxicating liquor is to supply a supposed public want without detriment to the public welfare, this House is of opinion that a legal power of restraining the issue or renewal of licences should be placed in the hands of the persons most deeply interested and affected—namely, the inhabitants themselves—who are entitled to protection from the injurious consequences of the present system by some efficient measure of local option,"—(*Sir Wilfrid Lawson*) 632

Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "it would be most undesirable and inopportune to change the arrangements now legislatively provided for the regulation of the trade carried on by the Licensed Victuallers of this Country, because any tribunal subject to periodical election by popular canvas and vote might, and in all probability would, lead to repeated instances of turmoil, and thus be detrimental to the peace and quietude of every neighbourhood in England,"—(*Mr. Wheelhouse,*)—instead thereof.

After long debate, Question put, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question:"—The House *divided;* Ayes 164, Noes 252; Majority 88.

Division List, Ayes and Noes 746

Question,

"That the words 'it would be most undesirable and inopportune to change the arrangements now legislatively provided for the regulation of the trade carried on by the Licensed Victuallers of this Country, because any tribunal subject to periodical election by popular canvas and vote might, and in all probability would, lead to repeated instances of turmoil, and thus be detrimental to the peace and quietude of every neighbourhood in England,' be there added,"

—put, and *negatived* 750

Amendment proposed,

To add, after the word "That" in the Original Question, the words "it is undesirable for this House to commit itself to legislation on the subject of licensing till the Select Committee of the House of Lords on Intemperance have published their final Report,"—(*Lord Francis Hervey.*)

Question put, "That those words be there added:"—The House *divided;* Ayes 121, Noes 169; Majority 48.—(Div. List, No. 41.)

Moved, "That this House do now adjourn,"—(*Mr. Heygate:*)—Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

INTOXICATING LIQUORS (LICENCES)—RESOLUTION—*continued.*

Amendment proposed,

To add, after the word "That" in the Original Question, the words "in the opinion of this House, among the conditions prescribed by Law for the granting of new Licences for the Sale of Intoxicating Liquors, it should be expressly provided that the licensing authority shall take into consideration the population and the number of existing licences in the district, and shall find as a fact, upon sworn evidence, that new licences are required for the necessary convenience of the public,"—(*Mr. Serjeant Simon.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there added:"—After short debate, *Moved,* "That the Debate be now adjourned,"—(*Sir George Campbell*:)—Motion *agreed to*:—Debate *adjourned* till *Tuesday* next.

ORDERS OF THE DAY.

Habitual Drunkards Bill [Bill 47]—

Bill, as amended, *considered* 753

After short debate, Bill to be read the third time *To-morrow.*

Friendly Societies Act (1875) Amendment Bill [Bill 85]—

Bill *considered* in Committee 755

After short time spent therein, Bill *reported,* without Amendment; to be read the third time *To-morrow.*

CO-OPERATIVE STORES—

Select Committee *appointed,* "to inquire into the constitution and operations of certain trading societies, trading under the name of Co-operative Stores, and to ascertain whether they are exempted from taxes and imposts to which the trading community are liable,"—(*Sir Charles Russell.*)

Mutiny Act (Temporary) Continuance Bill—Resolution [4th March] read; Bill *ordered* (*Mr. Secretary Stanley, The Judge Advocate, Colonel Loyd Lindsay*); *presented,* and read the first time [Bill 99] 757

Marine Mutiny Act (Temporary) Continuance Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. William Henry Smith, Mr. Algernon Egerton, Sir Massey Lopes*); *presented,* and read the first time [Bill 98] 757

COMMONS, WEDNESDAY, MARCH 12.

ORDERS OF THE DAY.

Medical Act (1858) Amendment Bill [Bill 2]—

Moved, "That the Bill be now read a second time,"—(*Dr. Lush*) .. 758

Amendment proposed, to leave out the word "now," and at the end of the Question to add the words "upon this day six months,"—(*Mr. Serjeant Simon.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question:"—After debate, *Moved,* "That the Debate be now adjourned,"—(*Dr. Brady*:)—Motion *agreed to*:—Debate *adjourned* till *Wednesday* 26th March.

Clerical Disabilities Bill [Bill 18]—

Moved, "That the Bill be now read a second time,"—(*Mr. Goldney*) .. 780

Amendment proposed, to leave out the word "now," and at the end of the Question to add the words "upon this day six months,"—(*Mr. Beresford Hope.*)

Clerical Disabilities Bill—continued.

Question proposed, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question:"—After short debate, Question put:—The House *divided;* Ayes 66, Noes 135; Majority 69.—(Div. List, No. 42.)

Words *added:*—Main Question, as amended, put, and *agreed to:*—Second Reading *put off* for six months.

COMMONS—Select Committee *nominated:*—List of the Committee .. 788

Supreme Court of Judicature (District Courts) Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Joseph Cowen, Mr. Ripley, Mr. Eustace Smith, Mr. Rowley Hill*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 100] 789

LORDS, THURSDAY, MARCH 13.

REPRESENTATIVE PEER FOR SCOTLAND—

The Clerk of the Crown in Chancery delivered his certificate that the Earl of Dundonald had been elected a Representative Peer for Scotland in the room of the Earl of Lauderdale deceased.

SOUTH AFRICA—THE ZULU WAR — THE RE-INFORCEMENTS — Observations, Earl Cadogan 789

Exchequer Bonds (No. 1) Bill—

Read 2ª (according to Order); Committee *negatived:* Then Standing Orders Nos. XXXVII. and XXXVIII. *considered* (according to Order), and *dispensed with;* Bill read 3ª, and *passed* 790

Bankruptcy Law Amendment Bill (No. 8)—

House in Committee (according to Order) 790

Amendments made; the Report thereof to be received on *Thursday* next.

Debtors Act (1869) Amendment Bill (No. 9)—

House in Committee (according to Order) 794

Bill *reported*, without Amendment; and to be read 3ª *To-morrow.*

Supreme Court of Judicature Acts Amendment Bill (No. 11)

House in Committee (according to Order) 794

After short debate, Bill *reported*, without Amendment; and to be read 3ª on *Thursday* next.

Consolidated Fund (No. 1) Bill—

Bill read 3ª (according to Order), and *passed.*

COMMONS, THURSDAY, MARCH 13.

PRIVATE BUSINESS.

Thames River (Prevention of Floods) Bill (by Order)—

Moved, to nominate the Select Committee on this Bill,—(*Mr. Raikes*) .. 795

Moved, "That Mr. Goldney be a Member of the Select Committee."

Moved, "That the Debate be now adjourned," — (*Mr. Cubitt:*)— After short debate, Motion, by leave, *withdrawn:*—Original Question put, and *agreed to.*

Mr. A. Brown, Sir Baldwyn Leighton, and Sir C. W. Dilke nominated other Members of the Committee.

Moved, "That Sir James M'Garel-Hogg be a Member of the Select Committee:"—After short debate, Motion *agreed to.*

Lord Robert Montagu to be another Member of the Committee.

QUESTIONS.

Prison Rules—Reporters of the Press—Question, Mr. W. M'Arthur; Answer, Sir Matthew White Ridley 816

Afghanistan and Khelat—Treaties, &c.—Question, General Sir George Balfour; Answer, Mr. E. Stanhope 816

Army—Linked Battalions—Question, Colonel Alexander; Answer, Lord Eustace Cecil 817

Army—The Staff College—Vacancies—Question, Major Nolan; Answer, Lord Eustace Cecil 817

Railways (India)—The Indus and the Bolan Pass—Question, Sir Henry Havelock; Answer, Mr. E. Stanhope 817

Army — Officers' Travelling Expenses — Question, Major O'Beirne; Answer, Lord Eustace Cecil 818

South Africa—Export of Munitions of War for Mozambique—Question, Mr. Ritchie; Answer, Mr. Bourke 818

Grand Jury Laws (Ireland)—Legislation—Question, Mr. O'Shaughnessy; Answer, Mr. J. Lowther 819

Army (India)—Pay of Lieutenants—Question, Colonel Naghten; Answer, Mr. E. Stanhope 819

Ireland — Town Inspectorship of Belfast — Question, Major Nolan; Answer, Mr. J. Lowther 819

Inspectors of Coal Mines—The Reports—Question, Mr. Stevenson; Answer, Sir Matthew White Ridley 820

The Treaty of Berlin—The Despatch in the "Times" of March 12th—Questions, Lord Robert Montagu; Answers, Mr. Bourke, The Chancellor of the Exchequer 820

South Africa—The Zulu War—The Defeat at Isandlana—Question, Dr. Kenealy; Answer, Lord Eustace Cecil 821

Criminal Law—Case of the Rev. H. J. Dodwell—Question, Dr. Kenealy; Answer, Sir Matthew White Ridley 821

South Africa—The Zulu War—The Re-inforcements—Coaling of Transports—Questions, Mr. Gourley; Answers, Mr. A. F. Egerton .. 821

Egypt—Mr. Rivers Wilson—Question, Sir George Campbell; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer 823

ORDERS OF THE DAY.

Supply—Order for Committee read; Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair:"—

The Franchise and the City Guilds—Resolution—

Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "the sale of the Parliamentary Franchise by the City Guilds with the consent of the Court of Aldermen is an abuse and should be abolished,"—(*Mr. James*,)—instead thereof 823

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question:"—After short debate, Question put:—The House *divided;* Ayes 153, Noes 114; Majority 39.—(Div. List, No. 43.)

Main Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair:"—

Egyptian Finance — Observations, Sir George Campbell: — Debate thereon 830

Instruction in Mixed Colleges — Observations, Mr. O'Donnell:— Debate thereon 852

Motion, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair," by leave, *withdrawn*:—Committee *deferred* till *To-morrow.*

Army Discipline and Regulation Bill [Bill 88]—
After short debate, Second Reading *deferred* till *To-morrow* .. 881

Oyster and Mussel Fisheries Order (Blackwater, Essex) Bill [Bill 76]—
Bill *considered* in Committee 882
Bill *reported;* as amended, to be considered *To-morrow.*

Teachers Organisation and Registration Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Lyon Playfair, Mr. Arthur Mills, Sir John Lubbock, Lord Francis Hervey*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 101] 882

LORDS, FRIDAY, MARCH 14.

THE VOLUNTEER FORCE—ADDRESS FOR A RETURN—
Moved that an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty for Return showing the number of courts of inquiry ordered by the War Office in each year in the Volunteer Force since its establishment; the number of volunteers of all ranks, the number of adjutants, and the number of instructors in each year on whom such were held, and the several offences charged,—(*The Lord Truro*) 882
After short debate, on Question? *Resolved* in the *Negative.*

HIGHWAYS ACT, 1878—Question, Observations, The Earl of Kimberley; Reply, The Duke of Richmond and Gordon 884
SOUTH AFRICA—THE ZULU WAR—THE DEFEAT AT ISANDLANA—Question, Observations, Lord Thurlow, The Earl of Longford, Lord Truro, Lord Stanley of Alderley; Reply, Viscount Bury 886

COMMONS, FRIDAY, MARCH 14.

PRIVATE BUSINESS.

London and North Western Railway (Additional Powers) Bill (by Order)—
Moved, "That the Bill be now read a second time,"—(*Sir Charles Forster*) 893
Amendment proposed, to leave out the word "now," and at the end of the Question to add the words "upon this day six months,"—(*Mr. Alderman Cotton.*)
Question proposed, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question:" —After short debate, Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*
Main Question put, and *agreed to*:—Bill read a second time.
Moved, "That the Bill be *committed* to a Select Committee of Five Members, Three to be nominated by the House, and Two by the Committee of Selection,"—(*Viscount Sandon.*)
Motion *agreed to.*
Moved the following Instruction to the Committee:—
"That they have power to inquire and report as to the expediency of authorizing the said Company from time to time to purchase by agreement or take on lease or otherwise provide, and to establish and hold booking and receiving offices and other premises for the collection, reception, and booking and delivery of goods, parcels, and other matters and things intended to be carried upon or over their Railway, and to collect, receive, book, and invoice any such goods, parcels, and other matters and things; and to make and carry into effect any such contracts or agreements with any other Railway Company or Companies with regard to the collection, reception, booking, or invoicing of any goods, parcels, and other matters and things intended to be carried upon or over the Railways of the respective Companies so contracting, or any or either of them,"—(*Viscount Sandon.*)
"Power to send for persons, papers, and records; Three to be the quorum:"—Motion *agreed to.*
And, on March 21, Committee *nominated*:—List of the Committee .. 904

[*March* 14.] Page

Midland Railway Bill (by Order)—
Moved, "That the Bill be now read a second time,"—(*Sir Charles Forster*) 904
Motion *agreed to*:—Bill read a second time.
Bill committed to the Select Committee on the London and North Western Railway (Additional Powers) Bill, with Instruction to the same effect.

QUESTIONS.

RAILWAYS—CONTINUOUS FOOT-BOARDS—Question, Mr. Gregory; Answer, Viscount Sandon 905

WEST INDIES—GRENADA—PROTECTOR OF IMMIGRANTS—Question, Sir Henry Holland; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach 905

BRITISH BURMAH—THE RE-INFORCEMENTS—Questions, Mr. Richard, Mr. W. E. Forster; Answers, The Chancellor of the Exchequer .. 905

THE CAPE COLONY—MILITARY EXPENDITURE—Question, General Sir George Balfour; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer 906

MERCANTILE MARINE—THE CASE OF DAVID JULIAN—Question, Mr. Macdonald; Answer, Mr. Bourke 907

SOUTH AFRICA—THE ZULU WAR—Questions, Mr. Sullivan, Mr. Chamberlain; Answers, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach 907

Moved, "That this House do now adjourn,"—(*Mr. Edward Jenkins*:)—After short debate, Motion, by leave, *withdrawn*.

UNIVERSITY EDUCATION (IRELAND)—Question, Mr. Callan; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer 924

THE TREATY OF BERLIN—LORD SALISBURY'S DESPATCH OF JANUARY 26—Questions, Lord Robert Montagu, The Marquess of Hartington; Answers, The Chancellor of the Exchequer 925

LICENSING LAWS AMENDMENT BILL—Question, Mr. Mundella; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross 926

AFGHANISTAN—THE WAR—ADDRESS OF GENERAL ROBERTS TO THE CHIEFS OF KURRAM—Question, Mr. O'Reilly; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer 927

EDUCATION (SCOTLAND) ACT, 1878—EXAMINATION OF HIGHER CLASS SCHOOLS—Question, Mr. Lyon Playfair; Answer, Lord George Hamilton .. 927

SOUTH AFRICA—TELEGRAPHIC DESPATCHES—Question, Mr. Otway; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach 928

SOUTH AFRICA—THE ZULU WAR—MANUFACTURE OF ARMS—Question, Mr. Ritchie; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer .. 929

SOUTH AFRICA—THE ZULU WAR—THE RE-INFORCEMENTS—COALING OF TRANSPORTS—Question, Mr. Boord; Answer, Mr. A. F. Egerton .. 929

SOUTH AFRICA—EXPORT OF MUNITIONS OF WAR FOR MOZAMBIQUE—Observations, Mr. Bourke, Mr. Mac Iver 930

SOUTH AFRICA—THE ZULU WAR—SIR CHARLES W. DILKE'S MOTION—Question, Sir Charles W. Dilke; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer 931

PRIVATE BILLS—CANVASSING OF MEMBERS—Observations, Mr. Raikes; Reply, Mr. Speaker 932

SOUTH AFRICA—THE ZULU WAR—THE DEFEAT AT ISANDLANA—GENERAL LORD CHELMSFORD—Notice of Question, Mr. Rylands; Observations, Colonel Stanley 933

ORDERS OF THE DAY.

SUPPLY—Order for Committee read; Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair:"—

ARMY—THE SCIENTIFIC CORPS—RESOLUTION—Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, praying Her Majesty to be pleased to order the issue of a Royal Commission to inquire into and to report whether any and what alterations of the Military system now in force are desirable, as regards the pay, promotion, employment, and conditions of service and retirement of the officers of the Ordnance Corps,"—(*Colonel Arbuthnot*,)—instead thereof 934

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question:"—After debate, Question put:—The House *divided;* Ayes 68, Noes 69; Majority 1.—(Div. List, No. 44.)

Words *added*:—Main Question, as amended, put, and *agreed to.*

District Auditors Bill [Bill 79]—

Order for Committee read:—*Moved,* "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair,"—(*Mr. Sclater-Booth*) 963

Moved, "That the Debate be now adjourned,"—(*Mr. Parnell*:)—After short debate, Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Original Question, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair," put, and *agreed to*:—Bill *considered* in Committee.

After short time spent therein, Bill *reported;* as amended, to be *considered* upon *Monday* next.

Prosecution of Offences Bill [Bill 68]—

Order for Committee read:—*Moved,* "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair,"—(*Mr. Secretary Cross*) 966

Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "this House will, upon this day six months, resolve itself into the said Committee,"—(*Mr. Benjamin Williams*,)—instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question:"—After debate, *Moved,* "That the Debate be now adjourned,"—(*Mr. Mitchell Henry*:)—After further short debate, Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

After further short debate, Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Main Question, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair," put, and *agreed to*:—Bill *considered* in Committee.

Committee report Progress; to sit again upon *Thursday* next.

Companies Acts Amendment Bill—*Considered* in Committee:—Resolution *agreed to*, and *reported*:—Bill *ordered* (*Sir John Lubbock, Mr. Coope, Mr. Herschell, Sir Charles Mills*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 102] 995

LORDS, MONDAY, MARCH 17.

RAILWAYS (IRELAND)—THE LETTERKENNY RAILWAY AND THE WEST DONEGAL RAILWAY BILLS—RESOLUTION—

Moved to resolve, That it is desirable before the Letterkenny Railway and the West Donegal Railway Bills be further proceeded with that the Board of Trade should report to Parliament whether the character of the country through or of the traffic for which these lines are to be made renders it necessary or expedient that either or both of them should be constructed on a three feet gauge, with the reasons on which their Report is founded,—(*The Chairman of Committees*) 996

After short debate, on Question? their Lordships *divided;* Contents 28, Not-Contents 36; Majority 8:—*Resolved* in the *Negative.*

Division List, Contents and Not-Contents 999

NAVY—EXPLOSION ON BOARD H.M.S. "THUNDERER"—Observations, The Duke of Somerset:—Short debate thereon 999

Rivers Conservancy Bill (No. 20)—

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª,"—(*The Lord President*) .. 1018

After short debate, Motion *agreed to*:—Bill read 2ª accordingly, and *committed* to a Committee of the Whole House on *Monday* the 31*st instant*.

Disqualification by Medical Relief Bill (No. 6)—

Order of the Day for the Second Reading, read 1023

Second Reading *put off* to *Friday* next.

COMMONS, MONDAY, MARCH 17.

QUESTIONS.

IRELAND—THE DUBLIN PORT AND DOCKS BOARDS—Question, Mr. M. Brooks; Answer, The Attorney General for Ireland 1024

THE STRAITS SETTLEMENTS—INSTRUCTIONS TO BRITISH RESIDENTS—Question, Sir Charles W. Dilke; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach .. 1024

CYPRUS—ENFORCED LABOUR—Questions, Mr. H. Samuelson, Mr. W. E. Forster; Answers, Mr. Bourke 1025

WEST INDIA ISLANDS—COOLIES IN GRENADA — Question, Sir George Campbell; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach 1027

IRELAND—IRISH BRANCH OF THE TREASURY—Question, Mr. O'Shaughnessy; Answer, Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson 1028

NAVY CONTRACTS—THE PENINSULAR AND ORIENTAL STEAM NAVIGATION COMPANY—Question, Mr. Baxter; Answer, Lord John Manners .. 1028

ARMY—STAFF OFFICERS OF ARTILLERY—Questions, Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice, Major Nolan; Answers, Colonel Stanley 1029

ELECTION PETITIONS RETURN — IRISH CASES — Question, Mr. O'Conor; Answer, Mr. J. Lowther 1031

SOUTH AFRICA—THE ZULU WAR—NAVAL COALING DEPÔTS — Question, Mr. Gourley; Answer, Mr. W. H. Smith 1031

NAVY—H.M.S. "VANGUARD"—Question, Mr. D. Jenkins; Answer, Mr. W. H. Smith 1033

ELEMENTARY EDUCATION ACT, 1876—DRUMMER BOYS — Question, Mr. Simonds; Answer, Colonel Stanley 1033

POST OFFICE—THE PACIFIC MAIL CONTRACTS—Question, Mr. Mac Iver; Answer, Lord John Manners 1034

NAVY—ROMAN CATHOLIC CHAPLAINS—Question, Mr. Errington; Answer, Mr. W. H. Smith 1034

CRIMINAL LAW — CASE OF WILLIAM HABRON, CONVICTED OF MURDER — Question, Mr. Mitchell Henry; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross .. 1035

INDIA—THE FINANCIAL STATEMENT—Question, General Sir George Balfour; Answer, Mr. E. Stanhope 1036

ARMY—OUT-PENSIONERS—Question, Mr. Barran; Answer, Colonel Loyd Lindsay 1037

NAVY ESTIMATES—SHIPS BUILDING—Question, Mr. Samuda; Answer, Mr. W. H. Smith 1037

SOUTH AFRICA—THE ZULU WAR—SIR CHARLES W. DILKE'S MOTION—Question, Sir Charles W. Dilke; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer 1038

METROPOLIS—PAROCHIAL CHARITIES OF THE CITY OF LONDON — Question, Mr. Fawcett; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross 1038

[*March* 17.] *Page*

TURKEY—PAPERS—Question, Sir William Harcourt; Answer, Mr. Bourke 1038

ARMY ESTIMATES—CONTAGIOUS DISEASES ACTS—Question, Mr. Hopwood; Answer, Colonel Stanley 1039

PARLIAMENT—BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE—INTOXICATING LIQUORS (LICENCES)—THE ADJOURNED DEBATE—Question, Sir Wilfrid Lawson; Answer, Mr. Serjeant Simon 1039

ORDERS OF THE DAY.

SUPPLY—*considered* in Committee [*Progress 3rd March*]—ARMY ESTIMATES.

(In the Committee.)

(1.) Original Question again proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £4,598,000, be granted to Her Majesty, to defray the charge of the Pay, Allowances, and other Charges of Her Majesty's Land Forces at Home and Abroad (exclusive of India), which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1880" 1039

Moved, "That the Chairman do report Progress, and ask leave to sit again,"—(*Mr. Parnell*:)—After debate, Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Original Question again proposed 1061

After debate, Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £4,588,000, be granted, &c."—(*Sir Patrick O'Brien*:)—After further short debate, Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Original Question again proposed 1086

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Item Sub-head C, for Regimental Pay, of £4,390,000, be reduced by £10,000,"—(*Sir Patrick O'Brien*:)—After short debate, Question put:—The Committee *divided;* Ayes 5, Noes 120; Majority 115.—(Div. List, No. 45.)

Original Question again proposed 1094

After short debate, Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Item Sub-head C, for Regimental Pay, of £4,390,000, be reduced by £1,000,"—(*Sir Patrick O'Brien*:)—After further short debate, Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Original Question again proposed 1103

After debate, Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £4,591,722, be granted, &c."—(*Mr. Parnell*:)—After further short debate, Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Original Question again proposed 1119

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £4,591,700, be granted, &c."—(*Major O'Beirne*:)—After short debate, Question put:—The Committee *divided;* Ayes 7, Noes 148; Majority 141.—(Div. List, No. 46.)

After further short debate, Original Question put, and *agreed to.*

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £50,600, be granted to Her Majesty, to defray the Charge for Divine Service, which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1880" .. 1120

Moved, "That the Chairman do report Progress, and ask leave to sit again,"—(*Mr. Parnell*:)—After short debate, Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Original Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

(2.) £33,100, Rewards for Distinguished Service, &c.—After short debate, Vote *agreed to* 1125

(3.) £98,000, Pay of General Officers.—After short debate, Vote *agreed to* .. 1127

(4.) £918,100, Retired Full Pay, Half Pay Pensions, and Gratuities, &c.—After short debate, Vote *agreed to* 1127

(5.) £121,500, Widows' Pensions, &c.

(6.) £16,800, Pensions for Wounds.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £35,000, be granted to Her Majesty, to defray the Charge for Chelsea and Kilmainham Hospitals (In-Pensions), which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1880" 1128

Moved, "That the Chairman do report Progress, and ask leave to sit again,"—(*Mr. Parnell*:)—After short debate, Question put:—The Committee *divided;* Ayes 14, Noes 96; Majority 82.—(Div. List, No. 47.)

Original Question again proposed 1130

Moved, "That the Chairman do now leave the Chair,"—(*Major Nolan*:)—After short debate, Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Original Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Resolutions to be reported *To-morrow;* Committee to sit again upon *Wednesday.*

[*March* 17.] Page

MOTIONS.

Employers' Liability Bill—

Motion for Leave (*Mr. Attorney General*) 1135

After short debate, Motion *agreed to*:—Bill to amend the Law relating to the Liability of employers for injuries sustained by their Servants, *ordered* (*Mr. Attorney General, Mr. Solicitor General, The Lord Advocate, Mr. Attorney General for Ireland*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 103.]

Land Drainage Provisional Order (Bispham, &c.) Bill—*Ordered* (*Sir Matthew Ridley, Mr. Secretary Cross*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 104] .. 1143

LORDS, TUESDAY, MARCH 18.

South Africa—The Zulu War—The Queen's Message — Question, Observations, Lord Truro; Reply, The Earl of Beaconsfield .. 1144

COMMONS, TUESDAY, MARCH 18.

PRIVATE BUSINESS.

Thames River (*Prevention of Floods*) *Bill—*

Committee on the Thames River (Prevention of Floods) Bill to consist of Twelve Members; Sir Trevor Lawrence and Mr. Maurice Brooks added to the Committee; Lord Robert Montagu discharged from attendance; Five to be the quorum.—(*The Chairman of Ways and Means.*)

QUESTIONS.

Criminal Law—Case of Michael Gilmore — Question, Mr. Mitchell Henry; Answer, Mr. J. Lowther 1149

Patents for Inventions (No. 2) Bill—Question, Mr. Samuelson; Answer, The Attorney General 1150

Army—The Indian Contingent—Cost of Transport — Question, Mr. Mundella; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer 1150

Parliament—The Vacant Seats—Dissolution of Parliament—Question, Mr. Hibbert; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer .. 1150

Law and Justice—Case of "Martin v. Mackonochie"—Question, Sir Ughtred Kay-Shuttleworth; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer 1151

The War Office Locks—Question, Mr. Macdonald; Answer, Colonel Loyd Lindsay 1152

The King of Burmah—Reported Ultimatum—Question, Mr. Richard; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer 1152

Public Health—Death-Rate of the Metropolis—Question, Sir Ughtred Kay-Shuttleworth; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth 1153

India—The Exchanges—Questions, Mr. J. K. Cross, Mr. Childers, Mr. Fawcett; Answers, The Chancellor of the Exchequer 1154

District Auditors Bill—Question, Sir Charles W. Dilke; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth 1155

Cyprus—The Greek Language—Questions, Mr. H. Samuelson; Answers, Mr. Bourke 1156

Army — The Consolidated Ration—Erbswürst—Question, Sir Henry Havelock; Answer, Colonel Stanley 1157

Quarantine Act — Cargo of Rags from Russia — Question, Mr. J. Cowen; Answer, Lord George Hamilton 1157

South Africa—The Zulu War—The Defeat at Isandlana—Question, Sir Robert Peel; Answer, Colonel Stanley 1158

India—The Afghan War—Newspaper Correspondents—Question, Mr. Anderson; Answer, Mr. E. Stanhope 1159

South Africa—The Zulu War—Despatch of September 14, 1878—Question, Mr. Shaw Lefevre; Answer, Colonel Stanley .. 1159

Dominion of Canada—The New Tariff—Notice of Question, Mr. John Bright 1160

Central Asia—Reported Russian Operations against Merv—Question, Lord Robert Montagu; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer .. 1160

Public Peace (Ireland)—Riots at Belfast and Outrage at Derry—Questions, The O'Donoghue, Mr. Sullivan; Answers, Mr. J. Lowther 1161

Egypt—The British Consul General—Question, Sir George Campbell; Answer, Mr. Bourke 1161

MOTIONS.

Wine Duties—Resolution—

Moved, "That, in the opinion of this House, it is desirable that a Select Committee be appointed to inquire into the system under which Customs Duties are now levied in this Country on Wine, and into its results, fiscal and commercial,"—(*Mr. Cartwright*) 1162

After debate, Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Specie and Paper Currency—Resolution—

Moved, "That, in the opinion of this House, a free circulation of specie currency, together with a full and adequate circulation of paper currency, convertible into specie on demand, is essential and necessary for the promotion and development of manufactures, commerce, and trade,"—(*Mr. Delahunty*) 1185

After short debate, Motion *agreed to.*

Post Office (West India Mail Contract)—Resolution—

Moved, "That the Contract entered into with the Royal Mail Steam Packet Company for the conveyance of Mails to and from the West Indies be approved,"—(*Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson*) 1191

After short debate, Motion *agreed to.*

County Boards Bill—

Motion for Leave (*Mr. Sclater-Booth*) 1199

After debate, Question put, and *agreed to*:—Bill *ordered* (*Mr. Sclater-Booth, Mr. Secretary Cross, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer*); *presented,* and read the first time [Bill 105.]

Coroners Bill [Bill 67]—Select Committee *nominated*:—List of the Committee .. 1222

COMMONS, WEDNESDAY, MARCH 19.

PRIVATE BUSINESS.

East Indian Railway Bill—

Select Committee *nominated*:—List of the Committee 1222

ORDERS OF THE DAY.

Hypothec Abolition (Scotland) Bill [Bill 3]—

Moved, "That the Bill be now read a second time,"—(*Mr. Vans Agnew*) 1222

Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "inasmuch as the Law of Hypothec is the equivalent in Scotland of the English

Hypothec Abolition (*Scotland*) *Bill*—continued.

and Irish Law of distress, and inasmuch as many other examples of preferential security over property being given in certain circumstances to particular creditors are to be found in the commercial Law of this and other Nations, this subject, if dealt with at all by Parliament, should be considered as a whole, and not be treated locally and exceptionally as in the present Bill; and in dealing with this subject due consideration should be given to the fact that the preferential security for payment of rent which landlords have from time immemorial enjoyed at Common Law, regulated by Statute, has, to the great advantage of the Nation, enabled many industrious and enterprising men of small means to obtain farms and rise in the world, which otherwise they could not have done,"—(*Lord Elcho*,)—instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question:"—After long debate, Question put:—The House *divided;* Ayes 204, Noes 77; Majority 127.—(Div. List, No. 48.)

Main Question put, and *agreed to:*—Bill read a second time, and *committed* for *Tuesday* 1st April.

WAYS AND MEANS—

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

(1.) *Resolved*, That, towards making good the Supply granted to Her Majesty for the service of the year ending on the 31st day of March 1879, the sum of £73,220 be granted out of the Consolidated Fund of the United Kingdom.

(2.) *Resolved*, That, towards making good the Supply granted to Her Majesty for the service of the year ending on the 31st day of March 1880, the sum of £8,494,195 be granted out of the Consolidated Fund of the United Kingdom.

Resolutions to be reported *To-morrow;* Committee to sit again upon *Friday*.

Trustees Acts Consolidation and Amendment Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Osborne Morgan, Mr. Gregory, Mr. Alfred Marten, Sir Henry Jackson*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 106] 1288

Public Health (Scotland) Act (1867) Amendment Bill—*Ordered* (*Dr. Cameron, Sir Wyndham Anstruther, Mr. M'Laren, Mr. Vans Agnew, Mr. Mackintosh*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 107] 1289

Licensing Act (1872) Amendment Bill — *Considered* in Committee:—Resolution *agreed to*, and *reported:*—Bill *ordered* (*Mr. Rodwell, Mr. Serjeant Simon, Mr. Arthur Mills, Mr. Leatham, Mr. Mark Stewart*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 108] 1289

LORDS, THURSDAY, MARCH 20.

NAVY—H.M.S. "BOADICEA" — Question, Observations, Lord Colville of Culross; Reply, Earl Cadogan 1289

Medical Act, 1858, Amendment Bill (No. 16)—

Moved, "That the House be now put into Committee on the Bill,"—(*The Lord President*) 1291

After short debate, Motion *agreed to:* House in Committee accordingly.

Amendments made; the Report thereof to be received on *Friday* the 28*th instant;* and Bill to be *printed*, as amended. (No. 31.)

Bankruptcy Law Amendment Bill (No. 8)—

Amendments *reported* (according to Order) 1304

Further Amendments made:—Bill to be read 3ª on *Monday* next.

COMMONS, THURSDAY, MARCH 20.

Page

QUESTIONS.

INDIA — THE INDIAN BUDGET — Question, Notice of Resolutions, Mr. Fawcett; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer 1306
CORONERS (IRELAND) — Question, Mr. O'Shaughnessy; Answer, Mr. J. Lowther 1307
IRISH CHURCH TEMPORALITIES COMMISSIONERS—THE REPORT FOR 1878—Question, Mr. Heygate; Answer, Mr. J. Lowther 1307
SOUTH AFRICA—SHIPMENT OF ARMS—Question, Mr. Ritchie; Answer, Lord Eustace Cecil 1307
THE BRITISH MUSEUM — THE NATURAL HISTORY COLLECTION—Question, Lord Arthur Russell; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer .. 1308
PUBLIC LOANS—PUBLIC WORKS LOANS BILL—Question, Mr. Chamberlain; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer 1308
JAMAICA—FLOGGING FOR LIBEL—Question, Mr. Errington; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach 1309
CRIMINAL LAW — THE DEVONPORT WATCH COMMITTEE — Question, Sir Wilfrid Lawson; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross 1310
LAW AND JUSTICE—CRIMINAL ASSIZES—Question, Mr. Cole; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross 1310
NAVY—THE ROYAL YACHT "OSBORNE"—Question, Dr. Kenealy; Answer, Mr. W. H. Smith 1311
DOMINION OF CANADA—THE NEW TARIFF—Questions, Mr. John Bright; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach 1311
CENTRAL ASIA—REPORTED RUSSIAN ADVANCE ON MERV—Question, Lord Robert Montagu; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer .. 1313
SOUTH AFRICA—DESPATCHES—SIR BARTLE FRERE—Question, Mr. Chamberlain; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach 1313
JAPAN—MEDICINAL OPIUM—Question, Mr. Mark Stewart; Answer, Mr. Bourke 1314
GAS AND WATER SUPPLY (METROPOLIS)—Question, Sir Ughtred Kay-Shuttleworth; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross 1314
ARMY DISCIPLINE (ANNUAL) ACT — Question, Sir Alexander Gordon; Answer, Colonel Stanley 1315
NAVY—H.M.S "BOADICEA"—Question, Lord Charles Beresford; Answer, Mr. W. H. Smith 1315
CRIMINAL LAW—CASE OF JAMES SWANTON—Question, Mr. Sullivan; Answer, Mr. J. Lowther 1316
DURATION OF PARLIAMENTS—Question, Mr. W. H. James; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer 1316
ARMY—SIXTEEN-SHOOTER RIFLES—Question, Colonel Barne; Answer, Lord Eustace Cecil 1317
THE LORDS' COMMITTEE ON INTEMPERANCE—THE REPORT AND EVIDENCE—Question, Mr. Blake; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer .. 1317
MALTA—THE RECENT RIOTS—Question, Mr. Anderson; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach 1318
ARMY — NEWSPAPER CORRESPONDENTS IN THE FIELD — Question, Mr. Anderson; Answer, Colonel Stanley 1318
ISLAND OF CYPRUS—HEALTH OF THE TROOPS—Question, Mr. A. C. Barclay; Answer, Colonel Stanley 1318
PARLIAMENT—STATE OF PUBLIC BUSINESS—Observations, The Chancellor of the Exchequer:—Short debate thereon 1319

ORDERS OF THE DAY.

SUPPLY—*considered* in Committee—CIVIL SERVICE SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES, 1878-9.

(In the Committee.)

CLASS III.—LAW AND JUSTICE.

(1.) £350, Wreck Commission.
(2.) £19,723, County Courts.
(3.) £426, Metropolitan Police.
(4.) £3,500, County Prisons, &c., Great Britain.—After short debate, Vote *agreed to* 1321
(5.) £8,004, Reformatory and Industrial Schools, Great Britain.—After debate, Vote *agreed to* 1322
(6.) £10,000, Magistrates and Miscellaneous Legal Charges, Ireland.—After debate, Vote *agreed to* 1332

CLASS IV.—EDUCATION, SCIENCE, AND ART.

(7.) £106,000, Public Education, England and Wales.—After short debate, Vote *agreed to* 1335
(8.) £210, London University.
(9.) £16,984, Paris International Exhibition.—After short debate, Vote *agreed to* .. 1339
(10.) £8,746, Public Education, Ireland.

CLASS V.—COLONIAL, CONSULAR, AND OTHER FOREIGN SERVICES.

(11.) £22,810, Diplomatic Services.—After short debate, Vote *agreed to* .. 1346
(12.) £3,000, Consular Services.—After debate, Vote *agreed to* 1350
(13.) £19,246, Treasury Chest.—After short debate, Vote *agreed to* 1359

CLASS VI.—SUPERANNUATION AND RETIRED ALLOWANCES, AND GRATUITIES FOR CHARITABLE AND OTHER PURPOSES.

(14.) £1,750, Relief of Distressed British Seamen Abroad.
(15.) £534, Pauper Lunatics, Scotland.

CLASS VII.—MISCELLANEOUS, SPECIAL, AND TEMPORARY OBJECTS.

(16.) £4,960, Temporary Commissions.—After short debate, Vote *agreed to* .. 1360
(17.) £7,200, Mediterranean Extension Telegraph Company (Guarantee).—After short debate, Vote *agreed to* 1361
(18.) £520, Epping Forest Commission.
(19.) £6,656, Civil Contingencies Fund.—After short debate, Vote *agreed to* .. 1361

REVENUE DEPARTMENTS.

(20.) £34,500, Inland Revenue.
(21.) That a sum, not exceeding £17,899 1*s.* 2*d.*, be granted to Her Majesty, to make good Excesses on certain Grants for Civil Services, for the year ended on the 31st day of March 1878, viz.:—[Then the several Classes set forth.] .. 1363

Resolutions to be reported *To-morrow;* Committee to sit again *To-morrow.*

Parliamentary Elections and Corrupt Practices Bill [Bill 78]

Moved, "That the Bill be now read a second time,"—(*Mr. Attorney General*) 1363

Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "no Bill to amend the Acts relating to Election Petitions and to the prevention of Corrupt Practices at Parliamentary Elections will be satisfactory to the House which leaves the Law with regard to payments for the conveyance of Voters to the poll in its present condition,"—(*Sir Charles W. Dilke,*)—instead thereof .. 1371

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question:"—After debate, Question put:—The House *divided;* Ayes 138, Noes 89; Majority 49.—(Div. List, No. 50.)

Main Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time:"—After debate, Question put:—The House *divided;* Ayes 118, Noes 6; Majority 112.—(Div. List, No. 50.)

Bill read a second time, and *committed* for *Thursday* next.

Ways and Means—Resolutions [March 19] *reported,* and *agreed to:*—Bill *ordered* (*Mr. Raikes, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson*); *presented,* and read the first time 1403

MOTIONS.

Lunacy Law Amendment Bill—
Motion for Leave (*Mr. Dillwyn*) 1403
Motion *agreed to*:—Bill *ordered* (*Mr. Dillwyn, Sir George Balfour, Mr. Herschell*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 111.]

Land Tax Commissioners' Names Bill—*Ordered* (*Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 109] .. 1404

General Police and Improvement (Scotland) Provisional Order (Paisley) Bill—*Ordered* (*The Lord Advocate, Mr. Secretary Cross*); *presented*, and read the first time [Bill 110] 1404

LORDS, FRIDAY, MARCH 21.

South Africa — The Zulu War—Sir Bartle Frere—Notices of Motion, The Marquess of Lansdowne, Viscount Cranbrook 1404
Spain—Slavery in Cuba—Question, Observations, Earl Granville; Reply, The Marquess of Salisbury 1405
Cremation—Question, Observations, The Earl of Onslow; Reply, Earl Beauchamp 1406
Cyprus — The Harbour of Famagousta—Question, Observations, The Duke of Somerset; Reply, The Marquess of Salisbury; Observations, Earl Granville 1409

Disqualification by Medical Relief Bill (No. 6)—
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2^a,"—(*The Lord Aberdare*) .. 1417
After short debate, Motion *agreed to*:—Bill read 2^a accordingly, and *committed* to a Committee of the Whole House on *Thursday* next.

COMMONS, FRIDAY, MARCH 21.

PRIVATE BUSINESS.

Brentford, Isleworth, and Twickenham Tramways Bill (*by Order*)—
Moved, "That the Bill be now read a second time" 1421
Amendment proposed, to leave out the word "now," and at the end of the Question to add the words "upon this day six months,"—(*Mr. Bristowe.*)
Question proposed, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question:"—After short debate, Question put:—The House *divided;* Ayes 112, Noes 86; Majority 26.—(Div. List, No. 51.)
Main Question put, and *agreed to*:—Bill read a second time, and *committed.*

QUESTIONS.

Banking Legislation—Question, Mr. Heygate; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer 1429
Criminal Law—Case of William Habron, Convicted of Murder—Questions, Mr. Mitchell Henry, Dr. Kenealy; Answers, Mr. Assheton Cross 1430
Vaccination Acts—The Bingley Magistrates' Orders—Question, Mr. Barran; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross 1432

[*March* 21.] Page

TURKISH GUARANTEED LOAN, 1855—Questions, Mr. Dodson; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer 1433

ARMY—DEPUTY ASSISTANT QUARTERMASTER GENERAL—THE STAFF COLLEGE—Question, Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice; Answer, Colonel Stanley .. 1434

EXPENSES OF ROYAL JOURNEYS—Question, Dr. Kenealy; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer 1435

CUSTOMS—WINES OF SPAIN AND PORTUGAL—Question, Mr. W. Cartwright; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer 1435

ARMY—SURGEONS AT DEPÔT CENTRES—Question, Mr. Leveson Gower; Answer, Colonel Stanley 1435

ARMY—NEWSPAPER CORRESPONDENTS—Question, Mr. Anderson; Answer, Mr. E. Stanhope 1436

POOR LAW AMENDMENT ACT (1876) AMENDMENT BILL—Question, Mr. Mellor; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer 1436

PARLIAMENT—STATE OF PUBLIC BUSINESS—THE BUDGET—Questions, Mr. A. Mills, Mr. Dillwyn; Answers, The Chancellor of the Exchequer .. 1437

PARLIAMENT—QUESTIONS—THE HON. MEMBER FOR MEATH—Notice of Question, Mr. C. Beckett Denison; Questions, Mr. Mitchell Henry; Answers, Mr. C. Beckett Denison, Mr. Speaker 1437

ORDERS OF THE DAY.

SUPPLY—Order for Committee read; Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair:"—

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE—RESOLUTION—Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "in the opinion of this House, it is expedient that measures should be adopted to provide a more speedy and efficient and less expensive mode of administering justice than now prevails,"—(*Sir Henry James*,)—instead thereof .. 1438

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question:"—After long debate, Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Main Question, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair," put, and *agreed to.*

SUPPLY—*considered* in Committee—CIVIL SERVICE SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES, 1878-9.

(In the Committee.)

CLASS III.—LAW AND JUSTICE.

£6,200, Law Charges, England.

Resolution to be reported *To-morrow;* Committee to sit again upon *Monday* next.

Valuation of Property Bill [Bill 71]—

Bill *considered* in Committee 1481

After short time spent therein, Committee report Progress; to sit again upon *Monday* next.

Racecourses (Metropolis) Bill [Bill 48]—

Bill, as amended, *considered* 1490

After short debate, Bill to be read the third time upon *Tuesday* next.

WAYS AND MEANS—

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Resolved, That, towards making good the Supply granted to Her Majesty for the service of the years ending on the 31st day of March 1878 and 1879, the sum of £299,218 1*s.* 2*d.* be granted out of the Consolidated Fund of the United Kingdom.

Resolution to be reported *To-morrow;* Committee to sit again upon *Monday* next.

COMMONS, SATURDAY, MARCH 22.

Page

Adjournment—

Moved, "That this House do now adjourn" 1493

South Africa—War Office Papers—Question, Mr. Shaw Lefevre; Answer, Colonel Stanley 1493

South Africa—Lord Chelmsford—Withdrawal of Notice of Motion, Mr. E. Jenkins 1493

Motion *agreed to*.

Ways and Means—

Resolution [March 21] *reported*, and *agreed to*.
Instruction to the Committee on the Consolidated Fund (No. 2) Bill, That they have power to make provision therein pursuant to the said Resolution.

LORDS, MONDAY, MARCH 24.

South Africa—The Zulu War—Sir Bartle Frere—Alteration of Resolution, The Earl of Camperdown; Observations, Viscount Cranbrook 1494

South Africa—Lord Chelmsford—Personal Explanation, The Duke of Cambridge 1494

Highways Act, 1878—Disturnpiked Roads—Motion for a Return, Earl De La Warr; after short debate, Motion amended, and *agreed to* .. 1497

Return of the names of the several turnpike roads which have become disturnpiked between 31st December 1870 and 30th June 1878 in each county in England and Wales, with the number of miles of each such road, and a statement of the cost of maintaining the same as shown by the last published account; similar Return with respect to the turnpike roads the trusts of which have been fixed by the Turnpike Continuance Acts to expire within five years from 30th June 1878; and Return of the number of turnpike roads the trusts of which will expire within the same period under the Acts by which the same were constituted, if not extended by any of the Turnpike Continuance Acts: Ordered to be laid before the House,—(*The Earl De La Warr.*)

Treaty of Berlin—The British Fleet—Observations, Question, Lord Campbell; Reply, The Marquess of Salisbury 1499

COMMONS, MONDAY, MARCH 24.

PRIVATE BUSINESS.

Liverpool Lighting Bill—

Moved, "That the Order [11th March] that the Liverpool Lighting Bill be committed to a Select Committee of Seven Members, Four to be appointed by the House and Three by the Committee of Selection, be read, and discharged,"—(*The Chairman of Ways and Means*) 1502

QUESTIONS.

South Africa—The Zulu War—Sir Bartle Frere—Alteration of Resolution, Sir Charles W. Dilke 1503

The Irish Church Commission—Date of Expiration—Question, Sir Harcourt Johnstone; Answer, Mr. J. Lowther 1503

Post Office Contracts—The Peninsular and Oriental Steam Navigation Company—Question, Mr. Baxter; Answer, Lord John Manners 1504

Army—The Scientific Corps—Question, Colonel Arbuthnot; Answer, Colonel Loyd Lindsay 1505

New Guinea—Italian Colonists—Question, Sir William Fraser; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach 1505

Drainage and Improvement of Land (Ireland) Act, 1878—Question, Major O'Beirne; Answer, The Attorney General for Ireland .. 1506

Contagious Diseases Acts — The Select Committee — Question, Sir Harcourt Johnstone; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer .. 1506

Poor Law (Scotland)—Legislation—Question, Mr. Fraser Mackintosh; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross 1506

France — Commercial and Manufacturing Distress — Question, Mr. Mundella; Answer, Mr. Bourke 1506

Model Schools, Ireland—Discontinuance—Question, Mr. Errington; Answer, Mr. J. Lowther 1507

Parliament—The Easter Recess—Question, Mr. A. Mills; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer 1507

South Africa—Lord Chelmsford—Question, Sir Robert Peel; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer 1508

Egyptian Finance—The Identic Note—Question, Sir Julian Goldsmid; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer 1508

Intoxicating Liquors (Licences)—Order for resuming Adjourned Debate on Amendment [11th March] read, and *discharged* 1509

ORDERS OF THE DAY.

Consolidated Fund (No. 2) Bill—

Bill, as amended, *considered* 1509

Bill to be read the third time *To-morrow*, at half past Four o'clock.

Supply—Order for Committee read; Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair:"—

Cyprus—Observations, Sir Charles W. Dilke 1509

After long debate, *Moved*, "That the Debate be now adjourned,"—(*Mr. Dillwyn:*) — After further short debate, Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Main Question, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair," put, and *agreed to.*

SUPPLY—*considered* in Committee—Civil Service Estimates—Vote on Account.

(In the Committee.)

£4,109,067, on Account, viz.:—Civil Services, Class I., Class II., Class III., Class IV., Class V., Class VI., Class VII., and the Revenue Departments.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £4,109,067, be granted to Her Majesty, on account, for or towards defraying the Charge for the following Civil Services and Revenue Departments for the year ending on the 31st day of March 1880, viz.:—[Then the several Classes set forth] .. 1593

After short debate, Resolution to be reported *To-morrow;* Committee to sit again upon *Wednesday.*

Poor Law Amendment Act (1876) Amendment Bill [Bill 44]—

Bill *considered* in Committee 1600

After short time spent therein, Bill *reported*, without Amendment; to be read the third time *To-morrow.*

General Police and Improvement (Scotland) Provisional Order (Inverness) Bill—*Ordered* (*The Lord Advocate, Mr. Secretary Cross*) 1605

Sale of Food and Drugs Act (1875) Amendment Bill [Bill 56] — Select Committee *nominated:*—List of the Committee 1605

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

LORDS, TUESDAY, MARCH 25.

Page

SOUTH AFRICA—LORD CHELMSFORD—Statement, Earl Cadogan .. 1605

SOUTH AFRICA—THE ZULU WAR—SIR BARTLE FRERE—RESOLUTION—

Moved to *resolve*, That this House, while willing to support Her Majesty's Government in all necessary measures for defending the possessions of Her Majesty in South Africa, regrets that the ultimatum which was calculated to produce immediate war should have been presented to the Zulu King without authority from the responsible Advisers of the Crown, and that an offensive war should have been commenced without imperative and pressing necessity or adequate preparation; and the House regrets that after the censure passed upon the High Commissioner by Her Majesty's Government in the despatch of the 19th of March 1879, the conduct of affairs in South Africa should be retained in his hands,—(*The Marquess of Lansdowne*) .. 1606

After long debate, on Question? their Lordships *divided;* Contents 61, Not-Contents 156; Majority 95.

Division List, Contents and Not-Contents 1695

Resolved in the *Negative.*

COMMONS, TUESDAY, MARCH 25.

QUESTIONS.

IRELAND—SPEECH OF MR. WILLIAM JOHNSTON (COMMISSIONER OF IRISH FISHERIES)—Question, Mr. Sullivan; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer 1697

POST OFFICE (IRELAND) LETTER CARRIERS—Question, Mr. P. Martin; Answer, Lord John Manners 1698

SOUTH AFRICA—THE ORANGE FREE STATE—Question, Mr. Otway; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach 1700

SOUTH AFRICA—SIR BARTLE FRERE—LORD CHELMSFORD—Questions, Mr. Ernest Noel, Colonel Mure, Mr. Otway; Answers, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach, Colonel Stanley 1700

PAROCHIAL CHARITIES OF THE CITY OF LONDON—THE ROYAL COMMISSION—Question, Mr. Fawcett; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross 1702

CRIMINAL LAW—CASE OF WILLIAM HABRON, CONVICTED OF MURDER—Question, Mr. Mitchell Henry; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross .. 1702

EGYPT—THE MINISTERIAL CRISIS—Questions, Sir George Campbell; Answers, The Chancellor of the Exchequer 1702

POST OFFICE—THE WEST INDIA MAIL CONTRACT—Personal Explanation, Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson 1704

ORDER OF THE DAY.

Consolidated Fund (No. 2) Bill—

Order for Third Reading read 1704

After short debate, Bill read the third time, and *passed.*

MOTIONS.

AGRICULTURAL HOLDINGS ACT, 1875—MOTION FOR A SELECT COMMITTEE—

Moved, "That a Select Committee be appointed to inquire into the operation of the Agricultural Holdings Act, 1875, and into the conditions of Agricultural Tenancies in England and Wales,"—(*Mr. Bernhard Samuelson*) 1705

Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "there can be no adequate remedy for the agricultural depression existing

AGRICULTURAL HOLDINGS ACT, 1875—*continued.*

throughout the country and severely affecting also the interests of town labour, which does not, especially at this period of increasing Foreign Competition, protect the application of skill and capital to the soil by the establishment of compensation for unexhausted improvements, equitable appeal against exorbitant rents, and substantial security of tenure for the agricultural classes both in Great Britain and Ireland,"—(*Mr. O'Donnell,*)—instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question:"—After long debate, Question put:—The House *divided;* Ayes 115, Noes 166; Majority 51.

Division List, Ayes and Noes 1762

Question proposed,

"That the words 'there can be no adequate remedy for the agricultural depression existing throughout the country and severely affecting also the interests of town labour, which does not, especially at this period of increasing Foreign Competition, protect the application of skill and capital to the soil by the establishment of compensation for unexhausted improvements, equitable appeal against exorbitant rents, and substantial security of tenure for the agricultural classes both in great Britain and Ireland,' be added,"—instead thereof.

Moved, "That the Debate be now adjourned,"—(*Mr. J. W. Barclay:*)—After short debate, Motion *agreed to:*—Debate *adjourned* till *Monday* next.

ARMY (MEDICAL DEPARTMENT)—MOTION FOR AN ADDRESS—

Moved, "That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, praying that She will be graciously pleased to give directions that there be laid before this House a Copy of Correspondence which took place in the year 1876, between Surgeon Major P. J. Clarke and Sir W. Muir, M.D., Director General of the Medical Department of the Army, and between Surgeon Major P. J. Clarke and the Military Secretary to His Royal Highness the Field Marshal Commanding in Chief, on the subject of the Supersession of Surgeon Major P. J. Clarke,"—(*Mr. Meldon*) 1767

After short debate, Question put:—The House *divided;* Ayes 26, Noes 76; Majority 50.—(Div. List, No. 53.)

Assessed Rates Act Amendment Bill—*Ordered* (*Mr. Marten, Sir Henry James, Mr. Torr*); *presented,* and read the first time [Bill 113] 1771

LORDS, WEDNESDAY, MARCH 26.

Consolidated Fund (No. 2) Bill—

Read 2ª (according to order); Committee *negatived;* Then Standing Orders Nos. XXXVII. and XXXVIII. *considered* (according to order), and *dispensed with;* Bill read 3ª, and *passed.*

COMMONS, WEDNESDAY, MARCH 26.

ORDERS OF THE DAY.

Convention (Ireland) Act Repeal Bill [Bill 4]—

Moved, "That the Bill be now read a second time,"—(*Sir Joseph M'Kenna*) 1772

Amendment proposed, to leave out the word "now," and at the end of the Question to add the words "upon this day six months,"—(*Mr. Marten.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question:"—After long debate, Amendment and Motion, by leave, *withdrawn:*—Bill *withdrawn.*

Racecourses (Metropolis) Bill [Bill 48]—
Moved, "That the Bill be now read the third time,"—(*Mr. Anderson*) .. 1821
Moved, "That the Debate be now adjourned,"—(*Mr. Alfred Gathorne-Hardy.*)
After short debate, it being a quarter of an hour before Six of the clock, the Debate stood adjourned till *To-morrow.*

LORDS, THURSDAY, MARCH 27.

Dublin University—
Divinity School (Church of Ireland) Bill—
Bill to make provision for the future control and management of the Divinity School heretofore connected with Trinity College and the University of Dublin—*Presented* (*The Earl of Belmore*) 1822
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 1ª:"—After debate, Motion *agreed to:*—Bill read 1ª (No. 36.)

Tenant Right (Ireland) Bill [H.L.]—*Presented* (*The Earl of Belmore*); read 1ª (No. 35) 1848

COMMONS, THURSDAY, MARCH 27.

QUESTIONS.

Ireland — Glengariff Dispensary District — Question, Mr. Sullivan; Answer, Mr. J. Lowther 1849
Ireland — The Game Laws — Case of the Hagneys — Question, Mr. Alexander M'Arthur; Answer, Mr. J. Lowther 1850
Customs Re-organization—Question, Mr. Ritchie; Answer, Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson 1850
Mauritius—Emigration of Coolies—Question, Mr. Alexander M'Arthur; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach 1850
Intemperance—Report of the Lords' Committee—Question, Sir Wilfrid Lawson; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer 1851
Prisons (Ireland)—Medical Officers—Question, Mr. Macartney; Answer, Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson 1851
South Africa—Sir Bartle Frere—The Despatches—Question, Lord Colin Campbell; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach 1852
Bar Education and Discipline Bill—Question, Dr. Kenealy; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer 1852
Vaccination Acts — Case of Mr. Hawley—Question, Lord Frederick Cavendish; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross 1853
Navy—Coaling at St. Vincent—Question, Mr. T. Brassey; Answer, Mr. W. H. Smith 1853
Prison Labour—Competition with Trades and Industries—Question, Mr. Serjeant Simon; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross 1854
South Africa — The Zulu War—Rewards for Service at Rorke's Drift — Question, Mr. Osborne Morgan; Answer, Colonel Loyd Lindsay 1855
Army—Artillery and Engineer Officers—Question, Major O'Beirne; Answer, Colonel Loyd Lindsay 1855
British Burmah—Question, Mr. Richard; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer 1856
Cyprus—The Pioneer Regiment—Question, General Sir George Balfour; Answer, Mr. Bourke 1857
Egypt—The Finances—Question, Mr. Errington; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer 1857

[*March* 27.] Page

ARMY — THE DEFENCE OF RORKE'S DRIFT — BREVET-MAJOR CHARD— Question, Colonel Arbuthnot; Answer, Colonel Loyd Lindsay .. 1858

SOUTH AFRICA — THE ZULU WAR—THE COMMAND—Questions, Mr. Otway, Mr. Arthur Moore; Answers, Colonel Loyd Lindsay 1858

MINES ACT, 1872 — MINING EXPLOSIONS — SUPERVISION OF MANAGERS— Question, Mr. Macdonald; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross .. 1859

SOUTH AFRICA — PAPERS AND DESPATCHES — Questions, Sir Alexander Gordon, Mr. Milbank; Answers, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach, Colonel Loyd Lindsay, Colonel Stanley 1859

FRANCE—THE COMMERCIAL TREATY—Question, Mr. Newdegate; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer 1861

CRIMINAL LAW—THE CONVICTS THEODORIDI AND GORLERO—Question, Mr. Callan; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross 1862

ARMY—PORTABLE INTRENCHING TOOLS—Question, Sir Baldwyn Leighton; Answer, Colonel Loyd Lindsay 1863

TREATY OF BERLIN—EASTERN ROUMELIA—Questions, The Marquess of Hartington, Lord Robert Montagu; Answers, The Chancellor of the Exchequer 1863

ORDERS OF THE DAY—

Moved, "That the Orders of the Day be postponed until after the Notice of Motion relating to the Zulu War,"—(*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer*) 1864

After short debate, Motion *agreed to.*

MOTION.

SOUTH AFRICA — THE ZULU WAR — SIR BARTLE FRERE — RESOLUTION [FIRST NIGHT]—

Moved, "That this House, while willing to support Her Majesty's Government in all necessary measures for defending the possessions of Her Majesty in South Africa, regrets that the ultimatum which was calculated to produce immediate war should have been presented to the Zulu King without authority from the responsible advisers of the Crown, and that an offensive war should have been commenced without imperative and pressing necessity or adequate preparation; and this House further regrets that, after the censure passed upon the High Commissioner by Her Majesty's Government in the despatch of the 19th day of March 1879, the conduct of affairs in South Africa should be retained in his hands,"—(*Sir Charles W. Dilke*) .. 1865

Amendment proposed,

At the end of the Question, to add the words "and that a war of invasion was undertaken with insufficient forces, notwithstanding the full information in the possession of Her Majesty's Government of the strength of the Zulu Army, and the warnings which they had received from Sir Bartle Frere and Lord Chelmsford that hostilities were unavoidable,"—(*Colonel Mure.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there added:"—After long debate, *Moved*, "That the Debate be now adjourned,"—(*Mr. Hanbury:*) —Motion *agreed to*:—Debate *adjourned* till *To-morrow.*

ORDERS OF THE DAY.

EAST INDIA [LOAN]—

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Moved, "That it is expedient to authorize the Secretary of State in Council of India to raise in the United Kingdom any sum or sums of money not exceeding £10,000,000, for the service of the Government of India on the security of the Revenues of India," —(*Mr. E. Stanhope*) 1951

After short debate, *Moved*, "That the Chairman do report Progress, and ask leave to sit again,"—(*Sir George Campbell*:)—After further short debate, Question put, and *agreed to*:—Committee report Progress; to sit again *To-morrow.*

[*March* 27.] *Page*

Blind and Deaf Mute Children (Education) Bill [Bill 93]—
Order for Committee read :—*Moved*, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair,"—(*Mr. Wheelhouse*) 1961
Moved, "That the Debate be now adjourned,"—(*Mr. Monk*:)—After short debate, [House counted out.]

LORDS, FRIDAY, MARCH 28.

Afghanistan—Negotiations with Yakoob Khan—Question, The Marquess of Ripon; Answer, Viscount Cranbrook 1963

Workmen's Compensation Bill (No. 7)—
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª,"—(*The Earl De La Warr*) .. 1964
After short debate, *Moved*, "That the Debate be adjourned to that day six weeks,"—(*The Lord Chancellor*:)—Motion *agreed to*:—The further debate upon the said Motion *adjourned* to *Friday* the 9*th of May* next.

Agriculture and Trade — Question, Observations, The Marquess of Huntly, Lord Norton; Reply, The Earl of Beaconsfield .. 1967

Medical Act, 1858, Amendment Bill (No. 31)—
Amendments *reported* (according to Order) 1986
Further Amendments made :—Bill to be read 3ª on *Monday* next; and to be *printed*, as amended. (No. 37.)

COMMONS, FRIDAY, MARCH 28.

QUESTIONS.

Christ's Hospital and School—Question, Sir Charles W. Dilke; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross 1987
Science and Art Department—Agricultural Science—Question, Mr. Phipps; Answer, Lord George Hamilton 1988
Inspectors of Irish Prisons—Question, Mr. Cogan; Answer, Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson 1988
Criminal Law—The Convict Theodoridi—Question, Mr. Callan; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross 1989
Afghanistan—The War—Rumoured Advance on Cabul—Question, Mr. W. E. Forster; Answer, Mr. E. Stanhope 1990
East India Loan Bill—Question, Mr. Fawcett; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer 1990

ORDER OF THE DAY.

South Africa — The Zulu War — Sir Bartle Frere—Resolution—Adjourned Debate [Second Night]—
Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Amendment proposed to Question [27th March] :—Question again proposed :—Debate *resumed* 1991
After long debate, *Moved*, "That the Debate be now adjourned,"—(*Mr. Courtney*:)—Motion *agreed to*:—Debate *further adjourned* till *Monday* next.

Lighting by Electricity—
Select Committee *appointed*, "to consider whether it is desirable to authorise Municipal Corporations or other local authorities to adopt any schemes for Lighting by Electricity; and to consider how far, and under what conditions, if at all, Gas or other Public Companies should be authorised to supply Light by Electricity,"—(*Viscount Sandon.*)
And, on April 3, Committee *nominated*:—List of the Committee .. 2090

Convention (Ireland) Act Repeal (No. 2) Bill—*Ordered* (*Sir Joseph M'Kenna, Mr. Patrick Smyth, Mr. O'Shaughnessy*) 2090

TWENTY-FIRST PARLIAMENT OF THE UNITED KINGDOM.

LORDS.

Representative Peer for Scotland (*Certificate*).

Thursday, March 13, 1879.

Earl of Dundonald, *v.* Earl of Lauderdale, deceased.

COMMONS.

NEW WRITS ISSUED.

Monday, March 10.

For *East Somerset, v.* Major Ralph Shuttleworth Allen, Manor of Northstead.

Friday, March 28.

For *Longford County, v.* Myles William O'Reilly, esquire, Assistant Commissioner of Intermediate Education in Ireland.

NEW MEMBER SWORN.

Thursday, March 20.

Somerset County (*Eastern Division*)—Lord Brooke.

HANSARD'S

PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES,

IN THE

Sixth Session of the *Twenty-First Parliament* of the
United Kingdom of *Great Britain* and *Ireland*,
appointed to meet 5 March, 1874, and thence continued
till 5 December, 1878, in the Forty-second Year of
the Reign of

HER MAJESTY QUEEN VICTORIA.

SECOND VOLUME OF THE SESSION.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Monday, 3*rd March*, 1879.

MINUTES.]—Public Bills—*First Reading*—Assizes* (17).
Second Reading—Bankruptcy Law Amendment (8); Debtors Act, 1869, Amendment* (9).

BANKRUPTCY LAW AMENDMENT BILL.—(No. 8.)

(*The Lord Chancellor.*)

SECOND READING.

Order of the Day for the Second Reading, read.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª."—(*The Lord Chancellor.*)

Lord HATHERLEY said, that he did not intend to oppose the Bill—on the contrary, he thought it desirable that the measure should pass through their Lordships' House with all due speed, and be sent down for early consideration to the other House, where there were so many who had a deep interest in the subject. He should, however, make a few observations with reference to the supposed necessity for legislation. No doubt, there was considerable demand for a change in the existing Bankruptcy Law, and that demand had reached its expression in the Memorial presented to the noble and learned Earl on the Woolsack from certain of the bankers and merchants of London. These were, no doubt, men of the highest consideration; but on that account it was all the more desirable that the House should consider carefully what it was the memorialists required, and how far the facts which they furnished bore out their views. He had no hesitation in saying that he thought a very great part of the necessity for the measure was due to what he should call the neglect or supineness of the creditors in looking after their interests in bankrupt estates. His noble and learned Friend had appointed a Committee to inquire into the operation of the Act of 1869. Of this Committee the Comptroller of Bankruptcy in England was a Member, and they reported that the want of activity among the creditors of an estate was one of the great reasons why fresh legislation was required. The Committee, however, went on to state that from the information which had been laid before them it would appear that the working of the Act was not in many cases, when fairly put in force, unsatisfactory. Again, the Comptroller in Bankruptcy in Scotland said that, in his opinion, the failure of the Act of 1869 was due principally to the fact that the creditors did not take proper charge of the estates of their debtors; while it was stated in the Memorial of the bankers that the objection which they entertained to the existing law was that it afforded undue facilities to insolvent debtors for withdrawing their estates from the control of their creditors. The policy of the Act of 1869 was to give creditors the right to administer the estate of the bankrupt which had become their own, with the least possible interference from the law. He quite agreed in that policy, and there was proof that where the creditors had acted in pursuance of it the working of the Act had not been unsatisfactory. There were two reasons for that supineness of creditors of which he complained. In the first place, men who had lost money through the bankruptcy of their debtors did not like to throw good money after bad, or to waste time in thoroughly investigating the debtor's affairs and administering his estate; and, in the next place, they did not like to be mixed up, as mercantile men, with bankruptcy matters, lest their own credit should be suspected, if it appeared that they had been heavy losers. This latter reason was one, he believed, which operated very powerfully. There was no question as to the necessity which had led to the alteration of the law in 1869. The evils of the old system were shown by the fact that in 1868 the number of bankruptcies, including compositions, was 12,000; that 7,800 persons were adjudicated bankrupt on their own petition, and that, of these, 7,400 paid no dividend whatever. The Act of 1869 was passed to cure those evils. It abolished the vicious principle of allowing persons to have themselves declared bankrupt on their own petition, presented at their most convenient time, and under circumstances most favourable to themselves; and they virtually appointed their own trustee and solicitor. In the year following the passing of that Act, the number of bankruptcies fell from 10,000 to 5,000; and in 1875 the number of applications was 7,500; in 1878 they amounted to 9,600; but the depression of trade had doubtless much to do with the increase. He believed that the Act of 1869 had brought the bankrupt's estates and effects as near to the pockets of the creditors as it was possible for legislation to do; and he trusted that the time had come when creditors would see that, by putting their own shoulders to the wheel, they would protect their interests better than any Act of Parliament could do. In the Memorial presented to his noble and learned Friend, the memorialists had mingled together two things which the Act of 1869 had carefully separated—the penal consequences of misbehaviour on the part of the bankrupt, and the accident of his misfortune or failure. That distinction was maintained in the Bill, as it assuredly should be. With regard to criminal jurisdiction provided by the Bill, he understood the new Judge would be one of the ordinary Judges of the land, and in that case, no doubt, he could try offences of this kind. Connected with criminal jurisdiction there was the question of whether or not there should be a Public Prosecutor; but, until that was done, he supposed the public must prosecute for themselves. He should be glad to see this Bill passed through their Lordships' House, for he believed it would be improved in the Commons.

Lord SELBORNE said, he must acknowledge that he had begun to despair of the whole question of bankruptcy; but he thought the fault lay more with the creditors than with the law. He had gone through the proposed Bill, and he must say that there were in it one or two alterations in the present law which appeared to him to be retrogressions—the provision by which a debtor was permitted to apply for his own adjudication, and the change which was made in the terms of a bankrupt's discharge. The present Act insisted that before a debtor was entitled to his discharge he must have paid a dividend of 10*s.* in the pound, or have obtained a resolution from a majority of his creditors in favour of his discharge. This Bill, however, would make a retrogressive change, for it would enable a debtor to obtain his discharge without paying any dividend whatever, or giving any security of his future property for the discharge of his debts. Now that imprisonment for debt had been abolished, he did not think it right that a bankrupt, not having paid any dividend, and whose failure had not arisen from any misfortune, should be released without a condition that a portion of his future property should be available for the benefit of his creditors. He perceived with some astonishment the power which the present Bill gave to the Court to refuse an order of discharge, except in terms which might make after-acquired property available for the payment of his debts. That was a power which did not extend to the case of non-payment of a dividend. There must be special reasons afforded to enable the Court to refuse an order of discharge after the expiration of two months. If the bankrupt had paid no dividend the Court ought, except for special reasons, to have the power of annexing to the discharge terms which would make after-acquired property of the bankrupt available to the payment of creditors.

THE EARL OF POWIS, who was quite inaudible, was understood to object that under this Bill proxies would be allowed.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR said, as he had been allowed to make on a former occasion a very full explanation of the provisions of this Bill, he certainly should be inexcusable if he were to trouble their Lordships now with more than one or two sentences. He need hardly follow in all points what had been said by his noble and learned Friend (Lord Hatherley), because he quite agreed with a great deal he had said. There was no doubt whatever that no system of bankruptcy could be introduced under which it would not happen that, if creditors did not watch over their own interests, it would be almost impossible to work the Act; and he agreed that a great deal of the evil of the present system had resulted from the indifference and supineness of the creditors themselves, and the impossibility of persuading them to look after their own interests. But, unfortunately, their Lordships must look to things as they were; and although they might regret the way in which creditors dealt with the administration of the law of bankruptcy, they must, as far as it was possible for legislation to do, aid it by such changes in the law as the experience of those who were acquainted with the working of the law had discovered to be necessary. With regard to proxies, it was true proxies were not abolished by this Bill; and, in fact, it was impossible that they should be entirely abolished; they must be necessary in many cases. The object of the provisions of this Bill was to remove the difficulties found by experience to be connected with proxies. Under the 143rd section it was provided that where it should appear to the satisfaction of the Court that there had been any solicitation in obtaining proxies for the purpose of getting the appointment of the trustees or receivers under a bankruptcy, the Court might refuse to allow the trustee, on behalf of whom such solicitation had been made, his remuneration as a penalty for doing that which was not right. Then they had to consider what was best calculated to meet the evils arising from the use of proxies. There were various complaints under that head; but he thought it was a matter which could not be very well settled by a rigid clause in an Act of Parliament, and that the better course would be to leave it in the hands of the Judge, who would, from time to time, as experience might dictate, draw up rules to meet the evils complained of. It might, perhaps, be desirable to limit the use of proxies. Another suggestion was that they should not be allowed to extend beyond a certain time; but in practice it was found that they were used at the first meeting upon minor issues before any of the burning questions of the bankruptcy came on for consideration; so that it was a question if they ought not to be renewed for every subsequent meeting. His noble and learned Friends seemed to object to the power which was proposed to be given to debtors to make themselves bankrupt when they found that they were unable to meet their liabilities. But had his noble and learned Friends considered this point fully? If they had they must have known there was nothing of which traders more complained than the inability of a man to do so under the present law. It operated in this way. As the law at present stood, the debtor might continue trading—his affairs getting worse and worse every day, and the estate from which his creditors were to get their dividend every day diminishing. The proposal of the Bill was that a man, when he found himself failing in business, should be allowed to come into Court, make a declaration of his insolvency, and hand over his estate to his creditors to deal with as they best could. His noble and learned Friends would let him sit at home, lessen his resources, and squander his funds until some creditor, becoming aware of his circumstances, stepped in and had him declared a bankrupt. At present a bankrupt could evade the whole intention of the law, inasmuch as he might select any place in England, far removed from his place of business, and, after nominally trading there for a few weeks, apply to the local County Court for leave to liquidate, getting a certain number of his creditors to pass a resolution giving him his discharge. Such proceedings were altogether illusory, and left him master of the situation to do what he pleased with his property. As regarded the order of discharge itself, as the law stood the debtor was not entitled to it until he paid 10*s.* in the pound, unless his creditors passed a resolution to that effect; and, in practice, he was almost certain to obtain that resolution. The Bill would make a change in that respect, and would require that if the application for discharge should be made before the expiration of 12 months from the date of examination of the bankrupt, the application must be concurred in by a majority in number, and three-fourths in value, of the creditors who had proved; and if after the expiration of 12 months, and before the expiration of two years, then by the majority in number and value of the creditors; but, at any time, a creditor who objected to the discharge of the debtor would be entitled to come to the Court of Appeal and state what were the grounds of his objection.

The Lord Chancellor

Motion *agreed to;* Bill read 2ª accordingly, and *committed* to a Committee of the Whole House on *Monday* next.

DEBTORS ACT, 1869, AMENDMENT BILL.—(No. 9.)

(*The Lord Chancellor*)

Bill read 2ª (according to Order) and *committed* to a Committee of the Whole House on *Monday* next.

House adjourned at a quarter past Six o'clock, till To-morrow, half past Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Monday, 3rd March, 1879.

MINUTES.]—Supply—*considered in Committee* —Army Estimates—r.p.

Ways and Means—*considered in Committee—Resolutions* [February 28] *reported.*

Private Bill (*by Order*) — *Second Reading*— Edinburgh Municipal and Police*.

Public Bills — *Ordered* — Exchequer Bonds (No. 1); Consolidated Fund (No. 1).

Second Reading—Oyster and Mussel Fisheries Order (Blackwater, Essex) * [76].

Committee — Racecourses (Metropolis) [48], [House counted out].

Committee—Report—Bankers' Books (Evidence)* [65].

QUESTIONS.

ELEMENTARY EDUCATION ACT, 1870—INSPECTION OF BOARD SCHOOLS—HOLBEACH.—QUESTION.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN asked the Vice President of the Council, Whether it is true that on Monday the 17th February the diocesan inspector, accompanied by the clergyman of the parish, entered the Board School at Holbeach and held a religious examination there between two and three o'clock in the afternoon, although the time table of the school provides for secular instruction at the time named; and, if so, whether, having regard to sections 7 and 16 of "The Elementary Education Act, 1870," he will take any steps in reference to such infraction of the Act, and especially to prevent the repetition of similar occurrences?

LORD GEORGE HAMILTON: The school board referred to is, I fancy, Long Sutton, not Holbeach. It appears that the diocesan Inspector wrote to the chairman of the board asking permission to examine the schools under the board in religious knowledge, and the board at once assented and the examination after due notice was held, but during school hours. We have been in correspondence with the school board, and have pointed out to them that any such examination ought to be held within the time set apart for religious instruction by the time table of each school, or during an extra meeting of the school.

ARMY ESTIMATES, 1879-80—REGIMENTAL ESTABLISHMENTS AT HOME AND ABROAD.—QUESTION.

SIR ALEXANDER GORDON asked the Secretary of State for War, If he will state to the House the reason of his having omitted from the Army Estimates for the year 1879-80 the "Detail of Regimental Establishments at Home and Abroad" which, for many years, has formed a portion of the explanatory documents printed in the Appendix to the Estimates; and, if he will repair the omission by laying upon the Table of the House such explanatory document in the form of a separate Paper?

COLONEL STANLEY, in reply, said, that for a great many years it was not customary to include the detail of regimental establishments at home and abroad in the Estimates; but the Department, wishing to give all the information that it possibly could, had of late years included the establishments. Owing to circumstances to which he need not then advert, some difficulty was experienced in re-adjusting the establishments at the last moment this year, and he thought it better to exclude them from the body of the Estimates rather than delay the presentation of the Estimates themselves. But he proposed either to lay on the Table what was called the Establishment Circular, which gave rather fuller details, or—what possibly would be preferable—to have a certain number of copies printed and left at the War Office for such Members as might think fit to ask for them.

ISLAND OF CYPRUS—CONSULAR JURISDICTION.—QUESTION.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether an official notice was published in the autumn of 1878 from the Office of the Assistant Commissioner of Larnaca in Cyprus to the following effect:

> "His Excellency the Lord High Commissioner desires that the business of the Court should be conducted without recognizing any Consular jurisdiction. If cases occur in which Consular intervention or jurisdiction is involved, the parties must be informed that the authority of Foreign Consuls in these matters cannot be allowed to interpose itself, and the ordinary procedure of the Courts is that to which all persons in the island must submit;"

and, whether the Frankish powers entitled to exercise Consular jurisdiction in Cyprus under the capitulations have informed Her Majesty's Government that they agree to waive their rights?

MR. BOURKE: With regard to the first Question, I have to state that Her Majesty's Commissioner in Cyprus has not reported the publication of any official notice containing any such statement as that which has just been read by the hon. Baronet. As to the second Question, I have to state that communications have passed between some of the Powers and Her Majesty's Government upon the most convenient mode of dealing with the question of foreign jurisdiction in Cyprus; but no communication of the nature referred to in the Question of the hon. Baronet has reached Her Majesty's Government from any Power.

CONTAGIOUS DISEASES (ANIMALS) ACT, 1878—CATTLE DISEASE IN THE UNITED STATES.—QUESTION.

MR. J. W. BARCLAY asked the Vice President of the Council, Whether, considering the scarcity of store cattle in this Country and the expectation entertained prior to the issue of the recent Order in Council that there would be a large importation of such cattle in the coming spring from the Western States of America, where it is believed cattle are and always have been free of any contagious disease, the Veterinary Department will institute inquiries whether the cattle in those States are free of disease; and, if this is found to be the case, whether their importation could be safely permitted, provided they come through Canada by way of Sarnia or Detroit, and not passing through any of the Eastern States or shipped at a United States port?

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: In reply to the Question of the hon. Gentleman, I can only state that so long as cases of pleuro-pneumonia exist in the United States, it would not be consistent with Part 4 of the 5th Schedule of the Act of last Session to exempt cattle coming from the Western States of America from the strong provisions of the Act relating to the slaughter of animals at the port of debarkation.

ELEMENTARY EDUCATION ACTS—SCHOOL BOARDS.—QUESTION.

Viscount EMLYN asked the Vice President of the Council, Whether he can lay upon the Table of the House a Return giving the particulars of any steps that have been taken by School Boards for the inspection in religious subjects of those Board Schools in which any religious instruction is given?

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: A very voluminous Return, moved for by the hon. Member for Plymouth, gives full information as to the system of religious instruction in board districts; but it is not yet in the hands of Members. Perhaps my noble Friend will wait until he has had time to peruse it. I may, however, add, that the total number of school boards having schools in England and Wales is 1,500, of which 35 provide no religious instruction—8 being in England, 27 in Wales; while there are 11 concerning which there is doubt, giving a percentage in England of about 1 per cent, and in Wales 10 per cent, of districts unprovided with religious instruction.

COLONIAL POSSESSIONS—JAMAICA. QUESTION.

Mr. KNATCHBULL-HUGESSEN asked the Secretary of State for the Colonies, When the next series of Governors' Reports, Colonial Possessions, will be issued; and, whether, considering the last printed Report on Jamaica is for 1876, the Reports could not be issued with greater promptitude, and kept nearer to current dates?

Mr. J. W. Barclay

Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH: A further series of Reports on the Colonies is in type, and will, I believe, shortly be issued; but it will not contain any further Report on Jamaica. That has been delayed by various causes; the death of the Colonial Secretary, the assumption of office by a new Governor, and a pressure of arrears of other business have contributed to its postponement. I have requested that it may be sent as soon as possible, and am taking steps with a view to procuring from the Colonies, early in each year, a condensed Report and summary of the statistics up to the end of the preceding year.

VICTORIA EMBANKMENT—THE NEW MINT.—QUESTION.

Mr. RYLANDS asked Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, in reference to the negotiations which have taken place between Her Majesty's Government and the Corporation of London for the acquisition of a portion of the Victoria Embankment for the erection of a New Mint, Whether he will lay upon the Table full particulars of the estimated expenditure which would be necessary for carrying out the proposed scheme before any final decision is arrived at, so as to give the House an opportunity of expressing its opinion on the proposal?

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER: If the negotiations should come to a satisfactory conclusion—and they are now proceeding—the Government will have to come to Parliament for a Vote, and every information will then be laid before the House.

SOUTH AFRICA—THE ZULU WAR—THE PAPERS.—QUESTION.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN asked the Secretary of State for the Colonies, Whether there are any Papers, other than those which are to be immediately presented to Parliament, which will be essential for the discussion of the causes of the Zulu war; and, if so, when he expects to be able to lay such additional Papers upon the Table of the House?

Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH: If the hon. Member had asked me the Question on Friday, I should have informed him that every despatch which materially bears on the subject, so far as it is in my possession, would be in the hands of hon. Members to-day; but since that time another mail has arrived from the Cape, conveying despatches, with regard to two of which I may, at least, say they ought to be seen and considered by hon. Members before this important question is discussed. Apart from these Papers, I cannot give a positive reply to the hon. Member's Question, because I cannot tell what further despatches may be on their way from Africa; but it is probable that there may be others of importance. I am quite sure that neither the hon. Gentleman, nor any other Member of the House, will wish to run the least risk of discussing this subject without having the most complete information. I have, therefore, to say that I think the time has not yet arrived when this question can be properly considered by the House.

CUSTOMS—REPORT OF COMMITTEE—OFFICIAL STATISTICS.—QUESTION.

Sir HENRY PEEK asked the Secretary to the Treasury, Whether the Report of the Committee on Official Statistics had been referred to the Commissioners of Her Majesty's Customs; and, whether they had made a reply; and, if they had done so, whether there would be any objection to lay that reply, with the evidence taken by the Committee, upon the Table of the House?

Sir HENRY SELWIN-IBBETSON, in reply, said, that the Report had been referred to the Commissioners of Her Majesty's Customs, and that when the latter had made their reply he should have no objection to lay that, together with other Papers on the subject, upon the Table; but that there would be no necessity for laying the whole of the evidence on which the Report was founded upon the Table.

CRIMINAL LAW—PENAL SERVITUDE ACTS.—QUESTION.

Mr. O'CONNOR POWER asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, If he can inform the House when the Report of the Royal Commission appointed to inquire into the working of the Penal Servitude Acts is likely to be presented to Parliament?

Mr. ASSHETON CROSS: Sir, I have received a letter from the secretary to the Commissioners, stating that they are still taking evidence, but they expect to be able to present the Report in the present Session.

PUBLIC WORKS LOAN COMMISSIONERS—LOANS FOR PUBLIC WORKS.

QUESTION.

General Sir GEORGE BALFOUR asked the Secretary to the Treasury, If he will arrange to keep the House fully informed, now and in future, as to the state of the loans made by the Public Works Loan Commissioners to any of the many undertakings, such as harbours, &c., for which Private Bills are at present and may be before the House, for changes in the undertakings or in their management?

Sir HENRY SELWIN-IBBETSON: I am always ready to give the House full information with respect to loans made by the Public Works Loan Commissioners; but I cannot see the necessity for any such arrangements as the hon. and gallant Member asks me to make. I understand his object to be to provide security against the passing of Private Acts which might, in their operation, prejudice the interests of the Public Works Loan Commissioners where they have lent money to local authorities. But I believe we already take all the precautions necessary to this end. Both the Treasury and the Loan Commissioners keep an eye upon the Private Bills of each Session, and take care to object to any clauses that would impair securities held by the Loan Board, and I am not aware that any instance could be cited in which they failed to notice proposed legislation of that character.

PARLIAMENT — BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE—COUNTS OUT.—QUESTION.

Mr. ANDERSON: I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, If he is aware that in the week ending on Friday morning Wednesday was the only day on which the House was not counted out; and that of the whole twelve sittings since the February meeting began, the sitting has come to its natural conclusion only three times besides the two Wednesdays, while it has been ended by a count out seven times, and of these only two were at a late hour? Here there seems to have been a paragraph accidentally left out. It was this:—

Whether those counts have been generally arranged, and were brought about by Members being induced to remain away? ["Order!"]

Mr. SPEAKER: By my direction those expressions were struck out of the Questions of the hon. Member on the ground that they were not consistent with the Rules of the House.

Mr. ANDERSON: Very well, Sir. I will therefore ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, If he will consider the desirability of establishing the practice of Mr. Speaker, in announcing that notice had been called to the fact of less than 40 Members being present, should state by whom it was called, in order that the name of the Hon. Member may appear in the Journals of the House; and, if he has any remedy to propose?

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER: Sir, I am perfectly aware that the House has been counted out very frequently this Session, and I regret that it should have been so. On the other hand, I must point out to the hon. Member for Glasgow that in many cases that arises from the exhaustion of the House at an advanced hour, when we have, perhaps, arrived at 1, or 2, or even later in the morning, and we have still a good deal of Business on the Paper which cannot be disposed of without considerable discussion; or from Members really finding themselves exhausted through having had a late night in the House the night before, and seeing that the remaining Business on the Paper is apparently not of much interest. Under such circumstances, hon. Members are often not willing to remain in the House. I regret that it should be so, because it is the interest of us all to economize the time of the House as much as possible; and as, in consequence of the Rule now adopted as to the Estimates on Monday, we may hope that the time of the Government may be economized, so we hope that hon. Members will take advantage of other days for bringing forward matters of real interest. As to the suggestion of the hon. Gentleman that the Speaker should name the Member who might take notice of there not being 40 Members present, that, I think, would be rather a questionable proceeding, although I have known Members who maintained, as our Friend (Mr. Collins) used to say, that it was quite right that notice should be taken of that fact, because important Business ought not to be proceeded with in a very thin House. There might be some objections to such a practice, unless it be adopted after a full discussion and by Resolution of the House. I do not think I have any other remedy to propose, except that Members should, as far as possible, endeavour to place on the Paper Business of a kind likely to gain the attention of the House, and consequently keep the Members in attendance.

AFGHANISTAN—REPORTED DEATH OF SHERE ALI.—QUESTION.

Mr. ONSLOW: I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer a Question of which I have given him private Notice, Whether he can confirm as authentic the news which appears in this morning's papers as to the death of Shere Ali?

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER: Yes, Sir, the statement which appears in the papers is the authoritative statement supplied by us for publication, as forwarded by the Viceroy of India.

ORDERS OF THE DAY.

SUPPLY.—COMMITTEE.

Order for Committee read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair."

ARMY—RETIREMENT OF OFFICERS.

RESOLUTION.

Colonel ARBUTHNOT, in rising to call attention to the Regulations in force whereby officers are precluded from counting towards voluntary retirement service performed while under twenty years of age, and any period during which they may have been on half-pay in consequence of wounds or ill-health contracted on Service, and are required upon retirement from the Army while serving abroad to defray the cost of their own and their successors' passages, and to move—

> "That, in the opinion of this House, it is desirable that the paragraphs numbered 86, 87, and 88 of Clause 124 of the Army Circular of 1st September 1877, and Clause 92 of the Army Circular of 1st May 1878, should be modified;"

said, as he was aware that many Members wished to get rid of these unofficial Motions before Supply, he would not intervene long. His story was a very simple one, and the case which he had the honour of submitting to the House had, he honestly believed, only one side to it. He might lay it down as an axiom that it was desirable that the officers of the Army should be a contented body, or if that was going too far, that it was desirable to remove causes of discontent from among them. He assumed, also, that it was impolitic and bad economy for the State to take away with one hand boons and privileges which it had given, or professed to have given, with the other. These Regulations—and especially the first of them—were a fair example of taking away with one hand what had been given with the other. Subsequently to the abolition of Purchase a Royal Commission was appointed to report on the best means of providing an adequate flow of promotion in the Army. He believed the terms of Reference spoke of a flow of promotion equal to that which existed during the operation of the Purchase system. The Royal Commission reported accordingly; and, among other recommendations, it advised the establishment of a dual system of retirement—that was, a voluntary and a compulsory system. The compulsory system of retirement was not liked, but it was accepted as a necessary evil. The voluntary system, and the terms on which it was proposed, were regarded as liberal, and no doubt it was viewed as a boon. A great many officers, as soon as the Warrant came out, endeavoured to take advantage of it. Many whom he knew, and many others of whom he had only heard, sent in their resignations, and applied for and obtained leave pending the acceptance of their resignations; they gave up their houses, parted with their effects, and one in particular took his passage to join a brother in Australia. That officer and many others were electrified by being recalled, because two or three years of their service had been prior to their attaining the age of 20. He admitted that in regard to officers who joined the Army in time of peace the objections to the Regulation were not so strong; but even in their case it was open to the very grave objection that it offered a premium to idleness and stupidity, because those who, from either of these causes, joined Sandhurst or Woolwich at the latest possible date, and remained there as long as they possibly could, would have the advantage of being able to retire with less service than their more talented or more industrious fellow-students. He would point out the advantages which the Regulation gave to those who entered the Service by what might be termed the "side doors" to the Army—namely, the Universities and the Militia. A boy might go at the age of 17 to Oxford or Cambridge, and obtain his B.A. degree before he was 20. If then he joined the Army, he would possess the advantage of having received a University education, besides the further advantage of knowing that the whole of his service would count; whereas a youth who had been to a Military College would have to serve two or three years longer. Again, he believed a great many Militia officers obtained Army commissions from the Militia who had failed to obtain them in the ordinary course. But to those who joined the Army in time of war, or even when war was threatened, the Regulation was a still more serious matter. Only last year a large number of cadets were commissioned after a few weeks at Sandhurst, so there must have been many who joined soon after attaining 17 years of age. In order really to appreciate its operation, they must consider its effect on those who joined the Army 24 or 25 years ago. In 1854 and 1855 the Crimean War was being waged, and soon after it there came the Persian War, the Indian Mutiny, and one of the wars with China. Many officers, consequently, served in two or three wars or campaigns before they were 20 years old; yet, although they gave their services to their country when those services were most urgently needed, and when, owing to their youth and unformed constitutions, the hardships were fraught with the greater danger, they were now informed that they were children then; that their war services could not count towards their retirement; and that they must serve two or three years longer than officers who had joined the Service after the period of danger was over. If it had been intended that the same rule should apply to voluntary retirement as was applicable to compulsory retirement, why was this not stated in the Warrant? It seemed to him that it would have been absurd thus to place the two kinds of retirement on the same footing. This was, however, done by a side wind. He further objected to the Regulation, because it rather savoured of *ex post facto* legislation. He had never yet heard a valid argument urged in favour of the Regulation. He had, indeed, heard an assertion, which he could not dignify with the name of argument, made use of by official Members of the House, to the effect that if officers were to be allowed to count their services before 20 towards voluntary retirement, such services must count also in the case of compulsory retirement. For his own part, he failed to see any logic or force in the assertion. It seemed to him that it would be best described as a device of the pettiest officialism, wholly unworthy of his right hon. and gallant Friend. If there were anything in the contention, of course, it involved a principle, and that principle must be applied to all relations between the State and the officers who served it. Yet this very same Circular, founded on the Warrant of 1877, laid it down that no half-pay service should count towards voluntary retirement, and yet that all half-pay service should count against the officer as towards compulsory retirement — a distinct violation of the principle laid down as sound in dealing with service under 20. Now, it would be most unreasonable for him to dream of suggesting that officers should be permitted to count half-pay service under ordinary conditions. All he did say was that arrangements ought to be made so that those who were compelled to go on half-pay, in consequence of their wounds or ill-health contracted on active service, should be allowed a limited time—say two years—as full-pay service towards voluntary or any other kind of retirement. The Warrant which dealt with the subject ought to be made a little more elastic, so as to meet some other special cases, such as those who were compulsorily placed on half-pay without promotion or any other compensating advantage. He never asked anything unreasonable, nor spoke about what he did not understand, and he did not see what answer, except a favourable one, could be made to the demand he was now making. Passing now to the third point, the Regulation was that officers who left the Service, unless they were compulsorily retired, should pay their own passages home and those of their successors out to the place where they had been serving. That was the old rule, and he gratefully acknowledged that his right hon. and gallant Friend (Colonel Stanley) last year made a concession to him when he urged that it was unfair to treat officers who had no further possibility of promotion as if they were not compulsorily retired. It was not wise that the officers of an Army, the greater part of which was serving abroad, should be penalized for going abroad. It might be all very well while the Purchase system existed; but now that all sorts of pains and penalties were imposed on officers it was not dignified for the State to lay down such a rule. Another objection to it was that it could not be put universally into operation. When the Purchase officers were dead and buried the only class of officers against whom the rule could be enforced were those who had served long enough to qualify themselves for a pension. Those who had not served long enough would be able to snap their fingers in the face of the authorities. He would appeal to officers on both sides of the House, and to Gentlemen who took an interest in Army matters, to use their influence on his right hon. and gallant Friend to induce him to make this concession. He would appeal to his right hon. and gallant Friend to save one of the most steady supporters of the Government from the pain of dividing the House against him. He knew his right hon. and gallant Friend was anxious to economize, but there was no economy in this practice. Something much more effectual might be done by reducing the amount of correspondence which was now carried on. It was said that the Government had come into Office to redress grievances. He did not like to speak of grievances with reference to the Army, and therefore he would call them hardships. He did not wish that his right hon. and gallant Friend should leave it to the other side to redress a hardship created by themselves, and more or less accidentally. If his right hon. and gallant Friend would make this very moderate concession — which people out-of-doors and in the House thought he could very fairly make — he would give the most complete satisfaction to the officers of the

Army, whether affected by these Regulations or not, and he would add very materially to his already high reputation for wisdom and justice and common sense. He begged to move his Resolution.

COLONEL MURE, in seconding the Motion, said, he had been requested by various officers, friends of his, to take part in this discussion. He could not help thinking that the case made out was so exceedingly clear that there must be something more behind, and that the Secretary of State for War was going to tell them something they had not heard before. This Regulation might have come into force through an idea that there was some analogy between the case of an officer and that of a private soldier. The proper age for a soldier to enter the Army was 18; but many enlisted long before, and it was very difficult for medical men to ascertain their real age. But officers were accepted in the Army as being of a certain age. He entered the Army at 17 years of age, under an idea that he should receive all the benefits that would arise from his service from that period. That was the bargain he made with the State—that he would be able to count his service from the day he obtained his commission until the day he was either obliged to retire or did retire, with all rights and privileges. But now it appeared that, by a new Regulation consequent on the new arrangements made for the retirement of officers joining the Army at any period whatsoever, they were to be docked of their service up to the time they were 20 years of age. So far as the retrospective operation of these Regulations went, they were a gross hardship on many officers who entered the Army with very different expectations. There was extreme injustice in this retrospective action.

Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "in the opinion of this House, it is desirable that the paragraphs numbered 86, 87, and 88 of Clause 124 of the Army Circular of 1st September 1877, and Clause 92 of the Army Circular of 1st May 1878, should be modified,"—(*Colonel Arbuthnot,*)

—instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

MAJOR O'BEIRNE supported the Motion, remarking that it was hard that while officers who were cashiered had their passage home paid, officers in the Service had not.

SIR ALEXANDER GORDON said, that the Royal Commission did not recommend that service under 20 years of age should be ignored in regard to voluntary retirement. The question of the new Warrant had been discussed at a late period of the Session last year—so late that the noble Marquess at the head of the Opposition protested; and the Government produced a statement showing the provisions of the Warrant, which the House accepted. It appeared from it that the age of 20 years was the earliest age from which service should count for compulsory retirement; but there was nothing said about the age for voluntary retirement.

MR. WHEELHOUSE said, he thought the hon. and gallant Colonel (Colonel Arbuthnot) had made out a case of substantial grievance which it would be an injustice to the Profession not to remedy. He knew one gentleman to whom this Regulation would make a difference of something like £300 or £400, to his great disappointment, as it was wholly unexpected, he supposing that his service would count from the time he entered the Army; but the few months disallowed made all the change in the rate of allowance for his commission.

GENERAL SHUTE would remind his right hon. and gallant Friend the Secretary of State that during last Session he spoke to him on this very question of service counting before the age of 20. The colonel commanding a cavalry regiment in which he took particular interest not only served three years before 20, but actually in the field before the enemy. On that occasion his right hon. and gallant Friend agreed with him that, under the circumstances, these years should be allowed to count. He sincerely hoped that his right hon. and gallant Friend would now concede something in that direction.

MR. PAGET said, he was an ensign at the age of 16, and there was a strong feeling in the Army that at the present time there was a great injustice in connection with this subject, and when there was an injustice it ought to be remedied.

Why fix upon the age of 20 at all? If so, why not 18 or 17? He had never heard anything like a sufficient reason for this extraordinary Regulation; and he hoped they would now hear from the Secretary of State for War that he recognized the grievance, and was prepared at once and decidedly to deal with it.

Colonel STANLEY said, he quite recognized the importance of the question which had been brought forward; and although his answer might not be regarded as altogether satisfactory by his hon. and gallant Friend the Member for Hereford (Colonel Arbuthnot), yet he hoped his hon. and gallant Friend would understand that he entirely appreciated his motives, and was anxious, in the fullest degree, to respond in the same good spirit as that in which the question had been mooted. There was no doubt the point was difficult to discuss in argument, inasmuch as it was one of the cases where there were officers who considered they were aggrieved by the action of an arbitrary line that was drawn at the age of 20—as was, indeed, the case of his hon. and gallant Friend who brought the subject forward, although treating it in no degree as a personal question; and there might be other officers in the House to whom the same rule would apply. In his own instance he should be mulcted of three years' service; but that was neither here nor there. The point they had to consider was whether any substantial injustice was done, or whether the circumstances were such as to render a recasting of the Royal Warrant for Promotion and Retirement advisable at the present moment. It should be borne in mind that the Royal Warrant was the subject of a very prolonged discussion before a Royal Commission, and afterwards between the various Departments; and the Royal Warrant which was presented to the House was the outcome of the deliberations between these various Departments. The new Warrant did not intend to alter in any way the status of officers under the former Warrant. So far as compulsory retirement was concerned, it certainly did take a new departure. The Warrant with regard to voluntary retirement was supplementary. The provision was intended to modify the harshness of compulsory retirement, and to give officers inducements to leave the Service at such an age as to keep up the flow of promotion throughout. At the present time, officers, as a rule, joined the Service much later than they did 10 or 12 years ago; therefore, the number of officers who would be affected by this provision would, in point of fact, be extremely small. He had no right to say that when he took office subsequently under Lord Cranbrook, and carried out the Royal Warrant, he was not answerable for the views to which his name might be attached; but though he signed the paper referred to in the execution of his duty as Financial Secretary, he could not say—and he should mislead the House if he were to imply—that there was the smallest point of divergence between the noble Lord and himself; on the contrary, he believed that all these questions were carefully discussed, and, so far as the War Office were concerned, were settled with almost complete unanimity. It was but fair to expect some difficulty in carrying out so complicated a matter as a Royal Warrant in relation to promotions and retirements; and he believed it was expressly stated at the time it was brought forward that though it was believed the details had been adjusted in a manner which would give satisfaction, his noble Friend did not on all points pledge himself to every minute detail. In point of fact, there had been several cases which it had been impossible to foresee, in which hardship would have been produced by these Regulations; and, under the power of interpretation given to the Secretary of State, it was possible, while interpreting the Warrant consistently with itself, to give in some cases the relief which was reasonably demanded. He had recently stated, in answer to the hon. and gallant Member for Leitrim (Major O'Beirne), that it had been laid down that half-pay in certain circumstances did not count towards compulsory retirement; but he recognized the fact that there was a substantial feeling of grievance in the Service with regard to this matter. The Office with which he was concerned was not in these matters able to act entirely alone; but, for himself, he would admit that a strong case had been made out for inquiry; and, although he was unwilling to give any pledge which he might not be able to redeem, he was quite willing to say that he would inquire into it. As to the passages of officers, they were, under the Warrant, placed precisely in the same position as they were under the former Purchase regulations. If an officer retired abroad under compulsion, actual or imminent, it was not deemed fair to put him to expense, and that was the interpretation now acted upon; but if an officer retired voluntarily abroad, it would, perhaps, be going beyond the original purpose of the Warrant to place him in a better position than he would have been in under the Purchase regulations. There might be room for divergencies of opinion; but he did not think that on this point there was that amount of injustice that called for immediate remedy. It was difficult to give an abstract opinion on a particular case; but he did not see how a difference of such an amount could have occurred under this clause of the Warrant, as was stated by the hon. and learned Member for Leeds (Mr. Wheelhouse). He had endeavoured to state the exact position of matters; and he hoped his hon. and gallant Friend would be satisfied with the recognition of the fact that inquiry was desirable, and would not press the matter further.

GENERAL SIR GEORGE BALFOUR hoped that the hon. and gallant Member opposite (Colonel Arbuthnot) would not press his Motion after the satisfactory explanation which had just been given by the Secretary of State for War. At the same time, there could be no doubt that the Order, limiting the counting of years of actual service of which the hon. and gallant Gentleman had justly complained, was a stupid Order, which in time must be remedied, now that the Secretary of State had expressed an opinion in favour thereof. All those who had any knowledge of the Army must fail to understand why young officers should be allowed to enter the Service before the age of 20, and yet be refused those privileges which pertained to their Profession of counting the years so served. A more stupid arrangement was never made; it could only have been passed by a civilian in the Treasury, quite ignorant of the military conditions of Service.

COLONEL ARBUTHNOT said, that after the frank statement of his right hon. and gallant Friend, he was perfectly willing to withdraw his Motion.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn*.

ARMY—FIRST CLASS ARMY RESERVE.

RESOLUTION.

MR. J. HOLMS, in rising to move—

> "That this House, having regard to the response made by the Men of the First Class Army Reserve when called out last year, is of opinion that that Force should be increased by at least 10,000 men during the present year, with a view to a reduction of the Army Estimates;"

said, there was probably never a year in which the Army Estimates were a matter of greater concern and importance to the country. During the last nine or ten months the War Office had had heavy, and sometimes sudden, demands made upon it for troops for different parts of the globe almost at the same time; and, unfortunately, all these demands had been made at a period when the state of trade and commerce of the country had been depressed to an extent almost unknown in the experience of hon. Members. The steady way in which the ordinary Army Estimates went on increasing year after year was very alarming. In the last five years the increase had been no less than £2,500,000. It was clear that when the Chancellor of the Exchequer came down to submit his Budget he would have to propose considerable additions to taxation; and, in his opinion, all true economists who really desired to effect a reduction in the Expenditure ought to examine carefully that which was the great spending Department of the State—namely, the Army. He believed that in that Department alone they might, if they could succeed in bringing about a change of policy—for it was a matter of policy, not a matter of detail—effect a saving of £2,000,000 or £3,000,000 per annum. Comparing this year with 1874-5, when the present Government assumed Office, and in both cases deducting everything connected with the abolition of Purchase and with localization, as well as extra Exchequer receipts, there was an advance from £13,293,800 to £15,857,195, or an increase of £2,563,395. The increase in the Expenditure this year over that of last year was £180,000, without referring to the Supplementary Estimates; but the question was whether they were even getting as much for the money as when they were paying a smaller amount. He was afraid that when they went through the Estimates it would be found they were getting a great deal less. In 1870-1 the deserters from the Army numbered about 6,000 men; and of the 4,700 who were recovered 146 were found to have deserted twice, and a few three times. This was regarded as a very serious blot. But year by year since then the numbers had increased. In 1876 the number advertised for was 7,610; in 1877 it was 7,500; and last year it had risen to 8,062. This marked and increasing desertion seemed to have become a chronic feature of the Army; and he observed that one item of expenditure was £800 for additional rewards connected with the apprehension of deserters. But not only had desertions from the Regular Army increased, but he wished to draw the attention of the Secretary of State for War to the extraordinary number of desertions from the Militia. In 1871 the number was regard as appalling when the figure stood at 6,600; but in 1876 it had increased to 11,400; in 1877 to 13,000; and last year to 15,000. In 1871 the number of desertions from the Regular Army and the Militia was over 12,000; last year it was over 23,000. He had always felt that the great cure for desertion was to be found in allowing men to go home when they had been made thoroughly efficient soldiers, so opening to them a legitimate and proper way out of the Army. He wished in connection with this to say something about the Reserve. Years ago it had been said that a serious risk would be incurred by largely increasing the Reserve. They were told to wait till the Reserve was tested to see how many of the men would come out. They did wait, and the way they responded was highly creditable to them. Within three weeks of the Royal Proclamation being issued last April, they came out almost to a man, and those who were absent were upon the sea, or had some other very reasonable excuse. At any rate, of the 13,460 men that could possibly have answered the call, over 13,000 did so; but they could never expect to get such a proportion from men who were kept under our false lock-and-key system of keeping men in barracks. This was a clear and complete test of the value and certainty of getting that Force quickly in time of need. The Reserve, was, moreover, extremely inexpensive; the whole amount did not average more than £9 or £10 per man. He considered that this was too little, and that if they had given the men £20 each, keeping £10 a-year in hand, they would have sent them back very contented to their homes. The great object of all the Acts of 1871 and 1872 had been to increase this Force; and yet from 1872 until the present time the whole increase had only amounted to 8,000 men, although during that period the recruits had numbered 142,000. Either Germany or France would have had ten times the number, because they went upon the good, common-sense principle of allowing men to go home as soon as they had become efficient soldiers. Until this country adopted the same common-sense principle, the Estimates would constantly increase. An additional argument in support of his proposal was afforded by the fact that the raw material was abundant, as was also the supply of officers. The action of the authorities in opening a side door through the Militia to commissions in the Army was, he considered, one of the greatest blots upon their military system. In 1870 and 1871, it was put forward as one of the main reasons in favour of the abolition of Purchase, that a better class of men would thus be secured as officers in the Army, and eventually in the Militia also. But, instead of this, Militia officers were passing into the Army, and there was a forced retirement from the Army of many men in the prime of life. This was a breach of faith with the British public. The Government proposed this year to ask for 22,000 Reserve men. That would be a Vote in excess of the present number by something like 7,000. Were his Motion to be accepted, 3,000 still more would be added; but he would appeal to the right hon. and gallant Gentleman (Colonel Stanley) as to whether he should not go far beyond the number which his Motion suggested? They had recently had a very brilliant example of the manner in which the Reserve Force was disposed to do its duty to the country; but he scarcely thought that as a nation they had done their duty to that Force; and he feared it would be difficult to get the men out on a future occasion unless something was done to allay the state of feeling which existed among them. From inquiries he had made he believed he was right in saying that when those 13,000 men were called out they were earning, on an average, at least £1 per week each. He also believed that, of the entire number, at least two-thirds were married men. Now, the whole allowance made to them per week each was 7*s.* 7*d.* pay, with an allowance to the wife of 6*d.* per day, and to the children of 2*d.* per day each. The whole amount thus allowed was £6,800 per week, showing that the men were losers by a sum of £6,200 per week during the something like 18 weeks which they served. That he regarded as being very unsound as a matter of policy, for it was starving the Service at a point where it was the least able to bear it. Many of the men were not employed for a considerable time after they were sent home; and the condition of the men when discharged was such that a Public Relief Committee was formed for the purpose of aiding them. Now, he considered that it was scarcely befitting a great country like this to take men from their homes to serve it, and then to turn them off in such a condition that a Relief Committee was necessary to afford them assistance. It was an important matter as regarded the present, and it was important also in reference to the future. He could not understand how such a state of things could have been permitted to arise. For his part, he believed it would be more safe to have 100,000 well-disciplined men, of good character, living at home, than it was to have so many throughout the country who had deserted when only half-trained. It would, in his opinion, be better to increase the number of the Reserve and to get rid of many men who were now dissatisfied with their condition. One word he desired to say with respect to the reinforcements they had just sent to South Africa. Instead of regiments each having Reserves ready to come in and make them up to the requisite strength, he found that many of the regiments came up very far short of their proper number of men. The full strength could not be made up by bringing in Reserves; and in consequence the course adopted—the only course that, under the circumstances, could be adopted—was to admit volunteers. The result was that they had men joining the regiments who were perfectly unknown to others in the regiments, and perfectly unknown also to the officers under whom they were to serve; so that, in fact, they had sent out regiments which were not nearly so strong as they would be if only they had had Reserves ready to join each and so bring them up to their required strength. Now, although he had more than once pointed out instances of the dissatisfaction which existed in the Army, he should like to call attention to a cause of desertion apart from those causes which he had urged upon the attention of the House on former occasions. He alluded to the conduct of young and inexperienced non-commissioned officers towards the men. He had received a great many letters upon the subject, and there was one from a private soldier so full of common sense that he hoped he would be permitted to refer to some of its statements. It was pointed out that, in a majority of cases, the men who were promoted to the rank of lance corporal were young and ignorant of their duties, knowing little or nothing of the rules under which the Service was conducted. These men from inexperience frequently reported very trivial offences as very serious ones—a fact which caused great discontent among the soldiers; and it was pointed out that if a soldier under the influence of drink by mere accident pushed against one of these non-commissioned officers he might, in his ignorance, charge the man with having struck him, and thus render him liable to be sent to penal servitude for a term of five years. Undeniably, under a short-service system, it was essential to have experienced well-trained non-commissioned officers who, as in France and Germany, were trained for the purpose, and engaged to remain 12 or 18 years. They, on the contrary, had a greater number of young non-commissioned officers than they formerly had; and he had no doubt that they required a more select and higher type of trained non-commissioned officers than they at present possessed. He could not but feel that the causes of their enormous and ever-increasing Expenditure were very clear. If they continued to adhere to principles which were unsound and to fight against nature instead of going with her, the only result they could expect was failure. Instead of compactness, cohesion, and well-defined responsibility, they saw looseness and disjointedness on every side; and it was clear to his mind that, in proportion as they ran counter to natural laws, so in proportion would they suffer for so doing.

An Army at best was a great evil, and they were bound to bring that evil to the lowest possible point. They could not, of course, but feel that with their wide-spread Empire they were bound to defend it; but he held that in time of peace they were equally bound to reduce their Expenditure, and, above all things, to reduce the amount of labour withdrawn from industry, the only source of a nation's wealth. He could not but think that if his right hon. and gallant Friend (Colonel Stanley) were to agree to proceed a little more quickly towards an increase of the Army Reserve, he would be doing that which was not only promised a long time ago, but that which would be conducive to the safety of the country and the reduction of the Expenditure now incurred upon the Regular Army. He begged to move the Amendment of which he had given Notice.

General Sir GEORGE BALFOUR seconded the Motion.

Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "this House having regard to the response made by the men of the First Class Army Reserve when called out last year, is of opinion that that Force should be increased by at least 10,000 men during the present year, with a view to a reduction of the Army Estimates,"—(*Mr. John Holms,*)

—instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

Colonel STANLEY owned to some surprise at the circumstance that the hon. Gentleman opposite, with his practical and business-like mind, should have wandered considerably beyond the terms of his Amendment. Upon those extraneous matters he would, in the few remarks he was about to make, only touch lightly or pass over entirely. It was a matter of regret that the hon. Member had not defined his Motion a little more clearly, because there were involved in it two propositions, which might be read in a contradictory sense. To one of those propositions he should be happy to give his assent—though a qualified assent—namely, that the Army Reserve should be increased by 10,000 men; but then the Motion went on to say "with a view to the reduction of the Army Estimates." Therefore, he was inevitably led to suppose that the hon. Gentleman desired to diminish the active Army in a corresponding degree. But was it wise, under existing circumstances, to put that Motion on the Paper? Was it expedient or right, when with the Army practically on a peace footing, they had one war actually on their hands and another barely over, the troops being still in the field, to send men into the Reserve, and to weaken the existing Force, for the sake of abstract adherence to a principle, though that principle might be good in itself? It would be his duty to state, in moving the Army Estimates, why the opposite course was pursued this year; and he confessed he was rather disappointed to find that the hon. Gentleman, from a disposition apparently to make the worst of the case against the Government, proceeded upon assumptions which were contrary to existing facts. One of the fundamental arguments of the hon. Gentleman was that if men were sent into the Reserve there would be no desertion; but, as far as his knowledge went, that was such an absolute assumption that he could not allow it to pass without some slight notice. The fact was well known that a large number of the desertions of which the hon. Gentleman spoke were desertions which occurred in the very early stages of the recruits' military experience, long before they could afford to send them into the Reserves as trained soldiers. Further than that, it was not only not the fact, but the direct opposite of the fact, that when men got into the Reserve they were safe from desertion. Some few years ago the cases were frequent in which men who were in the Army Reserve had deserted from it, and fraudulently re-enlisted again into the Army. That showed a tendency on the part of the men the exact opposite of that which the hon. Gentleman alleged. Then, in regard to the reduction in the number of men, the hon. Gentleman had warned him, in solemn tones, that they were going back to the bad old ways, and he said—"You are reducing the Army again." But did not the hon. Gentleman think it worth his while to assume that some of these men they intended to reduce would be sent into the Reserve? It was his intention, so far as these men would voluntarily go into the Reserve, and so far as he legally could, to send them there. There were some, however, whom it would be a waste of money to send into the Reserve——

MR. J. HOLMS: I ventured to say that I hoped the reduction would not be after the old system.

COLONEL STANLEY said, he was glad to accept the correction, and was pleased to find that the hon. Gentleman agreed with the course which the Government had intended to take before circumstances had caused them to modify their original decision. To pass men from the Colours to the Reserves, and still keep those with the Colours in an efficient state was, no doubt, the right thing to do if it was practicable; but the case had to be viewed in the light of common sense; and circumstances, unfortunately, obliged him at the present moment to give the Motion his unqualified opposition. The hon. Member, he might remark, left out of sight altogether a very important consideration—the peculiar requirements of the Indian Service. Short service had proved a great difficulty in connection with India. During the first year of service they could not send men into a tropical climate, and during the second year they could not send them to India on account of the cost of so soon bringing them back again. But a solution of the difficulty, as he had informed the hon. Member for Kirkcaldy (Sir George Campbell) the other day, had been found in allowing men in certain circumstances to extend their service by two years—a fact which he only cited to show that, with the best wishes to pass men into the Reserve as soon as they were qualified, the Government had been obliged to bow to the absolute necessities of the case, and prolong the active service of the men in some cases. He would not touch upon the demurrer which the hon. Gentleman had raised as to officers passing through the Militia, except to say that the Royal Military College at Sandhurst would only hold a certain number of officers, and if they wished to extend the other system of admission to the Army, they would have to increase the means of military education. He was happy, from what had passed that night, to claim the hon. Gentleman as an ally in endeavouring to pass the Army Discipline Bill. They proposed by that Bill to give more elasticity to the Reserve, by passing men into it under the time which was now the statutable limit, and they proposed other subsidiary measures which would tend to make the Reserve more elastic than it had hitherto been. This year they had proceeded rather tentatively. Up to a recent period no one knew exactly how the Reserve would come up. The proof had been as thoroughly satisfactory as anyone could have desired. His noble Friend (Viscount Cardwell) had carried short service and the establishment of the Reserves, after considerable opposition from some whose opinions had great weight; but the result showed that he had every right to congratulate himself and the House of Commons on passing that Act, as being one which would materially conduce to the strength of the country. He thoroughly agreed with the hon. Member that if they could pass men from the Colours to the Reserve and keep the men with the Colours in an efficient state, it was the right thing to do; but he felt it his duty, at the present moment, and on behalf of the Government, to give the Resolution of the hon. Gentleman his unqualified opposition.

MR. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN said, he could not support the Resolution as it stood, because it implied—as the Secretary of State had already interpreted it—that though 10,000 men were to be added to the Reserve that was to be done at the cost of the Regular Army. Now, he was not very rigidly attached to the present establishment of the British Army, and he would not say that it would not be capable at the proper time of reduction; but the strength of the Army was a matter of which the Government of the day ought to be the responsible judges, and in present circumstances he declined to express an opinion to the effect that the Army was numerically too strong. But he took that not to be the meaning of the hon. Gentleman. He took him to mean that 10,000 should, if possible, be transferred to the Reserve, and that their places in the Army with the Colours should be filled with recruits, and he urged that recruits were coming in in such large numbers and of such good quality that it would really be a pity to lose the opportunity of securing them. If that was what the hon. Member meant, he believed there could be no difference in any part of the House on the subject. It was a truism at the present day, especially after the manner in which the Reserve men had come out last year, to say that the short-service system was a success; and it was obvious that the larger the number of men passed into the Reserve consistently with the general efficiency of the Army the better it would be for the country. He believed that no one was more anxious to attain the maximum of strength in the Army Reserve than the right hon. and gallant Gentleman the Secretary of State for War. Were, however, the hon. Member for Hackney (Mr. J. Holms) placed in the responsible position of the right hon. and gallant Gentleman the Secretary of State for War, in all probability he would find it difficult to carry out short service to the extreme extent he at present advocated. The Secretary of State for War would, he felt assured, labour as earnestly as the noble Lord who preceded him to increase, as much as possible, the strength of the Reserve, and, at the same time, to keep up the flow of recruits into the Army. In these circumstances, he failed to see what good would result by the House of Commons assenting to this proposal; and therefore he would appeal to the hon. Member for Hackney to rest satisfied with having obtained the assurances he had from the right hon. and gallant Gentleman and to withdraw his Resolution.

Sir HENRY HAVELOCK said, he was not surprised that the right hon. and gallant Gentleman opposite could not assent to the proposition of the hon. Member for Hackney, which, if carried into practical effect, would convert our home battalions into an army of boys. The hon. Member appeared to have forgotten that it was necessary to keep at their full strength the 55 battalions in India, the 28 battalions in the Colonies, and the 18 home battalions which were first upon the roster for foreign service, leaving only some 41 home battalions from which the 10,000 men he proposed should be transferred to the Reserve could be taken. If this were done, no men who had seen more than four years' service would be left in the latter battalions, and their average strength would be reduced to about 350 men each. He therefore trusted that the hon. Member would not press the matter to a Division.

Mr. J. HOLMS said, that after the assurances he had received from the right hon. and gallant Gentleman he begged leave to withdraw his Motion.

Mr. O'DONNELL said, he was inclined to support the increase of the Army Reserve, and for political as well as military reasons. The unjust war which was being waged at the Cape in support of a glaringly aggressive policy jarred upon the public conscience, and would produce popular conviction which would have the strongest influence on the Government, and that influence would be the more felt if the class of men who were to fight was largely composed of the Landwehr. If, when wars of aggression were undertaken, many thousands of brave men were called in who were capable of judging of the nature of the expedition in which they were asked to partake, the injustice of the war and wanton aggressiveness of the Government policy would be brought home to the feelings and sentiments of the people in such a way as to completely destroy the power of the Government to embark the country, without notice, in such a struggle. It was quite clear that a National Army would have to be consulted, and could not be plunged into an unjust war. No doubt, when the real interests of the country were menaced, they would spring to arms with alacrity; but when it was only to support the extravagant pretensions of a Minister, or the foregone desires of some promoter of fantastic ideas, it would be impossible to use a National Army in such a way; and the very attempt to use it for such a purpose would result in showing the Government that, like the great sword Excalibur, it was something beyond the competency of their power. He could, however, understand the objections of the Secretary of State for War to a short-service system. Under the present mode of government there must be a great Army in India, which it would be very difficult to keep up under the short-service system. If under any Government a policy was carried out calculated to discontent our Indian subjects it must be necessary to keep up a great Army; and until the Government thought it worth while to rule, not by fear but by love, and devote its power to the contentment and affection of subject-peoples, it would always be thought a proper thing to present to this House

Estimates calculated to support armies of a character that, whenever it might be deemed in conformity with the governing spirit to refuse justice to India, or Ireland, or South Africa, or elsewhere, might be trusted to shoot down the Indians, the Irish, or the South Africans, or the inhabitants of any other misgoverned country.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Main Question, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair," put, and *agreed to.*

SUPPLY—ARMY ESTIMATES.

SUPPLY—*considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

COLONEL STANLEY: In moving the number of men to form the Forces for the ensuing year, I confess I have a task of some difficulty before me, and one for which I think I may fairly ask, and I am sure I shall not ask in vain, the kind indulgence of the Committee. The circumstances of the year are somewhat peculiar, and the Estimates show on the face of them that even at the last moment, when under ordinary circumstances no alteration or addition of any kind is made to the Estimates, it was necessary, to a certain extent, to re-cast them and to make provision for the misfortune, the memory of which is so fresh in the recollection of the House. I had hoped that it would have been my duty to show the Committee that the manner in which they responded to the invitation which the Government was compelled to address to them last year to vote increased Supplies for the service of the Army had been met by an endeavour on the part of the Government, in the hope of quieter times, to reduce the burdens which they are always unwilling, even for the necessities of the Service, to place on the taxpayers of the country, if it can be prudently avoided. It is true no very large reduction was hoped for from the Estimates of last year, yet it will be seen by those who care to go through the various explanations that were published when the Estimates were first circulated, that wherever it was possible there has been a diminution of expenditure, and that it is chiefly in the non-effective Votes, which are not under the control of the House or of the Secretary of State for War, that inevitable increases have arisen. But although the hopes with which these diminished Estimates were prepared have not been fulfilled, and we have found ourselves at the last moment placed in a situation which forbade any reduction of the Army, yet I must confess that the mode in which the Estimates have been presented—and for which I am entirely responsible—is not wholly satisfactory even to myself. But I thought it better to place them before the Committee at once, even in a somewhat unusual manner, rather than to withhold the Estimates from them, and to take further time for re-casting the whole of the Vote. The Committee have before them, in the Estimates as they are printed, the number of men and the expenses as they were originally framed; and they will find that it became necessary at the last moment to withhold the reduction of the men which we had previously intended to make. Before I show how that increased number of officers and men was distributed, there are some other matters connected with the first Vote upon which it will be expedient that I should briefly give the Committee some information. So many of those Papers which are the foundation of these Financial Statements are now, in accordance with a very good custom, made the property of the House, that it is rather difficult to enter upon any new ground. Therefore, as so many matters are already within the knowledge of hon. Members, I do not intend to occupy time by going at length into them, but will only pass rapidly over the leading topics. Coming first of all to that which is one of the principal points in reference to the Service—the recruiting—I may state that the Recruiting Report for the year 1878 is one which I think the Committee will consider eminently satisfactory. It is true we all know, and perhaps deplore, the circumstances which may have led a large number of men, who otherwise would have been occupied in civil life, to seek the profession of arms; but, speaking for the moment from a departmental point of view alone, the results of the recruiting are, I think, satisfactory. The establishment has been more than kept up, and there has been at no time a lack of recruits. Last year the number fluctuated to an extent which has caused us largely to exceed our establishment; and towards the close of the financial year now passing we made efforts, not absolutely to check recruiting, but to utilize the excess by sending more men to the Reserve. Still, at no time, except in one month, have we been at all below our establishment, and then only to a trifling extent. The Medical Reports as to the recruits raised have been entirely satisfactory; the medical officers have been stringent in their examinations, and yet the small number of men they have rejected proves that the quality of those who joined in the past year is equal, if not superior, to that of the recruits enlisted in former years. It is true that upon one point matters are not quite so satisfactory. The hon. Member for Hackney (Mr. J. Holms) referred on a former occasion to that point, which is undoubtedly a weak one in the history of the British Army—namely, the somewhat large amount of desertion. It must, however, be borne in mind that the number of desertions, considerable as it appears, is by no means to be reckoned as representing exactly the number of men who deserted. On the contrary, it is within the knowledge of all who care about the subject, that the facility for the commission of that offence leads almost to its becoming a professional habit amongst some of the men. I trust that that habit, and still more the enlisting of a class of men who take up re-enlisting as a sort of trade, will be somewhat checked by a Bill which I hope will be in the hands of hon. Members in the course of a very few days. The net loss by desertions amounted, in the past year, to 2,747 men. That is, however, more than counterbalanced by the large number of recruits raised. I have no word of disparagement to say of recruits, except this—which has been said almost uniformly by every Secretary of State for War since I have had the honour to sit in this House—namely, that in some cases the recruits are not quite so old as could be wished. That is a fault, no doubt, which mends every day; but, at the same time, it does not place our battalions in quite the same position as the battalions of Continental States, which can take men compulsorily for this service at any age they please. With regard to the number of appointments made in the Army, I think it may be of interest to the Committee to know that between the 1st of January and the 31st of December last year, 601 officers joined the Army. Of these, the number of gentlemen cadets from the Royal Military College was 387; there were nine non-commissioned officers promoted to commissions; there were also 205 Militia candidates. I mention this because in the year 1878 the first appointments were considerably in excess of the vacancies. Owing to the establishment of cadetships in the Royal Military College in 1877, there were not a sufficient number of candidates in that year to fill the vacancies, and they were accordingly not filled until the year 1878. Moreover, owing to the Reserve having been called out in the summer it was necessary, to some extent, to increase the number of officers. The total number of officers who retired from the Service by various means during the same period was 347, and of those 16 went on half-pay. This year a very material effect has been produced by the operation of the new Pay Warrant. That provides for the Army Pay Department; and as some hon. Gentlemen opposite were largely interested in the success of that experiment, I may say that I believe that it has fulfilled the expectations with regard to it. Notwithstanding the imminence of a European war during the first portion of last year, and notwithstanding the subsequent wars which broke out in Afghanistan and at the Cape, which, of course, in some instances, prevented officers from continuing their applications to join the non-combatant branches of the Service, yet over 100 vacancies were filled by volunteers from the Army, and the new Department has, therefore, come greatly in aid of the system of compulsory retirement. Many officers who would otherwise have been retired compulsorily from other causes have had opened to them this mode of retirement. It still utilizes their services, while, at the same time, it removes them from the line of promotion with which they would otherwise have interfered. That measure was intended for the benefit of the Service; and I hope that both as regard the qualification of the officers and the manner in which they perform their duties that the institution of the scheme will be justified. There are now 28 officers of that Department at the Cape, and no difficulty has been experienced in sending them out to fill up the places as required. Under these circumstances, I think there is a justification for the increase of the Vote for that Department this year by the sum of £5,280. It must be borne in mind also that a large portion of this sum would probably have had to be placed under the non-effective Vote, had these officers not gone into the Army Pay Department. I now come to a very important point, which I think I had better touch upon at this stage of our proceedings. It will be borne in mind that some few years ago a system was introduced by Viscount Cardwell which promised—and the promise has since been fulfilled—that in time of emergency we should be able to increase the Service by a number of men called from the Reserves, and, as it were, from civil life, who would come back to swell the Forces required for the purposes of war. It is rather curious, however, that at the time when we thought so much about an increase in the number of the men we should have thought nothing whatever about an increase in the number of the officers which the outbreak of war would inevitably necessitate. This difficulty must be constantly borne in mind. If, on the one hand, we appointed all the officers who would be required for the immediate purposes of war we should run the risk, always thought formerly to exist, that after the cessation of war promotion would be blocked up and a number of officers have to be compulsorily retired on half-pay. The subject was one of such importance that when I took Office I lost no time in assembling a Committee to inquire into and report upon this subject, as it seemed to me highly desirable that steps should be taken, without delay, for the establishment of a Reserve of officers. The importance of the subject will be seen, even when a small casualty has caused a demand for officers to exist, and when it is considered how many officers are required for the lines of communication and other duties connected with an army in the field, it is clear that the demand is one which we should be prepared to meet. Then, again, the increased establishment caused by the calling out of the Army and Militia Reserves would call for a very considerable increase in the number of officers. What recommended itself to the Committee was that those officers who had left the Service from one reason or another should be allowed to join on certain conditions. It has never been more signally shown than in the course of the last few days that there are in this country a number of officers who have retired from the Service, but who would give their ears to come back. The Committee considered whether they could not add to the number of officers available on an emergency without stopping the stream of promotion. We thought that if we employed properly qualified officers, without interfering with the line of promotion, we should materially strengthen the country in time of war. The Committee was presided over, with great ability, by General Hawley, and the object of their inquiries was to ascertain and report upon the number of officers required to complete the Army when raised to its full war strength, and whether it would be possible to employ the retired officers on an emergency, it being understood that such officers were to receive an increased rate of pay while employed, but were to revert to their former condition on the emergency passing away. The result of the Committee's inquiries was that the total number of extra officers when the Army was put upon its full strength would be 679, exclusive of those required for keeping up a line of communications extending over 100 miles, for which 124 officers would be required. The Commissariat and Ordnance Store Departments would also require greatly strengthening, and it becomes very important that they should be made thoroughly satisfactory. Under these circumstances, I have ventured to recommend that we should frame an Army Warrant, which would enable us to employ a reserve of officers in time of war. The details of the proposed scheme are still in course of preparation; but the substance of it amounts to this. We shall pay the officers a somewhat larger sum for allowance for a higher rate of pay; but they will be employed simply during the time when their services are actually required. Conditions will have to be laid down for preventing the employment of these officers interfering with the stream of preferment; but when the scheme has assumed its final shape, I shall lay it on the Table of the House, and shall be then happy to give further information. I think it is the first time we have contemplated a Reserve of officers; but I hold a very strong view as to the necessity for the step, and I believe that we may rest assured that the Committee, over which General Hawley presided, has found the right means for the end intended to be met. I will now pass from the officers to another point connected with the men. This is a question upon which I must ask the permission of the Committee to speak with entire frankness, and yet with some reserve. In 1872, the system known as the localization of the Army was established by Viscount Cardwell, the special points of which were that two battalions were to be linked together where double battalions did not exist in the same regiment. They were to have a depôt in common, and a Militia regiment was to be attached to them. The linked battalions, as they were called, were, from a certain date, to be absolutely interchangeable as regards officers and men. If I am not mistaken, exception was taken at the time, when the measure received ample criticism, to the want of elasticity which the system involved. I am bound to tell the Committee that if the lines of the localization scheme were strictly adhered to, I do not think that margin enough has been allowed for the possibility of our sending both battalions out at a time when we are not in a state of general war. Viscount Cardwell's localization scheme provided that one battalion out of every two might be abroad at the same time; and his alternative to having only 70 battalions was that when both battalions were abroad we were to raise the strength of a provisional battalion, and then to call out a linked battalion, and if an emergency required it to call out the second, and so on. But these were proceedings which it was understood could only occur when there was a war which threatened to be of very large dimensions. The Committee to which I have previously referred drew attention to it in words which very fairly expressed the want then felt. They said it seemed desirable to add to the existing Regulations some means by which the depôt might be expanded when both battalions were abroad at the same time. Since 1852 there have been the Burmese War, the Crimean War, the Kaffir War, the Indian Mutiny, two Chinese Wars, a Persian War, the Abyssinian Expedition, the Ashantee Expedition, and, since then, the war with Afghanistan, and, unfortunately, the war now going on at the Cape. In most of these wars the Forces abroad were increased, but in two cases only have the Militia been embodied. I think it right to speak with frankness about a fact which has been brought before the eyes of most men within the last few days—namely, that the short-service system and the localization system have not removed that difficulty of which we have always complained, and still experience, of having to transfer men from one regiment to another. Almost all commanding officers, although, comparatively speaking, they are used to see their men pass from them, feel the loss very much; and both commanding officers and regiments suffer unduly when those men are taken from them and transferred to other regiments. I do not wish to complain, or say that these matters could have been foreseen; but when we take cases such as occurred the other day with the 91st Regiment, which has been sent out to the Cape, along with the 72nd, now in Afghanistan, the difficulty will be understood. To supply the 72nd with the drafts necessary to keep it up the 91st has had to send out some of its best soldiers. When the disaster took place in Zululand, the 91st, which was the first for service, was necessarily put under orders, and it had to embark with no fewer than 374 men who volunteered and were drafted from other regiments.

Sir HENRY HAVELOCK asked from how many regiments these men were drawn?

Colonel STANLEY: Those 374 men were volunteers from 11 regiments. We recognize the courage and spirit of the men; but that cannot relieve the officers from the unpleasant necessity of receiving hurried drafts in that way. The 2nd battalion of the 21st received in that manner no less than 326 volunteers from eight regiments; the 58th 192 from four regiments; and the 94th 306 volunteers from nine regiments. I will give one more instance. Both battalions of the 24th are now serving at the Cape. The Committee is only too well aware that five companies of the one and one company of the other have been utterly destroyed.

The brigade depôt at that time, out of a nominal roll of 248 men, including the men awaiting their discharge, and so forth, had to send 109 men to fill up this draft. I do not wish the Committee to imagine that things are worse than they are; and we must bear in mind that these great vacancies could be easily filled up if we were in such a state of war as would enable us to call up our men from the Army and Militia Reserves. If an emergency were to arise, we have sufficient Forces to fill up the vacancies by calling up the Army Reserve, and also the Reserve of that useful body, the Militia. But those Reserves can only be called upon if we are in a condition of general war. It is my duty to tell the Committee that these difficulties arise out of the short-service system, and to place these difficulties, as I feel them to exist, before the Committee, though I have no positive plan which at the moment I can lay before the Committee for removing them. In making this annual Statement, I have thought it right that the Committee should know how the matter stands, and I am sure that they will agree with me in the propriety of certain steps which I have taken. From what I have already indicated to the Committee, it will be seen that we shall be prepared at another time to give a little more elasticity to the present system, by allowing the Reserve men to come forward for active service. By the expansion of the depôt, and by allowing Reserve men to volunteer for active service, I believe that a considerable number of our difficulties may be met. But if I do not find from further investigation that the increase of the depôts and the permission to the Reserves to volunteer for active service are sufficient to meet the wants of the Service, I shall, in a great degree, rely upon the assistance of a Commission or Committee, which I am prepared to appoint, consisting of officers high in the Service, by whose practical experience I shall endeavour to be guided, and by which, without departing from the general lines of the scheme which the country has adopted, we may, perhaps, be able to supplement it, and to supply, in some small details, the deficiencies which now exist. I venture to pass from this point, and I do not think that it is necessary for me to touch on every Vote in succession. I will now mention a subject which is always one of interest to the Committee—namely, the general state of the health of the Army. The health of the Army during the year 1878 has been very good. The admission rate has been somewhat below the average, and the death rate has been very considerably under the average. There has been, on an average, about 4 per cent of the strength of the Army in the hospital. There has been a good deal of cholera in May, June, July, and August in India, and fever and other diseases of the digestive system in the summer months in Malta. There have also been some cases of yellow fever in Jamaica; but in no instance has the death rate been above the average, and the health of the Army abroad may be considered satisfactory. There is one exception, I must frankly admit, in the case of Cyprus, where there has been a most unusual amount of sickness. There the Army suffered from fever, for the most part of a most malarious type. But, though the admissions were certainly very high, the death rate was not so. About 19 of the deaths were due to fever, 5 to sunstroke, 5 to dejected system, 1 to debility, 1 to dyphtheria, 1 to consumption — in all, 34. The average number of men in hospital was 19 per cent, and deaths were at the annual rate of 37·57 per 1,000. The most unhealthy month was September, and there was a great improvement in the health of the men after the cold weather set in. On the 28th of January, the number of men in hospital was reduced to 25 per 1,000. On this subject, the other day, I spoke without book; but my strong impression is that it will turn out that the sanitary state of the Ionian Islands will show a state of things, as regards the health of the Army, that will be encouraging in the case of Cyprus. I have also said that although Cyprus has been a good deal before the public with respect to the health of the men, and has challenged a considerable amount of attention, yet that there are many places in the various commands where the normal state of health is, unfortunately, less satisfactory than at Cyprus—places which we do not for one moment think of abandoning on that account; and other places where, as I shall show, sanitary arrangements made by British medical officers have contributed materially to improvement in the health of the troops. I am not able to compare entirely the health of those places; but I may say that the annual ratio of admissions per 1,000 in Malta is 1,090; in Gibraltar, 848; in Bengal, 1,979; in Madras, 1,562; in Bombay, 2,498; and in Cyprus the admissions are 4,298, from all causes. But when we come to the death rate, even in the worst month of the year, Cyprus is slightly in excess, in point of health, of other stations. The death rate is stated there at 37·57 per 1,000; while Bombay stands at 35; and Allahabad, Meerut, Delhi, and other places at 43 per 1,000. A rate of disease has often occurred far exceeding the rate during the short period we have occupied Cyprus; and, no doubt, our troops landed there at a very unhealthy period of the year. In the Mauritius, prior to 1867, the admission rate was 815 per 1,000, of which 22·23 was due to fever, and the death rate during the same period was 40·95. Sanitary arrangements at the Mauritius have very greatly improved the health of the troops, and we are in hopes still further of reducing the causes which tend to extend the fatality there. In the Ionian Islands much has been effected by sanitation. I am not able to give the statistics from an early period; but, in 1817, the earliest date I can get, the annual admission rate was 1,378 per 1,000, and the death rate 49 per 1,000. In 1836, the admission rate had dropped to 985, and the death rate to 15 per 1,000. In 1863, the admission rate was 684, while the death rate was only 8 per 1,000. That was considered literally one of the best stations in the Mediterranean. Both on medical, and on other grounds, I trust that the disease which has been so marked in Cyprus, and to which I am bound to call attention, has been due to exceptional circumstances; and I have every reason to hope, from medical reports which I have received from competent authorities at home and abroad, that the sanitary state of the Island may be brought to fully equal, if not surpass, other stations in the Mediterranean. Before leaving the Medical Vote, I must refer to a question of very considerable interest. I have endeavoured to give the House every information; but I am able to carry them very little further than that state of knowledge which they have already the means of possessing. The state of the Medical Department has, during the last few years, as hon. Members know, been by no means satisfactory. We have not been able to get the candidates required for the Service—that is to say, they have not come forward in such numbers as to give that scope for competition which ought to exist for entering the service of the Crown. But when we come to consider the causes of that state of things, they are not so easily traced. My noble Friend (Viscount Cranbrook) appointed a small Committee to inquire into the subject, and to report upon the reasons which prevented candidates from coming forward. That Committee stated many points upon which they thought there might be considerable amendment. But it must be borne in mind that there is always one point upon which there may be considerable dispute—namely, whether we ought to revert to the regimental system. That, no doubt, is a matter of money. I am free to admit that I may have some natural predilection in favour of the regimental system, and that if it were possible to retain the advantages of medical officers being attached to regiments while carrying out the general hospital system, that there may be a good deal to be said for such a proposal. There were two points contemplated when the Army Medical Department was formed. One was the diminution of the number of the officers, and the other was the adoption, in time of peace, of a system which must be followed in time of war. So far as I am concerned, I can be no party to anything which detracts from the general working of the Department so formed—that is to say, to anything which detracts from the working, in time of peace, of the system which is to be followed in time of war. The general hospital system was adopted by Viscount Cranbrook, and he said that it would be impossible to revert to the regimental system. That system was tried years ago, and it was found at Aldershot, Dublin, and other places, that regimental officers, as they then thought themselves, holding allegiance only to their regiments, considered it a matter of grace to undertake duty at hospitals for other regiments. The grouping of the sick, also, in the order of their regiments, led to undue expense in opening separate wards, or caused confusion, from the men of two or three regiments, suffering from the same class of disease in the same ward, being attended by separate sets of orderlies belonging to their different regiments. It was proved, to the satisfaction of the highest medical authorities, that such a system was impossible to work. For my own part, I must express the same adherence to the general hospital system, in time of peace as well as in time of war, that my noble Predecessor did. I have, however, thought it expedient to see whether, without undue expenditure, certain of the station hospitals may not be taken up by officers attached to regiments, and whether it will be possible to attach to them, for two or three years, officers who, while moving about with their regiments, can assist in performing general hospital duties at the stations wherever they may find themselves quartered. Although moving about with their regiments, when they came to the general hospital, they will, if necessary, take up the work of the officers they relieve. It is supposed that, under such an arrangement, without interfering with the general hospital system, it may be possible to carry out some of the conveniences and amenities of life which are agreeable to medical officers. That arrangement, however, will affect a very few; and though I have mentioned that such an inquiry has taken place, I must guard myself by saying that, unless it can be done within a reasonable margin of cost, the general hospital system, in its present form, must be adhered to. Two complaints have been made on behalf of medical officers. One, of the difficulty of effecting exchanges, and the other, of the inconvenience resulting from the frequent changes of station. I may state generally to the Committee that, from the inquiries I have made, I am satisfied that much may be done to diminish these complaints. If the Medical Department were entirely full, and if the conditions of service were a little nearer approached to what I hope to see, I think in many cases exchanges may be facilitated, while removals may in many cases be avoided. The Director General has promised to the best of his ability to keep officers in the same station longer than has hitherto been the case. In the Estimates we have not taken the full amount which will be necessary to meet the requirements of the Medical Warrants. I am bound to say that some matters connected with the Medical Department require careful investigation, such as accepting the nomination of collegiate and other bodies; and having regard to the period which must elapse before the new Warrant can be laid on the Table, I have made no substantial increase in the Vote on that account. I have, however, taken a certain amount for additional pay, and to meet certain changes provided for by the Warrant. Although the matter is one of great urgency, it is one in which we are bound to proceed carefully in ascertaining the facts and figures; but I am not without hope that I may be able to get the assent of the authorities to the issue of the Warrant before the next examination takes place in August. With regard to the attached medical officers, it must be understood that I am only proceeding to an extent which will not interfere with the general hospital system. As regards the Militia, the account I have to give to the Committee is generally satisfactory. My hon. and gallant Friend the Member for Sunderland (Sir Henry Havelock) will be glad to recognize the good that has resulted from the Committee of last year, on which he sat, and the benefit which has accrued from the Regulations with regard to the modes in which Militia recruits are enlisted. The hon. Member for Hackney (Mr. J. Holms) will also be glad to learn that the change which we have made in recruiting, so far as our short experience goes, has been justified, and that great practical benefit has resulted from placing greater responsibility on the recruiting officer. That is proved in two ways. In the first place, we have not so many recruits, but a much larger number of men have presented themselves for duty. The recruits, in 1877, were 41,000; and in 1878, 39,939 men. The loss in the former year was 9,970; whereas in the latter it was only 8,815. The net gain to the Service, therefore, was 31,071 in the former, and in the latter 31,124. Moreover, there was a diminution of £551 in the matter of bounty. Special testimony ought also to be borne to the recruiting battalion of the 6th West York, which in 1877 had 205 absentees, and in 1878 had none. The total strength of the Militia Force on the 1st of February this year was 114,603 men, against 110,979 last year. I must now remark upon the reasons which have weighed with me in recommending that the Militia should be trained this year three weeks instead of a month. Large numbers of recruits, it must be remembered, were raised last year. Those recruits, in most cases, received from eight to twelve weeks' drill, and therefore may reasonably be supposed not to have forgotten all they learned. The Militia Reserve was also called out, and served for about four months under the Colours. The circumstances under which the Estimates were prepared rendered it necessary to endeavour to save money wherever it could be justified; and I confess that, in view of the large number of recruits that were trained three months, and the large number of Reserve men that were trained four months, and looking to the fact that this year's recruits would receive three months' training, I felt myself justified in shortening the period of training by one week out of 28 days. I do not say that I did that without hesitation; but when one sees the inevitable increase to which I shall refer, and when one has to look about in various directions in the endeavour to bring the Estimates within reasonable proportions, one is bound sometimes to exercise one's judgment against one's wishes in these matters; and with that view I have thought myself justified, under the exceptional circumstances of this year, in recommending that the Militia training should be shortened by one week. The strength of the Militia Reserve on the 1st of February was 20,239; that was a slight falling off from the preceding year, when the number was 21,130. That, however, is easily accounted for by a large number of men having finished their time between the two dates, and by the fact that there has been no means of increasing the Reserve in that period. The strength of the Yeomanry has been given to the House in a recent Return. Here, again, as in the case of the Militia, I have found myself, for special and exceptional reasons, justified in recommending that the training should be shortened, and the Vote consequently diminished. During the last two months, and especially during the last fortnight, applications have been very numerous, in which it has been represented that, under the exceptional circumstances of the year, farmers will be much inconvenienced if they are drawn away from their ordinary occupations. Owing to the state of the land, they have not been able to carry out the necessary agricultural operations; and there can be no doubt that many of them would be unable to attend without loss. We have no right, if we can possibly avoid it, to press persons who at other times are ready and willing to come forward and give their services, and to place them in a position of disadvantage when we can relieve them. We propose, therefore, to give the various regiments the option of attending four troop drills in which each troop will be drilled in a particular locality. We also propose to recommend that they shall be paid at the rate of 3*s*. 6*d*. for each troop drill. At present these drills are not paid for at all, and it has been represented that something should be paid the men for their time, and for the labour of their horses. This year I propose to give commanding officers the option of either calling out their men together for two days, or of allowing them to assemble for troop drills, for which they will be paid at the rate of 3*s*. 6*d*. each. That course will, I believe, meet the exceptional circumstances of the year, though it must not be taken as a precedent for future years. With regard to the Army Reserves, I have only to reiterate what is already a matter of notoriety, and to repeat my statement as to the willingness of the men to come forward, and the very small percentage of desertions. Statements have been made, at various times and in several quarters, that the Reserve men considered themselves hardly dealt with, and that they were summarily dismissed. There must be reason in all things, and we are bound not to propose that they should be paid for a longer period than would meet the case of men out of work. Especially it should be borne in mind, that many of those men are engaged in employment subject to very short notice. We paid them for a period of about three weeks, and gave them a gratuity; and, as far as I know, the men accepted the amount with a good spirit, regarding it as fair, if not too generous, payment. I now come to the Volunteers, whose enrolled strength on the 1st of November, 1878, was, including the Staff, 203,213. I must ask leave of the Committee, in consideration of the time I have already occupied, to be allowed to pass over briefly the Report of the Committee upon the Volunteer Forces, as it has been only recently presented, and some of its points are of such difficulty as to afford materials for much discussion. But there are one or two subjects on which it seems my duty to say a few words. My noble Friend in "another place" has touched upon the leading principles of that Report, and has explained the necessity of speaking with some reserve, although he considered it necessary to lay before the public, at as early a period as possible, the recommendations of the Committee. There is one recommendation of the Committee to which, however, I have no hesitation in asking this Committee at once to give effect. I shall ask the Committee to increase the money grant for the purposes of instruction in camps. The Report of the Committee will form the subject of many discussions, and I think it is hardly necessary to say more at the present time than that the subject seems to me to have been satisfactorily discussed. It appears that the Parliamentary Votes for the Volunteers are, under ordinary circumstances of management, sufficient for the conditions of the Service, the sole exception being the allowance for camps, for which we propose to take an increase in the present Vote. There has been a certain amount of misconception in certain quarters with regard to the limitation of the establishment. On the one hand, we are all anxious in theory that a Force such as the Volunteers should be encouraged to increase to its utmost dimensions; but, considering the effect of such an increase on the Estimates, there are reasons for carefully guarding against any undue expansion of the Force. Perhaps we have been somewhat negligent in assenting to the increase of the establishment without taking into consideration how far it would increase the Estimates for the ensuing year. There is, however, no wish on my part, or on that of my Colleagues, to diminish the extent of the existing Forces; and though some limit, such as 200,000 or 250,000, might be reasonably assigned, still we must take things as they are, and endeavour to respond to the spirit of the Volunteers in the manner in which they themselves have responded to the call of the country. At any rate, I shall approach with very great caution anything in the nature of a limitation of this establishment, for I think that the time for such limitation has not yet come, though it may not be far distant. The increase in the present year is almost equivalent, in point of expense, to the cost of a battalion of Infantry; and, if the House insisted on diminished Estimates, a Minister of War would have to choose one of two alternatives—either to limit the Volunteer Forces, or to reduce the permanent establishment, which latter course would probably meet with very little favour. The increase which has taken place since 1873 in the Volunteer expenditure, exclusive of arms and ammunition, amounts to £99,500. The Estimate of last year was £485,338, and that of the present year, £512,400. This increase is satisfactory enough, but they are seriously large figures, though I may say that Volunteers have also increased both in numbers and efficiency. Still, the matter is one which requires very serious consideration at the hands of any Secretary of State for War. As to clothing, the Committee had recommended that the clothing of the Volunteers should, if possible, be assimilated to that of the Regular Forces, and very plausible reasons are adduced why such a change is desirable. The recommendations of the Committee will, however, cause a large amount of expense to the country. It will necessitate the advance of clothing, which will have to be charged in the Estimates of the year, while only one-third of the amount will be recoverable within the year, leaving two-thirds to be paid in the course of time. That, of course, is a thing which will remedy itself; but I have not thought fit to include anything of the kind in the Estimates for the present year. There is no reason, when men come handsomely forward, and give up their time, that additional cost should be thrown upon them. I am of opinion that such a matter as the change of clothing should not take place gradually. I will now touch upon another point in regard to the alterations which I propose to make with respect to transport in the field. There have been various complaints outside the Service that the existing commissariat and transport arrangements have broken down. These complaints have, in many cases, been very much overstated; and I do not believe that our deficiencies are greater than those which other countries, with far better military reputation, are likely to experience under similar circumstances. There are a great many difficulties with regard to shipment and trans-shipment; and there can be no doubt that, in certain cases, the Department was not physically equal to the work that it has been called upon to undertake. That was the case upon the West Coast of Africa; and I believe that in Cyprus and at the Cape the consequence was that the officers were, in some instances, nearly worked to death, or else that subordinate officers were pushed into duties which it did not ordinarily fall to their lot to discharge. What we require, therefore, is such a Department as will be capable of expansion in time of war, with a tolerably low establishment in time of peace. I hope, by the introduction into the Department of an intermediate rank of officers such as has been established for many years in India, and has been found to work well —namely, conductors—not only to provide satisfactorily for the carrying out of the lower duties of the Commissariat, but also to afford an opening to deserving and efficient non-commissioned officers. In India such a class of men has been found to work well, and it is also proposed, in analogy to the Reserve of officers, to give general officers, under certain conditions, a power to make use of combatant officers in the field. I am far from saying how we can carry out the process of amalgamation at the present time; but it must ultimately lead to this—that the duties involving work in the field will be conducted by the officers upon a military footing, while the Store Department depôts will be attended to by some of the most able of the officers of the Commissariat Department. I may say that the manner in which Commissariat General Strickland has fulfilled his duties under Lord Chelmsford, and has permitted the substitution of military officers for civil in the administration of the Commissariat Department, has well illustrated the value of the proposal. The Clothing Estimates for this year show a decrease of £20,000, while there is an increase in the Exchequer receipts of £10,000; thus amounting in all to a net decrease of £30,000. The general reduction of the Vote is caused principally by the fall in prices of all clothing materials, and there is no doubt, but for the fall in prices, there would have been an increase. This year we have been making the clothing for the Militia in 1880. The increase in the Exchequer receipts is owing to the clothing becoming the property of the public, instead of being given to the men upon its being discarded. This has been done gradually, and the soldier, on his discharge, receives a suit of plain clothes, instead of going home in a ragged uniform, which is not a credit to the Service. Great praise must be given to the endeavour to get a good pattern for the clothing, and great attention has been bestowed on its improvement. I venture to think that much improvement has taken place, and that it is probable that further improvement will occur. A change has also been made in the clothing factory, and a manager of great practical experience has been obtained to bring to bear his civil intelligence upon military clothing. I think it right to observe, with regard to the reinforcements sent out to the Cape, that each man, on landing, will receive new clothing, together with a reserve of boots and other necessaries. Nearly 8,000 men have been supplied within 12 days of the order being given, and no less than 17,000 garments have been made at the factory within that period. With regard to the question of heavy guns, of course that subject will receive our greatest attention; but we have not, at present, any very new or startling proposal to make in connection with ordnance. We have a gun equal to, if not exceeding in power, those of other nations; and I think we have very large experience in the different sorts of arms. I think we shall, therefore, be justified in resting satisfied with our present knowledge. Apart from the size of a gun, it is clear that the question of breech-loading guns for certain purposes must come up before long. It was found in practice by Sir William Armstrong that a very great increase of power could be obtained by producing guns of a lengthened bore. Sir William Armstrong, I believe, made experiments with a muzzle-loader and a breech-loader, and, within a small fraction, the two guns gave identical results. Therefore, the long-vexed question of breech-loaders and muzzle-loaders is pretty much in the same position as before. But there is another question raised by lengthening the bore of a cannon, for so doing in many cases would make it impossible to use such a gun on board ship. On some of our large ships the recoil of the gun is to the utmost limit of the available space, there being in many cases only 18 inches or 2 feet to spare; and it is quite obvious that if you increase the length of the gun by 2 or 3 feet, it will not be possible to allow for the recoil. We have taken steps, therefore, to have drawings prepared for the 20 and 40-ton guns. They were ordered by us a little time back, and have been in a state of forward preparation ever since. But while the design of these guns were still in course of preparation the lamentable accident on board the *Thunderer* occurred, and it was thought better to await the result of the inquiries into the cause of that explosion, and to see from what defect in the firearm the cause of the accident was attributable. I may say that Sir William Armstrong put into practice that which had been known, at all events, for some time before; and I think I shall be only doing justice to my gallant friend, General Campbell, the Director of Stores, by saying that as long ago as 1873 he made a proposal for the lengthening of the bore. That is the same proposal that has been brought forward as a new one at the present day. There were reasons why that could not be put forward at the time, and it is only right that I should state what I have on behalf of the gallant officer. I have not seen the gun myself, but I understand that it is one of great power and accuracy, and it is supposed not to be open to some of the defects that are found to exist in others of the same class. We have thought it right to order two 80-ton guns, two 75-ton guns, 14 18-ton guns, and 22 of smaller dimensions. For sea service we complete one 80-ton gun, six 38-ton guns, two 25-ton guns, and other guns of smaller dimensions. Martini-Henry rifles will be issued to the Cavalry, and carbines to the Royal Artillery; and, as far as I am aware, no man, mounted or otherwise, will go out to the Cape without an efficient firearm. In the present Estimates we have provided for 30,000 Martini-Henry rifles and 15,000 carbines. Although that does not give us a large stock, yet the supply is one which, under the existing circumstances, will be fully sufficient, unless we have an unusual demand made upon us. It is also proposed this year to manufacture a certain number of pistols. We have found a difficulty in obtaining them from the trade, and have been subjected to great delay and inconvenience. The submarine mining stores were fully replenished under the Vote of Credit; and as they still continue available, it is not necessary to put down anything on that account. With regard to accoutrements, we have been trying to put two regiments into an excellent description, known as the "Oliver" pattern. Owing to a most unusual delay in the factories, we were not able to supply them nearly so soon as we intended to do. I do not wish to use any words which may be interpreted as a threat; but, still, I cannot help saying that we have experienced such difficulties in times past in getting accoutrements in at the proper day, that it will become at least a question whether we shall not have to take up a certain amount of that work ourselves—at all events, to such an extent as to insure the Service not being put to inconvenience. The accoutrements which I have mentioned are no longer of buff and tan leather; but are buff leather for the Rifles, and brown leather for the Infantry. I think that the advance in the present form of accoutrements marks a period when the consumption of pipeclay will be put an end to. I may say generally that the works under the Military Forces Localization Act have been carried out. Of brigade depôts, there are now 61 established; 32 are now in hand; 23 are completed; and 9 existing barracks will be completed this year. The total expenditure contemplated by the Military Forces Localization Act of 1872 was £3,500,000, and up to the present day £2,750,000 has been expended. The Cavalry barracks at Knightsbridge will be completed in the course of the year; and we have taken some money for repairs at Aldershot, Shorncliffe, and elsewhere. £2,000 is also put down for the military works at Cyprus. The amount required at the latter station is £11,000, and that will have ultimately to be spent; but we have only taken £2,000 this year, and that will be sufficient to enable some progress to be made with the works. We have also taken money to provide for the erection of a sanatarium at Mauritius. With regard to the works generally, however, I have found myself bound to put a stop to the erection of any new barracks or works wherever it can possibly be avoided. Of course, when the works are in progress, and in many cases under contract, there would have been no real economy in stopping them. In March last a Committee was appointed to consider the various points connected with the defence of the Colonies, as regarded the establishment of coaling stations at Colonial ports. In accordance with the Report of that Committee, the Estimates of last year sanctioned an expenditure on those stations; and it also included other works, which have been proceeded with and are now in a forward state. I am bound to recognize the public spirit with which the Australian Colonies have taken up the question of their own defence. They have taken the best means in their power for the defences required. The Dominion of Canada has displayed a similar spirit in providing for her defence; the principal object sought to be attained by her being to provide secure places for Her Majesty's ships to coal and refit, instead of small vessels having to be sent to the ships. I have now, I think, passed through at some length nearly all the items of the Estimates; and, although very great care has been taken to diminish the Estimates of this year, there are certain causes which rendered it almost impossible that we should free ourselves from a large expenditure. The expenditure on the non-effective Vote I have already referred to. The pensions have increased from £1,216,000 in 1873-4 to £1,582,000 in the present year, showing in six years an increase of £366,000. The expenditure on the Volunteer Forces I have also mentioned; but there is another increase which I must mention, and it is in connection with the Army Reserve. In the years corresponding to those I have just given there has been an increase from £51,000 to £113,000. This branch of the Service will, of course, be the source of further increase. The next few years will, perhaps, be the worst period of our military history, so far as the expenditure in connection with this branch of the Service is concerned; because we have, on the one hand, the pensions of the old long service men, while, on the other, we have a yearly increasing amount of reserve and deferred pay. With regard to the deferred pay, that increase has been one that the circumstances have fully justified. I am far from saying that that is not also the case with regard to the other increases, for I believe that they have all been necessary. I believe that the various Votes which Parliament has sanctioned must unavoidably lead to an increase of expenditure for the next few years, until the pensions cease to come in. At the present time there is a first increase due to the men who enlisted about the time of the Crimean War and the Indian Mutiny, and who are now going to be pensioned; and I am informed that, in all probability, for the next few years there will still continue to be an increase upon the non-effective Vote. I beg to thank the Committee for the patience with which it has listened to my lengthened Statement, and I venture, with some confidence, to recommend the Estimates to the consideration of the Committee.

Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That a number of Land Forces, not exceeding 135,625, all ranks, be maintained for the Service of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, at Home and Abroad, excluding Her Majesty's Indian Possessions, during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1880."—(*Colonel Stanley.*)

Major O'BEIRNE considered that the Statement of the right hon. and gallant Gentleman the Secretary of State for War would be generally gratifying to the country; but upon one subject he (Major O'Beirne) could have wished him to be a little more explicit. With regard to the brigade depôts, it was his opinion that there was a vast scope for the reduction of expense in connection with their present organization. By the Return of last year it appeared that the strength of the brigade depôts did not exceed 80 men available for service, one colonel, one major, four captains, four subalterns, while there was an establishment of four captains and four sub-lieutenants. It appeared to him that a great reduction of expense might be effected by amalgamating these into companies, with only one captain for each depôt of the regiment, and by that plan a reduction would take place to the number of 141 companies, and a saving of £2,156 be secured. The present position of the depôts he thought to be quite indefensible with regard to the number of the commanding officers employed, for they had really nothing to command.

COLONEL MURE had intended to address to the Committee some observations upon the general condition of the Army before going into Committee, but had been prevented from so doing. With regard to the short-service system, he thought that inasmuch as the present year was the first in which they had been at war since that system had been brought into play, it might be regarded as a test year; while it was a subject for congratulation that, on the whole, the system was found to be working well. He was present last year at a Queen's field day at Aldershot, when the Reserves were called out, accompanied by a gallant officer, and on that occasion they were both much impressed by the magnificent appearance, as to stature and physique, of the men of the Reserves who were in the ranks. On leaving the ground his friend inquired —"What is all this croaking about the recruits?" and added — "I do not think I ever saw better men in my life." He (Colonel Mure) then asked him to look at the recruits who were, on that occasion, keeping the ground. "Good gracious!" replied this gallant officer—"You do not mean to say those are recruits who have been made into the fine men we see by good feeding and treatment alone?" It was, therefore, his opinion that the system of short service was acting well; but had the Motion of the hon. Member for Hackney (Mr. J. Holms) gone to a Division he should have voted against it; because it must be remembered that although the Reserve system was an admirable thing, it would not do to destroy our ranks with the Colours in order to make Reserves, which were accumulating, and would in the course of time form a far larger body of men than they did at present. Unfortunately it was the fact that we were engaged in small wars in various parts of the world; and for this reason he was glad to hear from his right hon. and gallant Friend the Secretary of State for War that he had very carefully considered the difficulty in which he had been placed in this respect. A very great strain had been placed upon the Army, and much difficulty had been experienced in sending out efficient troops to the seat of war, for which reason he was desirous of knowing what had become of the 18 regiments which Viscount Cranbrook last year had said were to be kept in a state of efficiency. It was a most remarkable fact that although the recruits numbered 28,000 yearly, and amounted to 80,000 during the last five years, we were unable to supply regiments in a state of efficiency when required in an emergency. The fact was we had the men; but they were too young, and could not be made use of. In 1877 he had asked for a Return showing the ages of the men in two regiments sent out to Malta at the time when it was believed we might get into difficulties with Russia. He referred to the second battalion of the Queen's and the second battalion of the 13th Regiment; and from the reference to the Return which he was about to make he thought the Committee would form a very decided opinion upon the point of their efficiency. Those two battalions went out at a time when there was no great strain, as at the present moment, upon the Army—for it was to be borne in mind that we had now two wars on hand at once—and were only sent to Malta, at a time of profound peace, to reinforce our Army in the Mediterranean. The second battalion of the Queen's embarked in 1877, and numbered 759 privates, of whom 458 were under 20 years of age, while 130 were men of 18 months' service and under; 470 of one years' service and under, and some of six and nine months only and under. The second regiment, which was the 13th Light Infantry, embarked about the same strength; 380 of these were under 20 years of age; 427 had only seen one year's service; 326 had only had nine months; and 139 only three months. He asked, when they knew the age at which they presumably admitted recruits—namely, 18—even if they all reached that age—whether they could call these regiments powerful Infantry? But when they knew that a great many men enlisted at 17 and

16—while in some Cavalry regiments even at 15—could it be suggested that these bodies formed efficient regiments of Infantry? He had had the good fortune to see the 60th Rifles embark the other day for the Cape; and he had no hesitation in saying that that was a very able battalion of short, strong, handsome men. He also saw the men who were to replace the 24th, and almost the same might be said of them. At the same time, it must be remarked that the great mass of Infantry which was now sent on these sudden calls was far too young for the work they had to do. The 88th Regiment (the Connaught Rangers) embarked not long ago for the Cape of Good Hope, and it was composed mainly of boys; and the Blue Book issued last year contained some reference as to their conduct at Prætoria, showing that this regiment of boys not only acted like men, but as brave men. In reference to that, he found a despatch from Colonel Bellairs, in 1868, as to the affair on the 29th of December, 1877, in which, after referring to the bravery of Major Moore, he spoke of the 88th, as follows:—

"The enemy were 600 strong, but with a small body of 48 Connaught Rangers we drove them off with a mere handful of young soldiers imperfectly acquainted with their weapons."

Now, he asked, was it fair or just to send out mere boys to fight such men as the South African Natives unacquainted with their weapons? Furthermore, Major Moore reported that the Connaught Rangers—boys as they were—not one of whom had fired a shot at an enemy before, repelled the attack from huge bodies which advanced in every direction, and held the final position in a well-contested field.

"Their fire was so wild, however, that to this may be attributed the small loss the enemy sustained."

That was an exact illustration of that which he had urged upon the House over and over again—namely, the fault and improvidence of employing mere boys to do this serious work. As to the late war in Afghanistan, he had not a doubt in his mind as to the admirable conduct of those engaged; but he should like to ask, whether certain reports which had appeared from the correspondents with the Army were true or not? Those reports did not refer in any way as to the excellent conduct of the men, but as to whether they were efficient soldiers in regard to their youth and physical requirements. It had been reported that the 70th Regiment was made up, for the most part, of men so young—half-grown boys, in fact—that they suffered extremely in the march, and that after the march a very large number were so incapacitated that they could not move. It was also reported that as to the second battalion of the 8th Regiment in the Peiwar Pass, though they behaved as British soldiers should, their physical condition was very far from satisfactory. He had no doubt that these reports were very much exaggerated; but, still, there were no Reports from the War Office, and, therefore, he was justified in asking the question. He regretted very much indeed the speech which had been delivered by the hon. Member for Hackney (Mr. J. Holms), for he always regretted to hear a Member of Parliament say anything in that House which detracted from the character of non-commissioned officers or privates of the Army. Their physical condition was a fair subject for criticism; but their moral qualities were such as no man ought to attack in this Assembly. They had 28,000 or 29,000 recruits every year; and out of that large number there was the greatest difficulty in getting men to take the stripes. This could not arise from the deficiencies amongst the men, as many of these recruits were reported to be of superior education. It could not arise from anything painful in their position under British commissioned officers, because he was perfectly certain that the general conduct of commissioned officers showed them to be humane, generous, and careful men. Therefore, there must be some reason why they would not take the stripes. He believed the speech of the hon. Member for Hackney would have a bad influence. He regretted that a Member of Parliament should think it right to produce a letter from a private soldier, of whom nobody present knew anything, whose sympathies and object were unknown, and who wrote a letter containing general charges against young non-commissioned officers of an almost disgraceful nature. He felt sure that, if the privates of the Army read the speech of the hon. Member, if it were reported, it would not be recognized by them as an inducement to take the stripes. What they wanted was to offer larger inducements to take the stripes—and not only this, but also to induce the men to remain in the Army long enough to become good non-commissioned officers. The right hon. and gallant Gentleman had, however, tackled the question, which was a very difficult one; and he had already introduced what he believed would be a most beneficial improvement, and that was the establishment of a class — something between the commissioned and non-commissioned officer. That would be a great advantage, no doubt; but, in conversation with a serjeant-major of one of their most distinguished regiments, the serjeant said the arrangement would be all very well as far as it went, but there would be but very few cases in the Army generally where this class would operate. Nevertheless, a little promotion would follow; and he had hoped, when he heard the intentions of the War Office, that there would be a class of these conductorships introduced into every regiment in the Service, instead of into the Commissariat and Supply corps alone. He confessed he should like to see this system more extended than had been proposed by the right hon. and gallant Gentleman. He now came to a subject which had never been brought to the attention of the House before. They now had wars in two parts of the globe; and morning after morning they with pride read of the gallantry of the British soldier. When they saw the names of relations or friends who had distinguished themselves, they congratulated each other upon the fact. They knew very well that in all Armies there were a certain number of hard fighting men who faced the enemy, who plunged into danger from which they could hardly expect to escape with life, and they knew that they were the company officers, the non-commissioned officers, and the leading privates. Nevertheless, in the despatches, rarely or ever was the name of a company officer, non-commissioned officer, or private mentioned — the latter almost never; but there was invariably a list of the names of officers—Departmental officers—who were commended to the notice of Her Gracious Majesty for their behaviour. That was the case the other day in that engagement in which the 72nd Highlanders and the Ghoorkas were so distinguished. He hoped the Committee would remember that this was a very delicate subject to allude to in Parliament; and he only mentioned the subject under a strong sense of duty to the company officers, non-commissioned officers, and men. They were all familiar with the contents of the despatch to which he alluded. The advance against the entrenchments of the Afghans was led by the 5th Ghoorkas and a company of the 72nd Highlanders. Here was an instance of the most terrible task which could be imagined—namely, the carrying of entrenchments in the face of brave defenders, well armed with rifles, and prepared for the defence. The only loss which took place that day was amongst the 72nd Highlanders and the 5th Ghoorkas. Captain Cook, who led the Ghoorkas, was mentioned in the narrative, but not in the recommendations for reward, of the despatches. He was given to understand that Captain Cook was to have the Victoria Cross — he trusted that this might prove true. But there was not a single reference in the despatches referring to the gallantry with which those Ghoorkas and 72nd Highlanders behaved—not a single company officer mentioned, not a single non-commissioned officer or private; but, strange to say, while the names of many Departmental officers were given, there was not a name of a Native officer mentioned of any rank whatever, although the greater part of the force was composed of Natives. Had fairness been awarded to the men who had done the brunt of the fighting that day? Was this encouraging to men when they enlisted to accept the stripes and remain in the Army? *Per contra*, how much inducement there would be if, after having fought bravely, men were mentioned in the despatches for gallantry. In what a proud position that man would be placed on returning to his native village, covered with honour, to receive the congratulations of his relations and friends. He trusted, in these remarks, he had said nothing which showed a want of respect to General Roberts. It was not his fault, but the fault of the system, which was most baneful to the interests of the Army. As a young officer, he had been glad to accept a position on the staff of

Sir Harry Smith, because he knew that if he came within 1,000 yards of the enemy, and thus took part in no actual fighting, he should be mentioned in the despatches. He thought it was most of all important to notice that in this despatch not a single Native was mentioned; and, according to it, not a single person distinguished himself but those who were mentioned. He did not say that those who were mentioned had not behaved admirably, and did not deserve mention; but when a special distinction was conferred, the inference, undoubtedly, was, that the others did not distinguish themselves so much. Another question to which he wished to allude was the social condition of the British non-commissioned officer and private, and, generally speaking, those who wore the uniform of Her Majesty in the Army or the Navy. At that moment anyone wearing Her Majesty's uniform—unless he was an officer—was, to a certain extent, a pariah in society. He might be a man of good education, and, when at home, living in a superior class; but if he went anywhere with civilians, relations, or friends, to a theatre, or on board a steamboat, or railway, he was told that he could not have a good seat at a theatre or place of public entertainment, or berth in the saloon of a steamer, or a first-class carriage, if he wore Her Majesty's uniform. No wonder that Her Majesty's uniform was considered by some as a badge of degradation, and that these exclusions gave rise to a strong feeling of mortification. It was a matter which he meant to bring before the House in a more substantial form, with the view of drawing public attention to the improvement of the social and civil position of the private soldier. Viscount Cranbrook, when in that House, had, with his usual generosity, admitted that the way in which soldiers were treated in society was a grievance which ought to be redressed.

Colonel COLTHURST said, he did not think the plan decided upon by the right hon. and gallant Gentleman would supply the want of non-commissioned officers to the regiments. What was wanted was non-commissioned officers; and as long as the men of the regiments were mere boys, the more necessity there was for them. A few years ago, when he had the honour of commanding a regiment, he found it difficult to get good, experienced non-commissioned officers. The non-commissioned officer of the future would differ in no material sense from the soldier he had to command, except by a little superior education. If they wanted, however, good non-commissioned officers, they must give them inducements to re-engage. The inducement of pensions, he thought, was the only one which would find them good non-commissioned officers. There was another point with respect to the brigade depôts, which had been alluded to by the hon. and gallant Member for Leitrim (Major O'Beirne). He (Colonel Colthurst) thought his hon. and gallant Friend had somewhat under-estimated the amount of work brigade officers had to do, and the number of officers there was available. He thought two or three, at the most, were generally with the four composing the brigade depôt. As regards the colonel in command, however, he thought there was a great waste of power in throwing upon him a great many minor duties, which distracted his attention from more important subjects, and which might be done by a subordinate officer. It was a great pity that the colonel was at all expected to interfere in the interior economy of the 80 or 90 men of a brigade depôt, when the duties could be attended to by the major. Very recent instructions from the Horse Guards, however, obliged the colonel to take personal charge of the brigade depôt.

Mr. RITCHIE said, that some steps should be taken to put a stop to the large number of absentees in Militia regiments. It was found, in many regiments, that the large proportion of those who enlisted never turned up for training at all; and, in his own regiment, he might mention that the proportion which did not come up for training was ridiculously large; for while last year they enlisted 633 recruits, at the training time only 203 came up—or not one-third of the number enlisted. It was a wrong principle to give men bounties on enlistment. He knew the answer would be, that if the money were not given the men would not enlist. No doubt this was true to a considerable extent; but he questioned very much indeed whether it would not prove, in the end, more advantageous to give the bounty now given on enlistment at the first or second training rather than at the time of enlistment. There would be fewer recruits in the first instance; but he thought, in the end, there would be as large a number of men at the training. There were many commanding officers of Militia regiments who were formerly unwilling to support this method who had now changed their minds; and he, for one, must say that he thought the experiment should be tried. Of course, experience only would show whether a great saving in expenditure might not be made without materially affecting the number of men present at the training. Another matter to which he wished to call attention was the very small proportion which the total number of men present at the annual trainings bore to the establishment. He considered that it would be very much more satisfactory, if the numbers on the establishment could not be maintained, that the establishment should be reduced. In 1878 the establishment was 137,556; only 86,458 came up for training—that was nearly 30 per cent short of the establishment. No doubt, the numbers present at that time were reduced by the fact of the Reserve being out simultaneously. In the previous year, however, there was a deficiency of about 25 per cent, the numbers being 99,850, showing a deficiency of about 37,000. He should like to ask whether the permanent staff was calculated on the total number of the establishment, because, in that case, it was much too large, as he had shown that the discrepancy in the numbers that came up for training varied from 25 to 30 per cent. The right hon. and gallant Gentleman had informed them that the Militia were to be called out this year for 20 days' training only. This he considered highly unsatisfactory. It was penny wise and pound foolish. If the Militia was to be maintained in an efficient state, it seemed to him that it was most unwise to think of reducing the number of days by such a large percentage. The reason which the right hon. and gallant Gentleman gave for calling them out for 20 days only was because the Reserves were out last year, and because the recruits now obtained so much more drill than previously. This argument, if it was good for this year, was equally good for any year, so that the only really new feature in the matter was the fact of the Reserves having been out last year, and he did not consider this was any reason for cutting short the drill of the whole Force by seven days or one-fourth. What was the actual result of 20 days' training? They all knew that there were certain days at the beginning and end of a training in which it was impossible that any work could be done; there was certain routine work to be gone through which precluded the possibility of proceeding with the ordinary training. He had made a calculation, the result of which was that out of this 20 days, only 13 would remain actually available for the purposes for which the Militia were called out; and such a number of days, he contended, was totally inadequate for the requirements of the Service. He confessed that state of things was, to his mind, most unsatisfactory—that, in order to effect a saving in the Militia Estimates—for that seemed to him the real reason—that body was to be deprived of a considerable part of their annual training; it must, he held, lead to a decrease in the efficiency of the Force. With regard to the brigade depôts, he agreed, in the main, with the hon. and gallant Gentleman opposite. In the brigade depôt with which his regiment was connected there were only 68 recruits obtained during last year. The establishment of the brigade depôt was—1 lieutenant-colonel, 1 major, 4 captains, and 100 privates; both battalions of the regiments were in India. He considered that a saving might be effected in the number of these depôts, and, consequently, in their expenditure. At Guildford the depôt was two miles from the town, and this materially affected the recruiting for the Militia. Recruits would enlist at the old barracks in the town; but they would not, as a rule, walk two miles to the depot and then enlist in the Militia. On that accouut he considered that the brigade depôt system at Guildford did not work altogether satisfactorily. With reference to the question of the Volunteers, he was glad that the right hon. and gallant Gentleman had said that he was not prepared to recommend, at least for the present, the carrying out of the change of clothing which was suggested by the Committee which sat on that Force.

COLONEL STANLEY remarked that he had said in his speech that he was not prepared to carry out the recommendations *in toto*, but that he thought they should be carried out only very carefully and tentatively.

Mr. RITCHIE said, he understood the right hon. and gallant Gentleman would not recommend the change of clothing at present at any rate; and he was glad that that was so, as otherwise a hardship would be imposed on some regiments. In April, 1874, it was arranged that if any change of uniform were to be made, the colour to be assumed was that of the brigade depôt to which the regiment belonged. He understood that the future colour was to be scarlet. One regiment which he knew, one of the best in London, would, if this recommendation was carried out, suffer a great pecuniary loss and hardship. He believed that it would result in its disbandment. This regiment was attached to the 53rd and 54th brigade depôts at Winchester, whose regular regiments were the battalions of the Rifle Brigade. By carrying out, therefore, the suggestions of this Committee, this regiment, which had adopted the recommendation of April, 1874, would be saddled with the double expense, and that from no fault of their own, but from having complied with the Regulations promulgated. That had been done, he knew, at an outlay of some £400 or £500; and if a new Order were issued again to change the colour of their uniform, that regiment, which had by great care extricated itself from pecuniary difficulties, would be again plunged in debt. For these reasons, he trusted that the right hon. and gallant Gentleman the Secretary of State for War would, when he adopted the suggestions of the Committee, show some consideration to those regiments which, by following out the requirements of the Regulation of 1874, had adopted a colour other than that now recommended.

Mr. CAMPBELL - BANNERMAN said, that there were very few points in the speech of the right hon. and gallant Gentleman to which he could take exception, although on some small matters he wished to ask questions. He would, however, first invite the attention of the Committee to a matter which affected rather the conduct of the Cabinet and Government than the War Department. He alluded to the fact that in the Estimates it appeared that the Army was to be reduced by 4,000 men; but that, at the last moment, these men were put again on the Establishment on the ground of reinforcements being sent to Natal. He admitted that it was a case which might often occur—that a Government thought that it saw its way to a reduction of the Forces, and found at the last moment their hopes frustrated by an unforeseen occurrence; but could it be said that the present occurrence was unforeseen? The right hon. and gallant Member for Stamford (Sir John Hay) had stated the other night that the Zulu War had come upon the Government as a surprise. But he asked hon. Gentlemen did the facts appear to bear out that statement? Was not the policy of the Government rather one which tended to war, and which had so tended for months past? He was convinced that it was so. He would not enter into the question whether the actual movement towards war originated at home or in the Colony; but the fact of the Government receiving the despatches, which were before the House, from Sir Bartle Frere, showed distinctly that they must have been aware that their policy was one which tended to war. He would refer, quite briefly, to certain expressions in the despatches in order to prove that the Government could not have looked upon the declaration of war as a surprise. In October—on the 17th of that month—the Government, having received an application from the Cape for reinforcements, declined to comply with that request, and in their despatch expressed a

> "Confident hope that, by the exercise of prudence, it will be possible to avert the very serious evil of a war with Cetewayo."

Sir Bartle Frere repeated his application, and in November the reinforcements were sent. The Colonial Secretary, in announcing their despatch on November 21, says, he regrets to learn that—

> "The prospect of peace is so very precarious;"

And he went on to say—

> "Though the aspect of affairs is menacing in a high degree, I can by no means arrive at the conclusion that war with the Zulus should be unavoidable."

Now, was it possible that anyone reading those despatches could say that the Government were unaware of the probability of war? And every subsequent event could only have confirmed the opinion that war was inevitable. And what was the nature of the Force in the Colony? Sir Bartle Frere, in asking for additional troops in September, said—

> "The whole Force at General Thesiger's disposal in Natal would, with the reinforcements I suggest, still be much less than Sir Garnet Wolseley considered necessary to guard against a Zulu outbreak in Natal before our responsibilities were extended to the Transvaal."

And the Government themselves, when complying with his request, said, in the despatch already quoted from, that the troops then sent were

> "Not for invasion or conquest, but to afford such protection as may be necessary to the lives and property of the Colonists."

So that as long ago as last autumn the Government knew that the policy of the Colonial authorities was tending certainly to war, and that the troops were only sufficient for defensive purposes; and yet in this crisis they resolve to reduce the Army by 4,000 men. Now, it was evident that if there was a war at all, it must be an offensive war, in order to break the power of Cetewayo; and accordingly, he asked, was this the time to reduce the establishment of our Army? There were some who might say that the Army was strong enough for the purpose even without those 4,000 men. Whoever might use this argument it could not be the Government, who put them on again in hot haste the moment our military operations received a check. In any case, it was clear that more men would have been required for the campaign, and this disaster at Isandula—deplorable as it was—was, after all, partial in its character; it was such an incident as might be expected in a campaign of this kind; it was not a great military catastrophe calculated to strain the power of the Empire. Yet he found the Government totally unprepared; it found them proposing to reduce the Establishment of the Army by 4,000 men, whom, by their subsequent conduct, they acknowledged they could not spare; and they were also driven to the adoption of hurry-scurry expedients in order to send out the battalions that were required. He considered that the conduct of the Government, in thus playing fast-and-loose with the Establishment of the Army, proposing a reduction of it at a time when they had one war on hand and were drifting into another, reducing the number of available men, and then, the moment a check occurred, immediately reinstating them, was a matter that required both explanation and justification. No doubt, the idea of a reduction was suggested by a desire to appear economical. He would attribute to right hon. Gentlemen opposite a sincere desire to merit such a character; but it seemed to him to be altogether beyond possibility that they could do so while this policy of annexation and aggression went on. With regard to filling up battalions for foreign service, he thought that the Government had also shown a want of care and foresight. The difficulty in filling up the six battalions which had been sent was due to two causes—First, to the fact that regiments first on the roster for foreign service were not maintained at full foreign service strength; and, secondly, that many of the men in their ranks were practically unfit for active service. The consequence was that they had to be filled up from other battalions, and thus those other battalions were in turn reduced by being deprived of some of their best men. Now, this was much to be deplored, and ought, if possible, to be avoided. With regard to this system of small linked battalions with short service, he wished to say that, although Lord Cardwell introduced it, he trusted it would not be imagined that the late Government would view with jealousy any attempt to alter its details. It was not cast-iron in all its parts, and he would gladly support any change necessary to ease its working. The difficulty of filling up regiments to war strength had always existed — it was especially observable during the Crimean War; and he did not think that the system of short service had increased that difficulty so much as it was sometimes thought to do. They had tried that system, and he believed that the decision was entirely in its favour. It was evidently successful for the purpose of great wars. He thought everyone was ready to admit that; but whether it was so applicable in small wars which occurred suddenly and without much warning might be doubted. Since they had adopted that system they had been threatened with a great European war, had experienced a war in the Transkei District, another in Afghanistan, and were now carrying on one in Zululand. No system could be expected to meet without difficulty such a strain as that. There was one mode, however, of meeting the difficulty, which was felt in these Colonial wars, and that was that men from the Reserve should be allowed to volunteer for service in the Line. Being a legal point, he would not express a confident opinion upon it; but he would just observe that he thought it unwise to refuse to allow them to serve in that way, if they were willing to do so. They might have been engaged for a longer period than six months, contingently upon the passing of an Act of Parliament—which would have been of the nature of a Bill of Indemnity—justifying their being so employed. He had no doubt, however, that what had been decided upon by his right hon. and gallant Friend (Colonel Stanley) was right; and, at any rate, he considered it highly satisfactory to know that as regarded a future emergency those men would be available for service. But admitting that, in a case of sudden emergency, there was a difficulty with short-service and linked battalions, that difficulty dwindled when they could look ahead and prepare. It was a question of administration and of arranging the roster. He thought that the seven years' experience of the working of that system of linked battalions and short service was matter for much congratulation. Both Viscount Cranbrook and the right hon. and gallant Gentleman had been most loyal to that system, and he hoped that the right hon. and gallant Gentlemen would continue to be so. The principle on which it was worked was a very simple one —of allowing battalions when they first returned home to dwindle to a low strength, and then as they approached the period at which they should go out again their strength was brought up, so that, at the time of embarkation, they stood at their full strength. But the relative numbers of the strong and weak battalions was entirely a question for the authorities to determine who alone knew the probable requirements of the year. The noble Lord the late Secretary of State for War increased the number of battalions at full strength, and the measure had been considered a wise one, and had been cheerfully supported by those who sat on his (Mr. Campbell-Bannerman's) side of the House. His right hon. and gallant Friend the present Secretary of State for War had now, on the other hand, gone in the opposite direction, for, by the original Estimates, in which it was intended that 4,000 should be taken off; and it would be found that the establishment of the battalions just come from abroad was 480 rank and file, a point lower than that at which the late Government ventured to leave them—as, if he remembered rightly, it stood, on their quitting Office, at 520 men. Of this he quite approved. If the idea was once abandoned that those battalions were intended for show, and that of their being merely drilling machines accepted, then it appeared to him a wise thing to reduce them, and the lower they were reduced consistently with their efficiency for drill purposes the better. Now, all this question was entirely at the discretion of the Government; and it was absurd to blame the system of short service and linked battalions, if the first battalions were too low in strength, or if there were too few of them for the requirements of the Government. Now, he submitted, with great deference, that it would have been a reasonable course for the Government, in October or November last, when they were in the state of mind which he had described—when the best they could say was that they thought that war at the Cape was not unavoidable, and that the preservation of peace was precarious—to have quietly and carefully worked up, say, half-a-dozen battalions, so as to be ready if called upon. By this means the men would have had time to shake into their places, and need not have been sent on board ship without any acquaintance with their comrades or officers. That, he thought, would have been a reasonable plan; but the Government appeared to have been perfectly unprepared in that respect; while the disaster of Isandula came upon them as an unexpected blow. They apparently did not expect that any fresh regiments would be required; but that was quite inconsistent with the knowledge possessed by them, as disclosed by the despatches already quoted. There was, indeed, another alternative which might have palliated, in some respects, the evil complained of; and that was that more battalions might have been sent at a smaller strength. It appeared to him that in the case of embarking in an European war, where masses of men were to be brigaded, there would, perhaps, be some advantage in large battalions; but this would not be the case in bush warfare, which was often conducted in companies, and even half-companies. And while there might be no disadvantage in having small regiments, there was a great advantage for such a war in a large proportion of officers; and if more regiments were sent full of picked and mature men, he could not but see that the Force would have been more efficient than it was. It might be said that it would increase the expense by sending out more head-quarters; but he ventured to say that the poorest economy in time of war was, on account of the cost, to fail to make use of the best means for bringing war to a speedy conclusion. He regarded the whole question as one affecting the Government rather than the Secretary of State for War, and considered that they had not acted with sufficient foresight, and in accordance to the knowledge which they possessed. Turning to the Estimates, he had a few things to say. He joined the hon. and gallant Gentleman opposite in regretting the short training proposed for the Militia; but thought that, as the Militia Reserve men were out a long time last year, it was not unreasonable that they should be let off this year with a shorter period of training. With regard to the Volunteers, he was glad that the Secretary of State for War had not committed himself entirely to the Report of the Committee. He was not quite sure that the construction of the Committee gave entire satisfaction to the body of Volunteers; for it was generally observed that no acting Volunteer officer was upon it, who knew the real wants of the Force, with the exception of his hon. and gallant Friend (Colonel Loyd Lindsay) and a noble Lord in "another place" (Viscount Bury), whose interest in the matter was looked upon as hybrid—half representing the War Office, and half representing the Volunteers. Again, there was the Volunteer Artillery, a very useful body of men, drawn chiefly from the artizan class, who were not so well off as the other portions of the Force, but whose expenses were much greater, and who, consequently, deserved a great deal of consideration, but who were not represented on the Committee. But the evidence upon which the Report was founded had not yet been laid before Parliament; and it might be found that they were well represented by witnesses, although not upon the Committee. Another point was as to the Store Votes. He was very anxious to know whether the right hon. and gallant Gentleman could inform the Committee what use had been made of the money voted last year outside the general Estimates? The sum voted last year, beyond the ordinary Estimates, was nearly £900,000. He would like to know on what sort of stores that money was spent, and whether the outlay gave any prospect of a reduction at a future time? The last observation he would make was with regard to a small but somewhat important matter in its way. The Recruiting Report of the year was a very satisfactory one, and he was sorry to see that the Inspector General proposed that there should be no more Reports. He hoped the Secretary of State for War would not agree to that proposal, for these Reports were full of information, and were deeply interesting to the House and to the public.

Sir WALTER B. BARTTELOT said, he had listened with surprise to the hon. Member for the Stirling Burghs (Mr. Campbell-Bannerman). He had noticed that he looked to his right hand, and to his left, and saw that strong men were gathering round him, and that the Secretary of State for War had felt it necessary to call up his Reserves, and was now prepared to fight the hon. and right hon. Gentlemen arrayed on the other side. He was surprised to find how small was the attack made by the hon. Member. Did he suppose that the Government would determine to reduce the numbers of the Army when there was any necessity for keeping them up? And what would he, and those who acted with him, have said if the Government had made great preparations for this Zulu War, when all the despatches, so far as he could gather, had shown that the Government were determined that no rupture should take place if they could prevent it, at any rate, for the present? But when it was found that a rupture had taken place, he would like to ask the hon. Member, who had filled a responsible office, whether he would have neglected to keep up the Army in a State of full efficiency? He recollected perfectly well, when there was a great deal more necessity than existed at that moment, the noble Lord, then Secretary of State for War, came down to the House in hot haste, and on a hot day in July, asking for 20,000 men and £2,000,000 on account of a great war that was then raging. When he heard hon. Members on the front Opposition Bench saying that the Government ought to be prepared on every point, he would call their very special attention to the way in which they themselves were prepared when great wars, and particularly the Crimean War, came upon them. No doubt the short-service system was on its trial, and no doubt it had not come up to all they could have wished. He was surprised to hear the hon. and gallant Member for Renfrew (Colonel Mure) first say that it was exactly what was wanted in the country, and then proceed to demolish his own argument, word by word, by saying that no regiment which they had sent out had men fit to enter into action. He said, indeed, that they had acted gallantly and nobly, but that they had not the required physique.

Colonel MURE said, that he had said they were not acquainted with their weapons.

Sir WALTER B. BARTTELOT thought he had heard something about the regiments in the Bholan Pass; that the men were not of that physique which would enable them to bear the strain of a campaign.

Colonel MURE: As to the 88th Regiment, he had spoken of them as boys, and quoted an official despatch. He said they were not acquainted with the use of their weapons. With regard to the 70th and 2nd Battalion 8th Regiments, he had simply alluded to a newspaper report, and asked a question.

Sir WALTER B. BARTTELOT said, he had no wish to misquote his hon. and gallant Friend, who had, he thought, confirmed everything he had said—that the men were not acquainted with their weapons, and were too young to be sent on service. He was glad his hon. and gallant Friend had spoken so strongly about it. It was known all over England, and elsewhere, that these men were young, and that they fought gallantly; but young they were, and older men could not be got. But the great question was, how were they to go on for the future? Were they to continue sending out men in the condition of those sent to South Africa; or were they to have older and stronger men? That could only be done in three ways—first, by calling out the Reserves; and so filling up the regiments with the Reserves. He understood that the Reserves were to be available in cases of emergency, and was not the present a case of emergency? It might be said that the men would be disheartened by being called out for a war of the kind now being waged. But the question ought to be settled whether or not they were to be made available. Anyone would see that his right hon. and gallant Friend had put the fact as plainly as any man could put it—that the depôt system had failed. He said it was not what he could wish, for they had had to call on regiments to furnish volunteers, which, he admitted, was a bad system. The right hon. and gallant Gentleman had told them that the 91st Regiment had obtained volunteers from 11 different regiments. *Ex uno disce omnes;* they were all alike, and had to take the only fit and efficient men from the other regiments. Was it to be tolerated for a moment that they could only keep up some of their regiments by getting volunteers from others? But there was another way of getting older and stronger men; and he would like to ask the right hon. and gallant Gentleman in what state was the First Army Corps at the present moment? He fancied they were to have an Army Corps fit to go on foreign service. The 18 regiments first for foreign service ought to have their full complement of 1,000 men, from which, perhaps, 200 might be deducted as unfit to go abroad; but there would still remain 800 men fit for foreign service. One regiment had been sent out and had received the full praise and commendation of his hon. and gallant Friend opposite (Colonel Mure). That was the 60th Rifles, which had not borrowed a man except from its own brigade depôt; but that was the corps depôt, and it was a question whether, instead of two, they ought not to have four battalions at the depôt centres. He had one word to say with regard to the despatches and the officers and non-commissioned officers serving abroad. What could be more gallant than the conduct of those poor fellows, Melville and Coghill, whose bodies were found wrapped in the flags of their regiments. No matter who was to blame—he was not going into that at present—what could be more gallant than the action of those young men, whether they had fought in Zululand or Afghanistan? He maintained that, although they had young soldiers, they were possessed of men most anxious to do their duty. He would now refer to another matter upon which he thought his right hon. and gallant Friend might afford some explanation—namely, the rather curious transaction which had occurred in one of the Cavalry regiments that had gone out. He would at once say that he had the highest respect for the gallantry and for the position of Colonel Drury Lowe, and for the way in which he had discharged his duties, as well as for the way in which he was received, and the honour in which he was held, by every man in the regiment; but the precedent, if followed, was one that might do great mischief in the Service. Colonel Lowe, of his own free will, had retired upon half-pay, receiving the money which he had expended on his commission, and had been again appointed to the command of the regiment over the head of an officer—a major in the regiment—who had taken a first-class at the Staff College, but who, for reasons best known at the War Office, was not thought competent to go out in command of the 17th Lancers. He hoped it would be seen that this was a precedent which ought not to be repeated, and that the case was one which deserved that consideration that he felt sure his right hon. and gallant Friend would give to the subject. He was not one of those for superseding a man after five years' service in his regiment. It was thought a good rule by Viscount Cardwell that, after five years' service, a man should be obliged to resign his command. But was it a rule that worked well? His firm belief was to the contrary. If the colonel of a regiment was a good man, he could not be in command too long; but if he was a bad man, he could not remain with the regiment too short a time. How was it with regard to Staff appointments? They had a right to compare the one with the other; and it was the fact that the system was rigidly adhered to in the case of regiments, but was evaded when they came to the Staff. He hoped his right hon. and gallant Friend would consider that point also. He believed that far more credit was due to the Secretary of State for War than he had claimed with regard to the system now in operation at Sandhurst, which was inaugurated by him and General Hawley. The tone and *morale* were good, and things were altogether in a better position now than they had ever before been at Sandhurst. Great credit must also be given to General Napier and Colonel Middleton. With regard to desertion. Although he believed a great deal was going to be done when the House came to deal with the Army Discipline Bill — and he ventured to hope that a great deal would be done in the direction of putting a stop to that offence—he would yet remind the Committee that there was nothing that deterred men from deserting so much as the knowledge that they would be marked with the letter "D." He believed there were some hon. Gentlemen who would say that they would not object to a mark, provided all — both officers and men — were marked on first entering the Army. But they wanted to distinguish the good from the bad; and it was to get at those who deserted, and then did the same again in another regiment, that their plan must be directed. He knew that the attention of the right hon. and gallant Gentleman had been called to this subject very lately; and he hoped that he would be able to frame some Rules by which the system of desertion might be curbed and put a stop to. He would not stop to make reference to the Militia or Volunteers, although they did require consideration. He congratulated the right hon. and gallant Gentleman upon his Statement; and he hoped that the discussion which had taken place on the regiments which had just been sent abroad would result in the abolition of the system which made it necessary to go from one regiment to another in order to fill vacancies in a regiment ordered for foreign service.

Sir WILLIAM HARCOURT said, that, whoever else might not be prepared to meet this war question, no one would be more ready than his hon. and gallant Friend opposite (Sir Walter B. Barttelot). He, at least, was always ready to enter upon a campaign, as he had shown when he found fault with his hon. Friend the Member for the Stirling Burghs (Mr. Campbell-Bannerman) for making some very reasonable and natural remarks. His hon. Friend had stated that, after reading the South African despatches, he could not understand that Her Majesty's Government could have expected peace in that region. He thought that was an admission at which every impartial man would arrive. He did not wish then to open a discussion with which they would thereafter have to deal very seriously; but he would only say one word upon it. If Her Majesty's Government had said to Sir Bartle Frere — "You must not enter upon an offensive war," then, it was true, they would have had a right to be surprised at the outbreak of such a war. But they did not say anything of the kind. They said—"We do not wish for war, but you are the best judge, and we leave it to you." But how any man, after reading Sir Bartle Frere's despatches, could have supposed that there would be no war, when the question was thus left to Sir Bartle Frere's discretion, he could not understand. It was perfectly clear which course would be taken under the circumstances. Therefore, his hon. Friend was entirely justified in saying that the Government ought not to have been surprised, and should have completed proper arrangements in view of a probable war in the course of this year. On the subject of the short-service system his hon. and gallant Friend appeared to have repented of his repentance; but on this question he knew that His Royal Highness the Commander-in-Chief had come forward and said publicly that, although he had been opposed to the system, he had been entirely converted by the magnificent success which had attended the calling out of the Reserves. He thought that was a tribute to the success of Viscount Cardwell's policy, coming from a high place —namely, the Head of the Army; and he also thought he remembered to have heard the hon. and gallant Gentleman state that, although he had been opposed to the system of foreign service, what had taken place had converted him. Such, however, was apparently not the case at the present. The hon. and gallant Member had, as he had said, repented of his repentance, and was now a greater opponent of the system than ever. He knew perfectly well, however, that in the quarters which knew best there was no repentance as to that system at all. It was not upon that question that he had risen to address the Committee, but upon the very much more important matter of the Estimates; and he was sorry to say that the Army Estimates were likely to occupy the attention of the Government this year much more than usual. They had undertaken—and were undertaking—new liabilities. They undertook to defend new territories every month — large countries in Europe having scientific Frontiers—to an extent which they did not know—for they had not yet been told whether they were going to take the whole of Afghanistan. Not satisfied with our own Empire—which extended in all directions to the Antipodes—they had undertaken to defend another Empire. They were not only going to defend Asia Minor, annex the Transvaal, and, probably, Zululand, but hon. Members opposite would not have forgotten that they had undertaken to defend the Frontier of Asia Minor. That was a very grand undertaking, and he had examined the Army Estimates to ascertain what was the exact provision for carrying out the Anglo-Turkish Convention for the defence of Asia Minor. They were going to defend that vast Frontier; to protect the mountains of Armenia; to line the valleys of the Tigris and the Euphrates; to cover Erzeroum; to protect India; to menace Russia—and for that purpose they had taken the Island of Cyprus, which in future was to be a great place of arms. This was the assurance to the Turks of the sincerity of the Government with regard to the Anglo-Turkish Convention. From this Island they were to menace Russia with their Forces; and, therefore, he looked forward, as he had said, with great interest to these Army Estimates, to see how this great place of arms was to be manned, and what was the Force which, at a moment's notice, was to be poured into Asia Minor to defend the lives of the Indian people, and to uphold the Anglo-Turkish Convention. It was not near enough to be at Malta—they must be close to the Tigris and the Euphrates. He looked with great, even absorbing, interest to see what was not the temporary garrison, but the permanent garrison, which Her Majesty's Government intended to place at Cyprus, because that was the Force which was to frighten Russia, and show their sincerity in regard to the Anglo-Turkish Convention, which was to maintain the reforms in Asia Minor—which had not begun—which was to be the last Article of the Treaty of Berlin. If the House would allow him, he would refer them to page 12 of the Estimates, and there they would find the permanent garrison of Cyprus, which was to remain until March, 1880. Before that time they did not know what might occur. There might be an Armenian War; and, from all he heard of the state of Armenia, an outbreak there was most likely. Hon. Members would find that the permanent garrison of Cyprus, which was to maintain the Anglo-Turkish Convention—for which object that Island was taken—and which had occupied it for nine months past, was exactly half a battalion, consisting of 350 men! They wanted the character of an economical Government, and they had to keep it. He had always had the highest opinion of the British soldier; but his imagination had never reached the height of believing that with 350 men they were going to line the valleys of the Tigris and the Euphrates; to cover the mountains of Asia Minor; to menace Russia, and to thereby uphold the Anglo-Turkish Convention. But what were these 350 men going to do? They kept 6,000 men at Malta—why did they only keep 350 men at Cyprus? If they were intending to make Cyprus a great military station, as at Malta and Gibraltar, why did not they keep an army there to protect their fleet, as well as a fleet to protect the army? He would be told that the Government would send a large body of men to Cyprus in the autumn, as had been done last year; but if that was to be so, how was the Island to become better prepared to receive the men than it was last year? Why was it that the men suffered unduly last year? The Government said it arose not from the climate, but on account of the hurried preparations and bad accommodation there. The fact remained, that they were to send 10,000 men to Cyprus next July; and what more did the Government ask for with which to make the necessary arrangements for their reception? Why £2,000! He doubted whether that sum would be sufficient to erect barracks for the 350 men, especially if they were built at the top of a mountain 3,500 feet high. He ventured to say that the real sincerity of the Government in these matters was not shown by making speeches, but by being ready to propose Estimates, and to ask the House to grant them. The Government dared not do this, and they were quite wise. The Government dared not do anything substantial in respect of Cyprus — that would be to put their sincerity to too severe a test. They made plans as to making a harbour at Famagosta; but when they were asked whether the work was proceeding, they replied—"Oh, no. It could be done; but we do not propose to do it." What did the Hydrographer to the Navy say in his Report? Why, that every single man in the Navy at Cyprus had the fever last year. The Government did not believe in Cyprus, any more than he did. If they did, they would have come forward with Estimates for adequately entertaining an army in this strong place. But they knew the thing was too ridiculous. A harbour was not made in a day, nor a year. If the Government had intended to make a harbour there they would not have lost a valuable year in setting about it. That being so, what became of the Anglo-Turkish Convention? To use a common expression, the Government believed Cyprus to be quite as great a humbug as those on that side of the House. There was not a single item of gain in the whole place. It was all very well to go to the Mansion House and say it was a strong place of arms, when the Government did not come forward and ask for a single serious item of expense in connection with it. There was another article in the Estimates, which referred to Cyprus, which seemed a little indefinite, and that referred to the Medical Department at page 162. From that it appeared that if there were to be 350 men of the garrison of Cyprus they were to have 13 doctors in attendance on them. He had had the curiosity to compare the ratio of doctors at Cyprus with that of other regiments; and he found that whereas at Cyprus half a battalion had 13 doctors, at Halifax two battalions had six doctors. Therefore, the number was as from 6 to 10 to 1; while, as compared with the number of soldiers, 13 doctors to 350 men would permit half of this army of 350 men being always in hospital! There had been some reference to the death-rate in Cyprus, and the Secretary of State for War had supplied them with particulars on that subject. It had been suggested that the evil was not in the ratio of deaths, but in the number of illnesses. He found, however, that the deaths at Bombay amongst a given number of men was 2,298, while at Cyprus it was 4,208. They wanted an effective army at Cyprus; but the army could be as much injured by illness that did not cause death occurring at the time the army was wanted as by death itself; and it had always been said of this fever that it disabled the men. That was the reason, he supposed, why it was proposed to put them on the highest mountain among the gods of Olympus, 60 miles from the harbour which had not been built. That being so, all he could say was that Her Majesty's Government were extremely wise in confining the number of men stationed there to the smallest possible force. They could not abstain from putting none at all, because that would be very prejudicial to the general opinion formed as to that Island; but the smallest force they could possibly send actually would be half a battalion, and therefore that quantity had been sent to show the sincerity of the Government in carrying out the Anglo-Turkish Convention. The real proof of the utility of things was the question of money; and the Government, from the first, appeared to him, to have shrunk from paying anything for Cyprus. What had they done there? Nothing. What were they doing? Nothing; and, in his opinion, they never intended to do anything. The whole estimated revenue of Cyprus was about £180,000 a-year, and of that they had to pay £110,000 to the Turks. The military administration cost them about £50,000; and that left a bare margin of £20,000 a-year, which would not cover the military expenditure, and was utterly insufficient to do anything in the way of developing the Island for war or anything else. It was said that the place was unwholesome, but that so were the Ionian Islands till they had made them wholesome. But what was being done to render Cyprus healthy? Nothing. They had not begun to drain or to take steps to mitigate the evils of the climate, except plant a few trees. They had laid out large sums on the Ionian Islands; but the income of Cyprus was not equal to defray the cost of improvements there. Therefore, he came to the conclusion that the Government had practically abandoned the notion of doing anything for Cyprus at all. They were not going to make it a harbour or a garrison; while to think of defending Armenia from Cyprus, under the circumstances, was a complete and entire delusion. He must say that he did regret the Government should keep Sir Garnet Wolseley there with that force of 350 men. There was no man more fit and proper to command an important stronghold; but look at what they were keeping him there for—as a taxgatherer for the Turkish Government! Surely a much more inferior man could perform those duties. It seemed to him that elsewhere the Government had work for Sir Garnet Wolseley; and why in the world a man like him should be kept to fill a position somewhat akin to that of the pettiest of the German Princes, with no money to improve the Island, or to make necessary reforms, he could not understand? Although some people were alarmed at the serious liabilities undertaken by the Government under the Anglo-Turkish Convention, he, for one, never believed that they meant anything by it at all. He never believed they would reform Asia Minor; he never believed they would defend Asia Minor; and in the words of Gay's epitaph, he believed the whole thing was

> "A jest, and all things show it;
> I thought so once, and now I know it!"

Sir JOHN KENNAWAY thought he should reduce the discussion to a practical turn by not following the hon. and learned Gentleman. The Volunteers had looked forward with great interest to the remarks of the right hon. and gallant Gentleman (Colonel Stanley), who, in opening, had made an appeal to them not to discuss the recommendations at the present moment. Considering the heavy strain upon the War Office during the past month, he was sure that suggestion would be adopted. The remarks of the right hon. and gallant Gentleman showed that he fully appreciated the sacrifices made by the Volunteers, and recognized the delicate manner in which this subject would have to be dealt with. He was sure the

Volunteer Force throughout the country would be content to give the right hon. and gallant Gentleman the time he asked for, and also that they would obtain full justice when the opportunity came. He hoped that the drills would not be unnecessarily increased, but that they would be kept within the number essential to the maintenance of efficiency. The Volunteers were willing to make any sacrifices that might be necessary for the well-being or the defence of the country. He hoped that when the right hon. and gallant Gentleman came to consider the question of change in dress, he would remember the many associations and memories which were mixed up with their peculiar uniforms. It had been shown by the hon. Member for the Tower Hamlets (Mr. Ritchie) what had been done by regiments in endeavouring to comply with the War Office Instructions. He felt sure that if the advantages were pointed out properly, whatever was necessary would be acquiesced in, and that nothing on their part would be wanting in order to effect an increased efficiency in that Force. He hoped, also, that the right hon. and gallant Gentleman would consider carefully the difficulties that lay in the way of some men becoming efficient on account of the great distances they had to come to their drills, and the time which was occupied in the service of their country. Very often, he believed, that time interfered with their business or other engagements. With regard to the increased allowance for camps, he would say that in that matter the right hon. and gallant Gentleman did not expect them to make bricks without straw. He was more and more convinced that Volunteers learnt more in camp than in any other way, and he thought that the Secretary of State for War had earned the thanks of all Volunteers in that matter. He quite agreed, also, with what the hon. Member for the Stirling Burghs (Mr. Campbell - Bannerman) had said about the Artillery. Guns, gun-carriages, ammunition, and articles of equipment, made it necessary that stores should be provided. He thought that hardly enough consideration had been given to that matter, and hoped that it would be attended to.

SIR HENRY HAVELOCK said, that the Estimates had been apparently drawn up very carefully. From them, however, it appeared that a great saving had been effected; but on investigation it would be found that there really was none. The sum of £2,000,000 which had been apparently saved, in reality, exhibited no saving at all. As far as he could ascertain, it appeared that there was rather an increase on each item. He did not at all agree with the remarks which had fallen from the hon. and gallant Member for West Sussex (Sir Walter B. Barttelot), nor did they meet the objections which had been urged by the hon. Gentleman the Member for the Stirling Burghs. The attention of the country had recently been turned to the large number of men required for regiments being brought up to full strength when sent out. He did not at all admit the soundness of the criticisms advanced by the right hon. and gallant Gentleman, and the hon. and gallant Member for West Sussex, that the fault lay at the door of the short-service system. On the contrary, the short-service system had, in the fullest degree, justified everything expected of it; and, more than that, had exceeded, he believed, all expectations. During the last few days five battalions had been sent abroad, and he thought it was most unsatisfactory that 300 or 400 men had been taken from other regiments to make the required number. But where lay the fault in this matter? It lay, he believed, with the right hon. and gallant Gentleman himself (Colonel Stanley). In 1877 it had been arranged that the 18 regiments first on the roster for foreign service should be kept up to the war strength, and both sides of that House had concurred in that arrangement. What sufficient reason, he wished to know, could the right hon. and gallant Gentleman bring forward for altering it? It was very curious that, simultaneously with this change—and he believed the short-comings in these five regiments were due to nothing else—five pages had been withdrawn from the Estimates; the very pages which contained the establishments of the alteration in which he now complained. He would not charge the Secretary of State for War with having done this intentionally—no doubt, it was the work of some subordinate. But he trusted that the right hon. and gallant Gentleman would give them an explanation of the circumstances which led to the removal of those most important pages, and he hoped that ere long they would see them restored to their place in the Estimates. If the system agreed to had been carried on, places in regiments would not have to be filled up by young men—soldiers not properly trained—and he trusted that the right hon. and gallant Gentleman would soon return to the policy of his Predecessor. He was very glad that the Secretary of State for War had said that he intended to proceed tentatively in the matter of the Army Medical Department. If he could, by those modifications, give some of the luxuries of regimental life to this large establishment, without departing from the principle of General Hospitals, he (Sir Henry Havelock) thought that he would have conferred a great boon on that branch of the Service. Another point touched upon before they went into Committee was a comparison between different means by which the Army might be augmented. He was glad that the right hon. and gallant Gentleman had not given any support to the proposal of the hon. Member for Hackney. If, on the other hand, a suggestion as to increasing the Militia Reserve had been carried out three years ago, there would have been now 10,000 more Reserve men to carry the system into effect. That would have been the effect of increasing the Militia Reserve from 30,000 to 40,000 men. That could be done at an expense to the country of only £10,000, which, compared with the number of men made available on any sudden emergency, was so trifling, that it was perfectly certain no other plan could carry it out at less than five or six times the expense. As to the point touched upon by his hon. and gallant Friend (Colonel Mure), he did think that too much prominence was sometimes given to Staff officers in the despatches, when subordinates were omitted. His hon. and gallant Friend was not, however, very happy in his illustration, for whatever the other defects of General Roberts, he certainly had adhered to the good old custom of India, and had brought into prominent notice the names of the Native officers and Native soldiers. He would instance the mention made by General Roberts in his report of the attack on the Peiwar Kotal of a Native officer, Azeez Khan, of the 5th Punjaub Infantry, and to the special compliment paid to him in the order of the day. He was very glad to know that every mounted man sent to the Cape was to be armed with a long range rifle.

Colonel STANLEY said, he did not wish his hon. and gallant Friend to fall into any mistake, even though that mistake might be in his own favour. What he said was that no mounted man would go out to the Cape without an arm of some sort, either rifle or revolver.

Sir HENRY HAVELOCK said, he was sorry that the right hon. and gallant Gentleman had been obliged to modify this statement, especially in view of the recommendations on this head made in the very last despatch from the Cape. He was sorry, again, to hear that it had been decided finally that only one of the batteries sent to the Cape should be 9-pounders, and that the rest of the batteries would be 7-pounders only. Both from the reports received from the Cape and the opinion of all military officers who had discussed the question, it was now clear that the 7-pounder was not the one best suited to Cape warfare, though admirably suited for different circumstances, in a different country. As they had already something like 21 of these guns at the Cape, in his opinion they ought to have had 9-pounders instead of 7-pounders sent out. He feared that, from some oversight, the peculiar fitness of the Gatling gun had been overlooked, although in the only report which had yet reached this country on that subject—that from Colonel Pearson, who was intrenched at Ekhowa—it was shown that one Gatling gun had been of the greatest possible service. Meeting at short range large masses of men, the execution done by that gun had been exceptionally tremendous, due to the manner in which the Zulus fought; and therefore he regretted very much that the right hon and gallant Gentleman had not sent more of the Armstrong-Gatling, although they had plenty of them in store at Woolwich. The guns they had sent out weighed 400 lbs., while Armstrong's pattern weighed but 150 lbs., and, mounted on a light Kaffir carriage, would not only have been infinitely lighter, but would have had greater range, and have been of more service to this sort of warfare. The only other point to which he wished to refer had a melancholy interest at the present time. In these days of breech-loading arms, and rapid fire, the greatest results must be obtained from any sort of shelter, however trifling and slight. Forces in the open, without cover, must certainly be exposed to a punishment which it was almost impossible for them to bear. The despatches from the Cape bore out, in a remarkable and melancholy manner, the lesson they were taught two years ago at Plevna; and he trusted that, at all events, that lesson would be utilized in the future. Changes in our Army were, however, so slow, and they were so difficult to bring about, that if the War Department were left to routine, and the public opinion of the country and the strong opinion of this House were not brought to bear, he did not see any reasonable hope of any change being made to provide for an emergency until that emergency had passed away. The experience of all armies in the field since the American War showed that troops who occupy a position for a few hours, or even a portion of a day, could and should immediately entrench themselves sufficiently to make the position most difficult to attack. Both the Russians and the Roumanians came very soon to see that it was no use having intrenching tools carried by waggons three or four or five miles in the rear. If they were to be of any use whatever, it was now certain that the tool must be carried by the soldier on his person, so as to be immediately available. On the most sudden and unexpected emergency those armies were able, with a light spade, weighing about 2½ lbs., in a very short time, to throw up the intrenchments that were required for their immediate protection. Already the Oliver equipment had been designed to add the intrenching tool to the ordinary equipment of the English soldier; and, therefore, he regretted all the more that this equipment was not supplied to the regiments that had just gone out to the Cape. If the men at Isandula had had these light spades, they would have been able, even in a few hours, to have intrenched the camp, or, at any rate, to have thrown up a few rifle pits flanking each other. Then, with the powerful weapons with which our men were armed, he undertook to say that we should not now have been mourning a great disaster; the greater Force would not have failed to do that which had now gained for a few men at Rorke's Drift an imperishable name in the annals of our country, and the war would have had a totally different beginning. He did hope that, under these circumstances, the lesson of the Turkish War would not be thrown away on the military authorities.

MR. O'DONNELL said, he had listened very attentively to the debate, and the remarks of the right hon. and gallant Gentleman (Colonel Stanley) made an impression on him which nothing subsequently said had tended to weaken —that they had had an exceedingly unsatisfactory Statement. The right hon. and gallant Gentleman had very clearly and fairly done his part; but it was quite easy to see from his Statement that the Military Department was in a very unsatisfactory condition. In fact, there were only three or four points on which he had been able to congratulate himself. In the course of his Statement he laid stress on the improved condition of recruiting. If, however, that was a source of satisfaction to the military authorities, it was so to nobody else; because its explanation was found in the deplorable condition of trade, the depression of trade, and the prevailing misery. Again, the right hon. and gallant Gentleman congratulated the House on savings in the cost of clothing, although it was to the depression of trade, and the general over-stocking of the markets, that this was to be attributed. No doubt, the right hon. and gallant Gentleman, if the Government followed its perturbing and braggadocial policy, would always be able to indulge in such sorry congratulations. It was by diminishing the demand for useful labour that the Government were able to get starving recruits to seek their ranks; and, no doubt, if they continued their disturbing policy, the damage to trade would continue to cheapen the material for uniforms. The hon. Baronet opposite (Sir John Kennaway) was very well advised in not attempting to answer the criticisms of the hon. and learned Member for Oxford (Sir William Harcourt). The right hon. and gallant Gentleman assured them that the acquisition of Cyprus should in no way dishearten them, because they might, by a sufficient expenditure, make it as healthy as the Ionian Islands. That was a curiously tame defence of a spirited foreign policy. He learnt, from a paper distributed that morning, that in order to make the harbour of Famagusta they would have to remove 15 feet of the abominations of centuries. He could not but think that if a Select Committee of the admirers of the Government were exported to that invigorating atmosphere, they would very soon come to a different conclusion on the glories of the Government policy. To one part of the right hon. and gallant Gentleman's speech, however, he could give an unqualified approval, and that was the part in which he gently threw cold water on the Volunteer system. The Volunteers were a very nice British toy, and they were little more than a toy. Undoubtedly, under certain circumstances, the volunteering movement might be of use in the defence of the country. In the time of Napoleon it would have been of a very considerable utility; but, at the present time, according to all the possibilities of the situation, the battles of England would not be fought on the shores of England, but at a very great distance from the centre of the Empire. For carrying out the magnificent schemes of our foreign politicians, and for the maintenance of the Empire, the Volunteers were not likely to be of the least possible utility. They could not be sent either to the defiles of Afghanistan, or to the forests of Zululand. He believed there was a rumour in the air that they might be made available for service in Ireland. He did not know what service was in contemplation; but, whatever it was, they would not be fit for it in any real soldierly sense. They were simply men who gratified a taste for soldiering, and gratified it at the expense of the real efficiency of the Military Force. It was on the Army and Navy, the troops ready for service in any part of the world, that the permanent security of the State could alone depend. He saw a very considerable objection, and an objection of the political order of the first class, to the indulgence of the volunteering foible. This introduction of a spirit of soldiering—this indulgence of a fancy for uniforms and arms, and all the fal-lals of an ornamental warfare—was decidedly calculated to spread among the masses of the civil population, who ought to be thinking of more serious things, and more noble things, that spirit which was not warlike—which was mere braggadocia—that spirit which Party opprobrium had marked with the name of Jingoism. He did not speak merely from his own limited observation, but from the observation of a large number of men in different parts of the country—old politicians, accustomed for 20 years to mark the progress of public opinion in this country—and their opinion was that the volunteering movement, while practically useless for the purposes of real military defence, was only useful to that Party which sought to draw off the attention of the country from real and domestic grievances, and to occupy it with the flashy visions of foreign aggrandisement. A Government which would confine itself to the business at home, and to the legitimate defence of the country abroad, would, he thought, very quickly and inevitably come to the conclusion that there should be limits to the Volunteer Force. Even the present Government saw that this mania had spread quite far enough for all the purposes of Jingoism; and he thought the Secretary of State for War quite right, now that all necessary political capital had been got out of the Volunteer movement, to throw cold water upon it—so far, at any rate, as it was likely to make more and more demands upon the public purse. It was mere sham soldiership, very similar to that National Guardism, and similar stuff, which had been discouraged by all foreign nations, as calculated to spread among the civil population an unhealthy craving for military exhibitions, which was most detrimental to the real progress and domestic happiness of the country.

Mr. PARNELL said, he quite agreed with the remarks of his hon. Friend, although, on the other hand, he should always vote against the grant for the expenses of English Volunteers as long as Volunteers were denied to Ireland, though that country had to pay its share of their cost. He did not propose to enter into the general question; but he did wish to ask some questions as to the Vote (A) for the men on page 6. The general Staff had increased from 78 last year to 237; while, on the other hand, he found, by reference to page 14, that the pay of the general Staff had been reduced from £86,416 to £83,170. The matter had puzzled him a good deal;

and he thought it as well that the seeming inconsistency should be explained. Again, on page 10, the colonels of regiments were stated as 112, while last year the number was only 75—51 at home, and 24 in the Colonies. He should like to have this explained, for he could find no reason for it in the Estimates. Again, on page 7, he found that the number of horses in the Royal Horse Artillery and the Horse Artillery had been reduced. In the first—the Royal Horse Artillery—the horses had been reduced by 90, and in the Horse Artillery by 648—in all making a reduction of 748. He should like also to ask whether this reduction had been already carried into effect, or whether it was only in contemplation? Again, page 13 showed 3,991 horses at home and 122 abroad belonging to the Royal Artillery, and 1,853 at home belonging to the Royal Horse Artillery on the 1st January, or 759 above the present Establishment. He was at a loss to understand how, in the short time since that time, there could have been this change. Then, again, for years, the aides-de-camp had stood at 38. He found, by reference to page 15, that these numbers had now been increased from 38 to 40, and he should like to know the reason for that change.

Colonel PARKER said, with the exception of the hon. and gallant Member for Renfrew (Colonel Mure), no other hon. Member had referred to the gallantry displayed by the officers and men on service in Afghanistan; but he (Colonel Mure) had gone into the facts, and brought to the notice of the Committee the services of the 5th Ghoorkas and a company of the 77th Highlanders at the Peiwar Kotal, while he looked in vain to the despatches for the name of a single non-commissioned officer or private recommended for distinction. Having served many years in India, he (Colonel Parker) had been a witness to the devotion of these men to the service of their country. Hon. Members themselves had also seen the promptness with which they tendered their services in Europe, and had been made acquainted with their meritorious deeds. As this was no Party question, he joined in the expression of regret that the services of some of the officers and men in India had not been more fully recognized, and was equally anxious with the hon. and gallant Member for Renfrew, who had spoken on the other side of the House, to tender to those men the distinction which was their due.

Colonel STANLEY confessed that he could not clearly follow the second reference of the hon. Member for Meath (Mr. Parnell) in regard to the general Staff; but he would endeavour to give full details on this point on Report. Again, with regard to colonels, if the question of the hon. Member related to the increase of two colonels which had taken place, that arose from the fact that the regiment was upon the India Establishment. It was also quite true that there had been a considerable reduction in some of the batteries of the Royal Artillery, which led to a corresponding reduction in the number of horses. The Government had, indeed, intended to reduce the number of horses by about 1,000; but the reinforcements sent to the Cape had prevented their carrying the reduction to that extent. In regard to the question as to the increase in the number of aides-de-camp, attached to the Staff of the General Officer at Cyprus, this was a new command, and they appeared now on the Estimates for the first time. He felt bound to make some remarks generally upon the criticisms with which the Estimates had been received. He had occasionally heard of a small boy tying a cracker to the coat-tails of a respectable person and then running away. He did not, however, think it was respectful to the House, or conducive to the dignity of its proceedings, that a prominent Member on the Opposition Bench should tell them that he came from a Committee of Supply elsewhere, where, consequently, he could not have heard what was said in the first instance, and, after making a speech—no doubt, brilliant and effective, as all his speeches were—leave the House without waiting for a reply. He (Colonel Stanley) spoke without any feeling of annoyance, but could not think the course pursued by the hon. and learned Member (Sir William Harcourt) was one conducive to Public Business. He was bound not to allow some of his remarks to pass without contradiction. He spoke in a grand way with regard to Cyprus, and asked when they were going to see all those wonderful effects of the Anglo-Turkish Convention, and whether they were going to defend the banks of the Euphrates with half a battalion of men? As an after-dinner speech it was, doubtless, very effective, but had no relation to the Business before the House. The hon. and learned Gentleman had, moreover, no reasonable ground for making those statements; because it was only a short time ago that he had put a number of categorical questions, which he (Colonel Stanley) had answered to the best of his ability, and yet he again put those questions that evening. He had always told him that Cyprus was not a station which came under the same conditions as Malta and Gibraltar, and that it was one which they would endeavour to occupy with a very small garrison. It was quite true that only £2,000 was taken in the Estimates for the present year; and in the Statement made to the Committee earlier in the evening he had explained why only that sum was taken, the explanation being that they did not receive the Estimates in such detail as would have enabled them to insert a larger amount. It was also to be borne in mind that there was a considerable quantity of building materials, for which the money had been voted last year. This had, no doubt, been utilized to a considerable extent; but the whole of it might not have been spent. He would only warn his right hon. Friends upon the Bench opposite not to allow the hon. and learned Member to occupy his position until he had received some little financial education; and he thought that of all the expensive and expansive ideas he had ever heard, those of the hon. and learned Gentleman were the most so. With regard to the 13 medical officers at Cyprus, he thought it right to state, in the first place, that rather an excess of medical men were required there, because the garrison was split up into small detachments; and he had, therefore, yielded to the wishes of Sir Garnet Wolseley, who attached great importance to the presence of medical men in the districts to be administered by him, who should be available for the civil population. This advice could not be overrated among the population of Cyprus, and he was happy to say that the sanitary precautions recommended had been largely attended with success. He had been afraid that the hon. Member for the Stirling Burghs (Mr. Campbell-Bannerman) was about to bring a very grave charge against him; but if he would look at the facts, he would see that they conclusively disproved the charge which he brought. There was nothing in the despatches of the Government inconsistent with the proposals which had been made for lowering the Estimates made in the first place, and that which he had been obliged to make in increasing the original Estimates. His hon. Friend asked what ground could they allege for the change made at the last moment? The answer was, that the change explained itself. The Estimates were not financially closed until after the 11th of February. The Government had every reason to believe that the force furnished was sufficient for the purposes for which it was intended—namely, of defence. It was quite beyond the question to say that it was less than Sir Garnet Wolseley thought would be necessary for the suppression of the Zulu rising. The Government had, under the circumstances of the year and in view of the increased Reserves, been desirous of bringing the Estimates within the narrowest financial compass, and they had at one time thought it desirable to contemplate the reduction of 3,900 men; but, between then and the presentation of the Estimates, a demand for reinforcements had arrived from the Cape. That, of course, placed them in a different position; for, when they were sending thousands of men out of the country, it was not the time for reducing the Army by 4,000 men. The hon. Member then went on to say—"Why did we not use foresight, and why did we not get Reserve men to come forward, and then come to the House for a Bill of Indemnity?" But, considering the gauntlet to be run, what sort of opposition would he have met with? Again he asked—"Why had we departed from the Establishment?" All he could say was, that he was unwilling to depart from the principle of having the first 18 battalions kept for service. But it was illustrative of the curious complications of the Service that the proposal of Viscount Cranbrook to increase 18 battalions to their highest strength had allowed the influx of a very large number of young troops. So it was thought better, if possible, to adjust the scale so as to have a certain number of battalions with less interval between them, and to group them into sixes. Then the hon. Member said they would have done better by sending out small battalions. They had already something like 88 battalions in the place of 70; and to increase the number would be to raise difficulties against themselves, and force them to take a step which, he ventured to inform the Committee, would oblige them to expand some of the depôts. That was certainly not the course which it was thought fit to pursue. The hon. and gallant Baronet (Sir Walter B. Barttelot) had asked how they then stood with regard to the Army Corps? To this he would reply, that the system of short service and linking of battalions had been somewhat strained by the calls made upon it, which calls had arisen from the undertaking of extra duties thrown upon the Army. This was, practically, a complete Establishment; and if, unhappily, cause should arise for the first or second Army Corps to go abroad, it could only be under circumstances in which those Army Corps would be very efficiently completed. With regard to the other question of his hon. and gallant Friend, he would frankly own that he was personally responsible for the change of appointment, made at the last moment, in the 17th Lancers. He had not the honour of acquaintance with the distinguished officers who had been referred to; but the facts were that Colonel Gomm, who recently succeeded to the command of that regiment, had met with a most unfortunate accident, which placed his life in no slight danger for some days, and which for a time would wholly incapacitate him for proceeding upon active service. The gallant officer himself hoped to recover sufficiently to enable him to proceed on the passage with his regiment; but whether that gallant feeling was indulged or not, it was felt that there should be in charge of the regiment an officer fully acquainted with it, from the highest to the lowest ranks. It so happened that Colonel Lowe had been looked up to—he would almost say adored—by both officers and men of the regiment. As to any injustice having been done by passing over an officer second in command, who had only recently returned to the regiment, he (Colonel Stanley) felt, under the circumstances, that it was one of those peculiar cases in which no time was to be lost. Colonel Lowe had undertaken, in the handsomest manner, to comply with the condition of serving under Colonel Gomm, and otherwise to place his services at the disposal of the regiment, in the event of his recovery. The arrangement was one to which, he believed, that no officer had demurred. And he repeated that he took upon himself the whole responsibility of having decided the matter in the way it then stood. In reply to the observations made by his hon. and gallant Friend with regard to the alleged evasion in every way of the five years' rule, he would be glad if some specific statement were made, in order that the cases referred to might be brought to light. He was not conscious that the rule had been departed from, except upon one occasion when the continuance of the command was sanctioned by himself, and when the application of the rule would have rendered the officer liable to recall at a time when his regiment was actually in face of the enemy.

Sir WALTER B. BARTTELOT thought it due to himself to state that it was not with regard to regimental officers, but to Staff appointments, where officers had been transferred from one appointment to another, which was virtually keeping them employed for more than five years.

Colonel STANLEY said, if the officer had proved himself efficient and qualified, it was best, upon public grounds, that the appointment should take place. The hon. and gallant Member for Sunderland (Sir Henry Havelock) had commented upon the delusive idea, encouraged by the form in which the Estimates had been drawn up, that a very great reduction had been effected. With regard to the first item, he admitted that this did appear to be the case, and would take care that the form should be altered, if the comparison of the Supplementary Estimates with the original Estimates did not render the item clear. He feared his hon. and gallant Friend had not heard his reply to the question of the hon. and gallant Member for East Aberdeenshire (Sir Alexander Gordon), which would have explained to him the reason for the omission from the Army Estimates of this year of the details of the Regimental Establishments at Home and Abroad. In that reply he had stated that some difficulty had arisen in re-adjusting the Establishment at the last moment, and that, therefore, it had been thought better to omit the details of the Establishment from the body of the Estimates; but that he intended to lay on the Table of the House what was called an "Establishment Circular," giving fuller details, and to have a certain number of copies printed and left at the War Office for such Members as chose to call for them.

An hon. MEMBER thought it preferable that the details should be given in their ordinary place in the Estimates; although, of course, the same information might be conveyed in another form.

COLONEL STANLEY wished to pay his humble tribute to the manner in which the hon. and gallant Member for Cork County (Colonel Colthurst) had for the first time addressed the House, while he ventured to express a hope that he would, in future, take part in the debates. With regard to his remarks upon the position of the non-commissioned officer, he quite agreed that it was desirable to endeavour to supply his wants. Viscount Cranbrook had already done something in that direction, and the question would not be lost sight of by him. The noble Lord was most anxious to open up a prospect, if possible, for this very deserving body of men. With regard to the social position of non-commissioned officers and privates, he quite agreed with the hon. and gallant Member for Renfrewshire (Colonel Mure); but, although the point raised was very worthy of consideration, and although some natural indignation might be felt that a red coat should exclude the wearer from a position which he might fairly claim, he thought the matter was one in which neither the House nor the Government could, at the present time, interfere, and which must be left to the good feeling of the public. The hon. and gallant Member had also asked several questions with regard to the recruits of the 70th Regiment in Afghanistan, to which he replied that the Government were in possession of no more information—possibly not so much—as was the hon. and gallant Member himself. Indeed, no report had been brought to him in any manner; and he could, therefore, only hope that the circumstances of which complaint had been made were not so bad as the hon. and gallant Member supposed. The hon. Member for the Tower Hamlets (Mr. Ritchie) had commented upon the changes made in the payment of recruiting money, which had been attended with better results as to the class of recruits. He urged that they should not pay any bounty, and he (Colonel Stanley) quite agreed that if the custom could be broken down by giving up recruiting for two or three years, the suggestion might be adopted with advantage. The question had been discussed in Committee, and many Members of it were in favour of the system of the hon. Member. He had already spoken on the subject of the depôts and agreed that there was not really the number of officers available which appeared on the Establishment. With regard to the clothing of the Volunteers, he asked leave, at a future time, when the Vote was reached, to press upon the Committee rather more clearly certain facts and figures. What he had said earlier in the evening he repeated—namely, that he was very anxious that the recommendation of the Committee should be carried into effect if it was likely to be for the public good. He believed he had now included all the points raised by hon. Members, and had, therefore, only to ask the House to allow them to take the Vote.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT wished to say one word with reference to his absence. He had fully intended to be present to hear the reply of the right hon. and gallant Gentleman, but was not informed that it had been begun. He hoped the Secretary of State for War would not think that any intentional disrespect was meant.

Question put, and *agreed to.*

Resolution to be reported.

Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That a sum, not exceeding £4,598,000, be granted to Her Majesty, to defray the Charge of the Pay, Allowances, and other Charges of Her Majesty's Land Forces at Home and Abroad (exclusive of India), which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1880."

MR. PARNELL, in view of the lateness of the hour, moved to report Progress, as he wished to make some reference to the Stock Purse.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Chairman do report Progress, and ask leave to sit again."—(*Mr. Parnell.*)

COLONEL STANLEY would be very glad to afford the hon. Member any information he desired on the subject of the Stock Purse; but, at the same time, must appeal to the Committee, after the very long and fair discussion which had been taken upon the Estimates, to allow the Vote to pass.

MR. DILLWYN thought that if there was the prospect of a discussion, and a speech of half-an-hour's duration from his hon. Friend (Mr. Parnell), it had better be adjourned for another night. The sum of £4,000,000 was a large one, and required some consideration.

MR. O'DONNELL said, there were many subjects upon which further information was, he hoped, to be given before the Vote was allowed to pass, many of which had, again and again, occupied public attention. It was on occasions when money was asked for that the nation expected to have authoritative declarations upon questions which were raised by the Estimates. He could not but think that the Committee had the right to remind the Government that it was only lately that their craving for taking away the rights of private Members on Monday nights had been satisfied. The House would be more ready at an appropriate hour another day to vote the money. He supported the Motion of the hon. Member for Meath.

Question put, and *agreed to.*

Resolution to be reported *To-morrow;*

Committee also report Progress; to sit again upon *Wednesday.*

WAYS AND MEANS.—REPORT.

Resolutions [February 28] *reported.*

SIR JOHN LUBBOCK was anxious to make an appeal to the Chancellor of the Exchequer, in support of that of the right hon. Member for Pontefract (Mr. Childers) made a few days ago. He did not wish to occupy the time of the House; but would urge upon the right hon. Gentleman, in view of the increase in the Expenditure of the country, coupled with the general uncertainty of affairs, that it was very desirable that he should make his Financial Statement as early as possible, so that the intentions of the Government might be made known. The right hon. Gentleman, on acceding to Office, made an excellent speech upon the necessity of reducing the National Debt; but during the last two years he was sorry to see that there had been an increase in that Debt of no less than £6,000,000. The amount of the Floating Debt at that moment was only £4,000,000. But the whole of the transactions of the Chancellor of the Exchequer with reference to the National Debt were of the most complex character. He not only borrowed money with one hand and paid it away with the other, but he borrowed money with one hand and paid it away with the same. He had diminished the most economical form of Debt with the effect of mystifying the country and preventing it from understanding the policy of Her Majesty's Government. A few evenings ago they had been told that it was intended to advance £2,000,000 without interest to India by way of loan. He confessed he was unable to understand what was meant by Her Majesty's Government, who really had not got £2,000,000 to lend, but were, on the contrary, themselves borrowing. It might be they were going to get somebody else to give the £2,000,000 on our guarantee. But it would not appear in our accounts as Expenditure, because it was invoiced. The consequence would be that it would not appear in the accounts of either of the two countries. He considered the arrangement contemplated of a very extraordinary character; and inquired why, on the other hand, India should not lend this country £2,000,000 for the purpose of the Natal War? He was glad to see the Chancellor of the Exchequer had returned to his place, and would again urge upon him the desirability of making his Financial Statement as early as he possibly could do so. He trusted that he would allow the intentions of the Government to be known by the country; because the state of uncertainty then existing was very prejudicial to commerce, and would, he feared, lead to a considerable amount of speculation.

MR. DILLWYN earnestly supported the appeal just made to the right hon. Gentleman—that he would let them have his Financial Statement at an early date. He had some knowledge of the financial position of some parts of the country, and could assure the House that there existed the greatest anxiety and uneasiness to know what were the intentions of the Government. The conditions of trade being very depressed, he feared they would not have a very satisfactory Statement to make; but whether it was satisfactory or unsatisfactory, it had better be known at once, and he trusted that early information would be given on that important subject.

MR. WHITWELL supported the observations of the hon. Member who had just sat down (Mr. Dillwyn), because the Chancellor of the Exchequer had said that some weeks would elapse before the Budget made its appearance. He (Mr. Whitwell) was continually addressed upon the importance of having that Statement made early, and in this nobody was more interested than the right hon. Gentleman himself. They were all aware of the great strain affecting the commerce of the country; and there was, besides, the natural feeling that taxation might be more or less affected. He trusted that the large commercial constituencies would receive some assurances as to the earlier introduction of the Budget.

MR. COURTNEY rose for the purpose of inquiring of the right hon. Gentleman for what period it was intended to issue the Exchequer Bonds?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: I rather think the terms of the Resolution carried an answer to the question of the hon. Member. At all events, the intention is only to issue the Bonds for 12 months, not for any longer term. With regard to the Financial Statement, I can say that I am as anxious as anyone can be to bring forward the Budget at an early period. On the other hand, I think there is a disadvantage in bringing it forward prematurely, and before we are able to say, with anything like confidence, what the upshot of the year really is; for it would be very difficult, under present circumstances, to estimate that with exactitude. I will consider the question as to when it can be brought forward, and for the present I take note of the observations of the hon. Members who have spoken on the subject, but cannot undertake now to fix the date.

MR. CHILDERS thought the House had heard with satisfaction the words which had fallen from the Chancellor of the Exchequer. But he might remind him of the very great mischief which had been done by the delay on the part of Finance Ministers to make important statements on questions deeply affecting the financial world. Nothing had recently shaken public confidence in France to a greater extent than such a delay. He considered that the postponement of the Budget at the present time would be a very serious matter indeed.

SIR HENRY SELWIN-IBBETSON desired to remind the House that it was forgotten that, with the exception of the year 1860, every one of the quoted deficits happened when the financial year came on the 5th of January.

Resolutions *agreed to.*

Ordered, That a Bill be brought in upon the First Three Resolutions; and that Mr. RAIKES, Mr. CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER, and Sir HENRY SELWIN-IBBETSON do prepare and bring it in.

Ordered, That a Bill be brought in upon the Fourth Resolution; and that Mr. RAIKES, Mr. CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER, and Sir HENRY SELWIN-IBBETSON do prepare and bring it in.

RACECOURSES (METROPOLIS) BILL.

(*Mr. Anderson, Sir Thomas Chambers, Sir James Lawrence.*)

[BILL 48.] COMMITTEE.

[*Progress Clause* 1, 17*th February.*]

Bill *considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Notice taken, that 40 Members were not present,—Committee counted, and 40 Members not being present,

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair:—House counted, and 40 Members not being present,

House adjourned at a quarter before Two o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Tuesday, 4th March, 1879.

MINUTES.]—PUBLIC BILLS—*Second Reading*—Supreme Court of Judicature Acts Amendment (11); Assizes * (17).

Second Reading—Referred to Select Committee—County Courts* (12).

CITY OF GLASGOW BANK BILL.

SECOND READING.

Order of the Day for the Second Reading, read.

THE EARL OF REDESDALE (CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES) said, that, with regard to this Bill, he had thought it desirable to call their Lordships' attention to its special character, in order that he might take their Lordships' opinion upon it. All their Lordships must be aware of the difficulties in which a great number of persons had been thrown by the failure of the City of Glasgow Bank, and by the various transactions which were connected with that matter. In consulting with the Chairman of Committees of Ways and Means as to the measures which it might seem desirable to enter upon in the first instance in this House, that Gentleman had very earnestly desired that this Bill should commence in their Lordships' House, in order that there might be an opinion expressed upon it by persons of high legal authority for the purpose of directing the attention of Parliament to questions necessarily raised in connection with the failure. As it appeared to him, it was a Bill not entirely without some sort of precedent; but still it was not quite in accordance with the practice of Parliament. The first Bill of this nature was promoted for apparently the same purpose as was intended here—that of the Albert Life Assurance Company in the year 1871. It was brought into Parliament at that time, when, on account of an accident that happened to him (the Earl of Redesdale), he was not in attendance in the House; and, consequently, he had no share in the proceedings connected with that Bill. Since that time there had been the European Assurance Company's Bill, which was also an exceptional Bill. On both these, occasions arose for the action taken, owing to the state of the law. The only other Bill exceptional in its nature that he knew of, which was of any importance, was that of the London, Chatham, and Dover Railway, which was a Bill, as their Lordships knew, instituted because it could not be ascertained when and by what means that Company's affairs could be settled. They were, therefore, obliged to apply for an Act of Parliament. In the present Bill there were, no doubt, many provisions of considerable importance; and he thought it was desirable that the House should have some opinion on the subject before it adopted the principles of the Bill. But their Lordships would remember that in the present case the matter was very large, and that was made the chief excuse for the promotion of that measure. But, it might be asked, what was there in that case that made its settlement, contrary to that of almost every other affair, more expedient by proceeding under a special Act of Parliament than by coming under the ordinary proceedings of a Court of Law? He thought it was therefore more desirable that the House should act with discretion in the matter, and not too readily accede to the proposition. It was one of the provisions of the Bill that there should be the appointment of an Arbitrator instead of proceedings in the Courts of Law; and it was provided that the Arbitrator might settle and determine all matters by that Act referred to his Arbitration, not only as regarded the legal or equitable rights of the parties, but upon all actions, and in such manner, in all respects, as he in his absolute and unfettered discretion might think to be equitable and expedient, as fully as might be done by Act of Parliament. That was a most extraordinary power to give to any arbitrator, and their Lordships must feel that to give such power to any man to determine questions whether according to law or not according to law, but entirely in accordance with what he might think fit, was giving him a very wide power, which might not be considered in all cases by the parties affected by a decision to be in accordance with the justice of the case. He might also say that up to the present time, as far as he knew, the Courts of Scotland had found no difficulty in dealing with the matters brought before them. He believed that they had already given their judgment in a certain number of cases of large amount, and that the Courts had not found any difficulty in arriving at their conclusions. Under these circumstances, he thought their Lordships should consider well before they gave their assent to the principles of the Bill. He did not propose at the present moment to give an opinion upon it, and he would like to have some assistance from the House in directing the course that would be prudent to adopt in determining this question.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR said, his attention had been called to this Bill by the noble Earl who had just spoken, and he was quite prepared to lay before their Lordships the observations that occurred to him to make upon it. But, in the first place, he must express his deepest sympathy with everyone who in any way was connected with the affairs of the City of Glasgow Bank, whether as shareholder or as depositor; and he was sure that in saying that he was not saying more than all their Lordships felt, and that if any course were open for assisting in accordance with what was the practice in such cases, by which relief could be given to those unhappy persons, Parliament would be very happy to give that relief. But their Lordships must carefully consider what was the proposal which was made by this Bill. Now, this Bill proposed at once, and with some violence, to terminate that which all the ordinary Courts of Law would determine. The proposal of the Bill was to take away from all those who at present had resorted to those Courts, who might be satisfied with those Courts, the right to continue those proceedings, and to substitute in place of the ordinary Courts of Law the authority and the decision—the absolute authority and the unappealable decision—of some individual to be named in the Bill, and who was to be called the Arbitrator, but who really was in the position of a despotic Sovereign, entitled to decide everything connected with the Bank in any way he thought fit. Now, it was said that there were precedents for taking this course. He would refer, in a moment, to those precedents; but he must first say, with regard to the Glasgow Bank, that although he believed it was a case almost without a parallel as regarded the magnitude of the liabilities which would have to be provided for, still, as far as he understood it, it was not a case in which there was any peculiar or special difficulty as to the legal aspect of the case. There were certain legal questions which arose, which would have to be determined; but the circumstance that the determination involved the question of several millions of money did not render the case in any way peculiar as regarded other cases in which the stake was much smaller. The question of the importance of raising money, so far as he had heard, was not in any way peculiar. Now, one of the cases which had been mentioned as examples was that of the London, Chatham, and Dover Railway; but that was a case which really had no application to the present one. That was a case where the share capital of the London, Chatham, and Dover Railway had become so involved with claims between the different sections of it, that it was absolutely impossible to extricate the case from the confusion in which it stood through the acts of the Courts of Law. Some provision had to be made which would sacrifice legal rights entirely, and substitute for them fair provisions of a different kind. That was done through the medium of a private Act of Parliament; but it was thought that it could be done more conveniently through the intervention of certain Arbitrators who could act as if they had the power to make Acts of Parliament. Accordingly, they exercised that power, and their award really was in the shape of a private Act of Parliament. The next case was the case of the Albert Arbitration—and what he had to say with regard to that would apply equally to the European Arbitration. Both of these cases were alike. There was a gigantic Insurance Company breaking-up, which had swallowed up some 15 or 20 other Insurance Companies, and there were involved questions of the greatest intricacy with regard to those different Insurance Companies and their shareholders as against each other. In the case of the Albert Insurance, the winding-up of all these Companies had been going on in the Court of Chancery for, he thought, nearly a space of 18 months; a very large sum had been expended in costs, and the result of all those proceedings had been absolutely *nil.* He was speaking only from memory; but he thought that there had not been a single list of contributories in any one of the Companies settled by the Court of Chancery. The intricacy of the case was so great, and the appeals before the Court were so numerous, that not only had the Court not got to the point of making a decision, but they had not settled the list of contributories. In addition to that, the Judges of the Court had themselves declared that it was impossible, as far as they saw, that the litigation ever should end; they said, if the Court did nothing else but take the cases of the Albert Arbitration, they had more than enough to do. In addition to that, the shareholders in the Companies, and the policy holders, had manifested in very large numbers—and in this respect he would ask their Lordships' particular attention to the present Bill—their desire to be emancipated from the technicalities of proceedings in the Court, and to have their affairs settled through the medium of friendly arbitration. In that state of things, a Bill was introduced to Parliament, and it received the assent of Parliament, and the Albert Company was wound up. The European, also, was in the course of winding-up, and he believed it was very nearly completed. In the present case, the state of things, as their Lordships knew, was this—The City of Glasgow Bank failed, as far as he remembered, in the month of October last, and the liquidation commenced in the month of November. Now, the liquidation of the City of Glasgow Bank was not what was called a liquidation by the Court; it was a liquidation as a winding-up under the supervision of the Court—that was to say, by certain persons being appointed by the creditors and shareholders to be the liquidators of the Bank under the direction and supervision of the Court. When any question of difficulty arose, the Court was appealed to, and it decided the question. They were now in the month of March, and he was bound to say that the activity which had been displayed was extremely creditable to all the parties concerned, because he found that the list of contributories had been settled; he found that a call had been made upon the contributories, and a sufficient sum of money had already been got in to justify the payment of the first dividend. It was to be hoped that the dividend would be as much as 6*s.* 8*d.* in the pound —that was to say, one-third of the debt of the Company. Now, in order to accomplish this result, the Court of Session had shown, as it seemed to him, its very great power of dealing with the cases; because he was told that the Court of Session had decided, not all the cases that had arisen, but what were called all the "representative cases" that had been raised. A great number of cases had been raised that it was not necessary to allude to; but as representative cases, the decision of them would govern others, and of those so decided, 10 had been appealed to their Lordships' House. The Court of Session, however, had decided in that short time all the cases which were required to be decided as representative cases, and, as he had said, 10 of these had been appealed to this House. One day next week their Lordships would commence the hearing of those appeals. Now, so far as regarded the action of the ordinary tribunals, what he had stated to their Lordships would show that there was no excuse for saying that the ordinary tribunals were not able effectively and speedily to deal with the questions that arose in the case. But then, he would ask, who was it that solicited interference with the ordinary tribunals of the country?—and there it seemed to him there was a difference between this case and those that had come formerly before the House. He was told that this Bill was promoted by two shareholders, and there had not been, as far as he was aware, any Petition to their Lordships' House by other shareholders, or any meeting held, or any manifestation or desire by other shareholders that this legislation should take place. He had no doubt that those who promoted the Bill had acted with the best possible motives; but what was desired was that there should have been some manifestation of the wish of the mass of shareholders and others for an interference with the ordinary tribunals of the country. Under those circumstances, he must say he should regret if their Lordships were to see in this case another instance for this very strong and high interference with the ordinary Courts. The instance in which they were now asked to act, as it seemed to him, had none of those peculiar features which the former cases had. In the observations which he had made, he had tried to describe the case as he understood it to be at the present moment. It was possible that it would assume a different aspect hereafter. It was possible that there might be delays and difficulties which he did not at present see any reason to anticipate. Of course, their Lordships would not actually dismiss the Bill at present. He thought, therefore, that their Lordships might be right in adopting this particular course —that they should not actually reject and dismiss this Bill, but adjourn it for a certain length of time in order to see whether hereafter a state of things would occur different to that which he anticipated. If their Lordships thought it right to adopt that course, the Bill might possibly be put off for a period of a couple of months, and in that time they might see whether any of those difficulties which the promoters of the Bill had suggested which had not yet occurred should occur. Under the circumstances of the case, the course he had to recommend to the House was to defer for two months the second reading of the Bill.

LORD HATHERLEY thought a *primâ facie* case had been made out by the noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack why the House should hesitate at the present moment to proceed with the Bill. He (Lord Hatherley) had endeavoured, but unsuccessfully, to discover who were the promoters and who were the opponents of the measure. He had no knowledge of the parties; but the Bill was of such a description that it ought not to be passed unless with a large consensus of approval from the shareholders on the one hand, and the creditors on the other. The proposal to postpone the second reading was, in his opinion, a very judicious course, and, therefore, he should support it.

THE EARL OF ROSEBERY said, that the statement just made by the noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack would be received with great gratitude by his unfortunate fellow-countrymen in Scotland. He was quite aware —and he thought the Lord Chancellor had very clearly put the point before the House—that the course pursued by the promoters of this Bill was unusual; but it was equally certain that the catastrophe which brought about the measure was unprecedented in the annals of this country. There was one statement in the speech of the noble and learned Lord which was not entirely correct. The noble and learned Lord said the Bill was promoted only by two shareholders, and that, so far as he knew, no meeting had been held in regard to this Bill. It might be technically true that only two shareholders appeared as promoters of the Bill; but it was also true that two meetings of shareholders, representing at least one-eighth of the stock of the City of Glasgow Bank had been held, and at those meetings resolutions had been passed unanimously in favour of the Bill. At the outset of his speech, he understood the noble and learned Lord to recommend the summary dismissal of the Bill, and he was proportionately delighted to find from his concluding remarks that he only recommended its postponement. He was quite sure that with the extreme soreness of feeling in Scotland, and the unexampled destitution that prevailed in all ranks, from the highest to the lowest, any summary dismissal of this measure, which was rather a Petition than a Bill, would be very ill received in that country. Now, when the noble and learned Lord spoke of this Bill as not at present being necessary, he thought the noble and learned Lord had forgotten the great case of the Western Bank, which, though not by one-half as great as the Glasgow Bank, took 19 years to liquidate, and had then to be finally wound up by an Act of Parliament. At the end of 19 years, the liquidators had to apply to their Lordships' House for that very remedy which the promoters of this Bill were anxious to provide at the threshold of their proceedings. A great factor in the case was the immense expense that was going on. The interest on the enormous deficit of £12,000,000 entailed an annual expense of from £100,000 to £200,000; and he did not think that the period of liquidation could be put at a less time than in the case of the Western Bank. So it was easy to calculate the enormous expense that would fall upon the unhappy shareholders and others concerned in the liquidation of the Glasgow Bank. There was another circumstance which ought not to be lost sight of in considering this question. There were many manufacturers in Scotland who held shares in the Bank, who were placed in a very uncertain position by this liquidation. In fact, they did not know their position. All they knew was that they had to go on working for the benefit of the creditors of the Bank. Many of these individuals were men with families, and some of them were advanced in years, and from one day to another they had to go on working in ignorance of their real position, except that they were working for the creditors of the Bank, not for their own families. He could only thank the noble and learned Lord for the course he had recommended to their Lordships, and sincerely hoped that when, two months hence, the subject came again before the House, they would not summarily dismiss the Bill.

Order *discharged*, and Bill to be read 2ª on *Tuesday* the 29*th of April* next.

PRIVATE BILLS.

Ordered, That no Private Bill brought from the House of Commons shall be read a second time after *Tuesday* the 10*th day of June* next:

That no Bill originating in this House authorising any inclosure of lands under special report of the Inclosure Commissioners for England and Wales, or confirming any scheme of the Charity Commissioners for England and Wales, shall be read a first time after *Friday* the 4*th day of April* next:

That no Bill originating in this House confirming any provisional order or provisional certificate shall be read a first time after *Friday* the 4*th day of April* next:

That no Bill brought from the House of Commons authorising any inclosure of lands under special report of the Inclosure Commissioners for England and Wales, or confirming any scheme of the Charity Commissioners for England and Wales, shall be read a second time after *Tuesday* the 17*th day of June* next:

That no Bill brought from the House of Commons confirming any provisional order or provisional certificate shall be read a second time after *Tuesday* the 17*th day of June* next:

That when a Bill shall have passed this House with amendments these orders shall not apply to any new Bill sent up from the House of Commons which the Chairman of Committees shall report to the House is substantially the same as the Bill so amended.

SUPREME COURT OF JUDICATURE ACTS AMENDMENT BILL.—(No. 11.)

(*The Lord Chancellor.*)

SECOND READING.

Order of the Day for the Second Reading, read.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR, in moving that the Bill be now read 2ª (according to Order), said, he proposed that this and the ASSIZES BILL should be considered in a Committee of the Whole House; and that the COUNTY COURTS BILL, which stood for the second reading for this evening, should be referred to a Select Committtee.

LORD SELBORNE expressed his concurrence in the course proposed by the noble and learned Lord.

Motion *agreed to;* Bills read 2ª, and *committed* accordingly.

ARMY—DESERTIONS—REPORT OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL OF RECRUITING, 1878.

QUESTION. OBSERVATIONS.

LORD ABINGER, in calling the attention of the House to the Report of the Inspector General of Recruiting for 1878, asked the Under Secretary of State for War, Whether it is the intention of Her Majesty's Government to bring forward any measure to check desertion from the Army? The noble Lord said, he desired to express at the outset his opinion that the linking of battalions together prevented the action of amalgamation which, under the new system, was now so desirable. With one hand they seemed to keep up the regimental system, and with the other they tried to destroy it. In his opinion, the time had arrived when the number of battalions or regiments in the Service should correspond with the depôt centres. There were two points which were satisfactory in the Report of the Inspector General. One was the splendid manner in which the Reserve had come forward when called upon; the other, that recruits were coming forward in more than sufficient numbers, and of a superior quality. Indeed, the supply of recruits was so far in advance of the requirements of the Service that the Inspector General had been able to increase the standard. He congratulated the noble Viscount opposite (Viscount Cardwell) upon the two cardinal points of the new system—namely, that of short service and the Reserves—which had so far worked satisfactorily. It was now proved that under the system of short service they could get a sufficient number of recruits, and the condition of the Reserves showed that they could at any time bring forward large numbers of old soldiers in the best state of efficiency. But there was a want felt, and it seemed to him that the Government should take power to call out a portion of the Reserves, not merely in times of great danger, but whenever their services would be required for small local wars. This might be done in one of two ways. They might either call out that portion of the Reserves attached to the depôt centre or sub-district to which the regiment was attached, or the men last passed into the Reserves. If either plan were adopted, they would then send out well-drilled, experienced soldiers, and they would fill up a gap which was still observed in the system. He noticed that in the Army Discipline Bill the Secretary of State proposed to take power to call out volunteers from the Reserves. So far well; but the Government should have positive power to call out a portion of the Reserves for service when required. As to the Report itself, he hoped it would be given annually. Now he came to the point raised in the Question of which he had given Notice—Desertion in the Army. He would repeat the opinion he expressed last year, that the true way to check desertion was by marking the whole Army, say, with a simple "V.R." of the size of a threepenny-piece. This would enable them to get rid of the whole system of fraudulent enlistment. But if this were objected to, why should not the men who entered the Army be re-vaccinated in such a manner and in such a place as to render the mark easily recognizable by Army surgeons? There would be no disgrace attaching to such a mark. If any doubt existed in the minds of the authorities as to the feeling of the men on the point, it could easily be obtained by sending a Circular round to the various centres — such as Aldershot, Shorncliffe, Colchester, and others, and invite an expression of opinion upon it. If the result should be that the plan was found distasteful to the men, why let them fall back on the marking of deserters, which he did not see any objection to. It was said that public opinion was against it; but he thought if it were clearly shown that all that was done was to put some distinguishing mark on the deserter, the public would not pronounce in any strong terms against it.

Lord TRURO asked what was the cause of the desertions in the Army? The cause, in his opinion, was the amount of harass and the enormous number of minor punishments to which the men were subjected for the most trivial offences. There had been no less than 282,687 punishments in the course of one year in the British Army, and in the same period there had been over 16,000 — near 17,000—courts martial. He should not presume to say what the requirements of the British Army were; but these punishments must, to an intolerable extent, harass the men—the result being desertion.

Lord Abinger,

Viscount BURY said, it must, he thought, be generally admitted that the Report of the Inspector General of Recruiting was a very favourable one in most respects. The Army had been recruited up to its full strength, and the Inspector General found no difficulty in getting recruits who were superior to the recruits of recent years and of a better physique. On that point, therefore, they might congratulate themselves. His noble Friend (Lord Abinger) turned from that point to deal with a question which was somewhat akin to it. His noble Friend seemed to object to the system of linked battalions, which he pronounced to be an anachronism in the present day, and added that things went on much better under the old system. He (Viscount Bury) was not about to express an opinion upon that point. His noble Friend was a *laudator temporis acti*; but Parliament had, with the full consent of all parties, adopted a new system, which, so far from breaking down, had proved itself, under the circumstances, as elastic and convenient as could reasonably be expected; and though his noble Friend had mentioned one or two points in which amendment might be possible, he did not raise any solid objection to the system itself. It should not be forgotten that at the present moment England had on her hands two wars, with the Army on a peace footing, and that she had been able to furnish all the troops required by the exigencies of the Public Service in two separate and distant quarters of the globe. It had been commented on somewhat strongly that two regiments recently sent to the Cape as reinforcements had themselves to be reinforced before they went out by volunteers from other regiments. That was quite true; but it must be remembered—to take one instance—that the 91st Regiment had been denuded of its men in order to supply deficiencies in the 72nd Regiment, which was its linked regiment, in India; but there was no difficulty in bringing the 91st, under the brigade depôt system, to its war strength when it became necessary so to do. The same remark applied to other regiments which had been sent out—as soon as the necessity arose, the men came forward. It was not pretended for the system that it was one of cast iron, which could not be remedied or perhaps remodelled hereafter, but it was one not to be hastily cast aside. Passing on to the subject of desertions, he (Viscount Bury) must admit, with regret, that they were numerous. Without doubt, the old plan of marking deserters was the simplest that could be adopted for preventing men who had been guilty of the offence from rejoining the Colours. He, for one, would be the last to hesitate on the ground of a mere mawkish sentimentality from marking a man who had deceived his country and probably committed a fraud of the grossest and most cowardly description, coupled with the robbery of his clothes and other necessaries, in order to prevent him from repeating his offence. But the system of marking had been abandoned after full consideration, and it was not the intention of Her Majesty's Government to recommend a recurrence to it. As to the alternatives suggested by his noble Friend, he could not hold out any hope that the opinion of the Army generally would be taken by Her Majesty's Government as to the advisability of adopting a universal system of marking officers and privates alike. The vaccination plan would be practicable, but it had been determined not to adopt it, for the present, at all events, in the hope that the provisions of the Bill recently introduced in the other House of Parliament would be of such a nature as materially to diminish the number of desertions. Until it was seen how that proposal worked, it was not the intention of Her Majesty's Government to propose any departure from the existing system.

The Duke of CAMBRIDGE desired to say a few words. In the first place, he must express his astonishment at some of the observations of the noble Lord (Lord Truro), who was under the erroneous impression that there was either an undue amount of crime or of punishment in Her Majesty's Service, and that the annoyance to which the men were exposed by petty punishments was the explanation of the number of desertions from the Army. No doubt, the Returns of offences made up a large aggregate, which those not acquainted with the minor details of the Army system might think serious; but those offences did not represent any proportionately large amount of crime, for the reason that they were chiefly inflicted for very minor offences. Some increase in the number of offences against discipline might be found in the large number of young non-commissioned officers they now had. The class of non-commissioned officers they formerly had were men of stability as well as respectability, with discretion and command of their tempers, which gave weight to any rebuke they might feel it their unpleasant duty to administer. Now, unfortunately, they had to deal with a number of young men and young non-commissioned officers, who, instead of listening to the rebuke of their superiors, were too apt to be what was commonly called "cheeky." Looking through the Report carefully, he did not find that there was more serious crime than formerly. Desertion was altogether another question. Desertion, he would not deny, had increased very largely; but that he accounted for in the same way as he accounted for the greater number of minor offences shown by the Returns—namely, by the circumstances arising under the new system of enlistment. They uniformly found that when they had, as was the case under the short-service system, a very large number of recruits, a great number of desertions followed, for the simple reason that many men went into the Army with the intention to desert. This was not an experience of to-day merely. They would find, if they looked back, that there had been invariably a large amount of desertions when they recruited to a heavy amount. Recruiting and desertion had always increased in about equal ratio. As far as the marking of deserters was concerned, he thought it was sufficiently understood that marking was no part of the punishment for desertion; but was simply adopted in order to prevent the public being cheated over and over again by re-enlistments on the part of men who had previously run away from the service of their country. He did not deny that it was necessary to do something; but he objected *in toto* to one of the alterations suggested—to mark every man—officer as well as private—on entering the Army. As to the officers, he strongly deprecated its application. As regarded the officers, they never deserted; and as regarded the privates, the very fact that a young man on entering the Army would be liable to be marked would be an indignity to which he would not willingly submit, and it would be of itself sufficient to prevent his enlisting. As far as the vaccine mark was concerned, the case was different. It would not in itself be an indignity, inasmuch as all men entering the Army had to be vaccinated, and it could not matter as to the way in which the punctures were made; while, at the same time, it would afford a means of identifying men upon whom the operation had been performed. He had been somewhat astonished to hear his noble Friend (Lord Abinger) go into the general question of the organization of the Army, which was not raised by his Notice. Not having expected such a departure from the subject-matter of the Notice, he was not prepared to enter upon a debate which might otherwise have been very appropriate; but he wished to remark that it was all very well to talk just now about doing away with linked battalions. There was a great deal of sentiment in these matters; but he desired to point out, as regarded linked battalions, that the men were interchangeable as the exigencies of the Public Service required. There was not the slightest difference in that respect between linked battalions and double battalions. The same inconveniences that existed in the case of the one existed in that of the other also. If they had double battalions—the one at home, the other abroad—and deficiencies arose in the latter, how could they be made up without volunteering? The truth was that the outcry as to volunteering resolved itself into a question of money. If they had money, they could get the men and could do without volunteering; if they had not, they could not get on without it. It was impossible, without a sufficient number of men, to carry out the duties required. They were asked why they did not keep the regiments which were high on the list for foreign service up to their full complement? Well, they did so. But it happened that men dropped off; that others were entitled to their discharge; that others were required for depôt duty. Moreover, when a regiment was suddenly ordered abroad for service in a tropical climate, it could not take with it the men under a certain age, or those within a few months of their discharge; so that he would venture to say that there was not a regiment in the Service from which it would not be necessary to knock off at least 200 men when ordered abroad. They had not got the Establishment that would enable them to keep sufficient depôts to dispense with volunteering from other regiments. Unless, as he had said, they had a sufficient number of men, it was clearly impossible to avoid volunteering. He admitted that the system of volunteering was objectionable—that he felt as strongly as any of their Lordships could do—but volunteering was not inherent in the new system only. When he was in the Crimea, in command of a division which included the Highland Brigade, one regiment of that brigade, on going out, took out volunteers from the two other regiments that remained at home; when the second went out and joined the brigade, it took volunteers from the third; and at last the third regiment, on joining the brigade, was composed almost entirely of volunteers. There was nothing new, therefore, in that system; although as a soldier he would, of course, much rather it was not necessary to resort to it. But, he repeated, it was a question of money. If they did not wish to have volunteering, they must put their hands into their pocket. If they did not, they must be satisfied that whatever Government was in power would do the best they could under the circumstances in which they were placed. He trusted that their Lordships and the country would admit that those who worked under him, as also the Secretary of State, had done the best they could, and that it was wonderful that in so short a time the battalions had been made up, and that under very difficult circumstances. It was a proof of the good spirit and good feeling that prevailed in the Army that they could have had many hundred more soldiers who were anxious to join any regiment under orders for foreign service. There was no doubt that third or depôt battalions could have been formed, if the circumstances had been considered so serious as to render such a step necessary; but it was one which could not be taken unless the country was prepared to pay for it.

VISCOUNT CARDWELL said, he quite concurred in what had been said by his noble and gallant Friend opposite (Lord Abinger) on the subject of the linked battalions. They knew, however, from what had occurred last night in "another place," that it had been the intention of Her Majesty's Government up to a late moment to reduce the number of the rank and file to be voted for the year. As the illustrious Duke had said, if it were intended to create third battalions, they must be prepared to incur the necessary expense. If they were not, then whatever other means might be at their disposal, they would fail in their object. They would not, indeed, ever again be placed in the position in which Lord Raglan found himself in the Crimea, or have to fill up regiments in the way he was called upon to do; because they had trained Reserves whom they could call out for a national emergency, such as that of last year, or they could have recourse to a certain amount of volunteering. It was said by his noble Friend that it would be desirable to have compulsory power to call out a certain portion of the Reserve Force for a temporary purpose, if they wished to meet an ordinary war like the present by battalions, not exclusively composed of young recruits, but in some part assisted by men volunteering to join them from the Reserve; but he thought it a wiser determination on the part of the Secretary of State not to seek such a power, but, except in the case of great national emergency, to be satisfied with the readiness of those who might be invited to volunteer.

THE EARL OF LONGFORD reminded their Lordships that the step taken last year in the calling out of the Reserves had been only half a success. It was true that the men had come out with alacrity when called upon; but the military establishments were not ready to receive them. Those establishments had been so starved that the men were unable to find their clothing or their equipment, to enable them to take at once their places in the ranks. The essential condition of the Reserve system, with short service, was that all these preparations should be made beforehand. The Departments ought to be organized and maintained in a state of entire efficiency, if they desired to see the system work successfully.

INDIA—SCARCITY OF GRAIN IN THE PUNJAB.

QUESTION. OBSERVATIONS.

LORD WALSINGHAM asked the Secretary of State for India, Whether Her Majesty's Government have received any information which would lead them to anticipate a scarcity of grain in the Punjab during the present year; and, whether any precautions have been taken to provide against the possible emergency of a famine in that district? He was led to put the Question by information which he had received from a reliable source as to a condition of things in the North-West of India, which, if truthfully represented, seemed to demand the careful consideration and early attention of the Government. He was informed by a gentleman long resident in the Punjab district, in a letter dated January the 29th, that no snow or rain had fallen there since September; that the cold weather crops were dying for want of the usual winter rains; and that on the mountains above there was no heaped-up snow to supply the rivers in the hot weather. Now, their Lordships were well aware that in that country the chief food of the people came from the crops of rice which they grew, and that if the rivers were not swollen by melting snow, that irrigation upon which the cultivation of rice entirely depended would become impossible. Enormous quantities of grain had been exported from the Punjab during the last two years to feed the starving populations of Madras and Bombay, and as there was now no surplus store in that district, a failure of crops would involve the necessity of importation or the alternative of famine. Moreover, it was difficult to see whence a sufficient supply could be derived to replace the recent exportations, if the emergency should unfortunately arise. The means of information at the command of the Government were naturally so much better than those which could be derived from any private sources that he was anxious—first, to ascertain whether they had received any confirmation of the statements to which he had called their Lordships' attention; and, secondly, to express a hope that should those statements be corroborated, they would not permit any unusual calls upon the Revenues of India to deter them from making timely and full provision against a repetition of one of those great calamities which had so lately fallen upon other districts of that Empire.

VISCOUNT CRANBROOK: On my attention being called to this subject by the Notice on the Paper, I put myself in communication with the Governor General by telegraph, and I have received from him a reply which brings down our information to this very morning. My noble Friend need not be the least apprehensive that the Government of India will not be looking with anxious eyes wherever there are the least signs of famine. The Government of India is all the more alive to this question because of what has already happened; and I can assure my noble Friend that the greatest care is being taken to provide against any emergency that may occur in the various Presidencies. There is no doubt that there has been a failure of the winter rains; but the consequences, I hope, will not be so serious as my noble Friend seems to anticipate. The Governor General has sent two telegrams. The first is as follows:—

> "Lieutenant Governor has just visited great part of Punjab. No present apprehension of famine.
>
> "Present situation.—Autumn harvest fair. Winter rains very scanty and spring crop prospects thereby affected. During past fortnight rain fell in parts and will do good, but still withheld in Delhi territory. Central and Western Punjab.—Prices dear throughout Punjab. Rain in upper districts will still do good, as harvest there is late. Main spring crops cut in April.—Estimate of expected yield not available.
>
> "Central Provinces.—Spring crop cut and exceeds expectations, which is good augury for crops elsewhere. In Cashmere, where dearth expected, Punjab Government have arranged to send 4,000 tons of grain."

The second telegram, which is apparently in reply to one sent by the Viceroy to inquire as to the failure of the February rains, is couched in the following terms:—

> "North West Prospects.—Recent rain more widespread, though not sufficiently general. Autumn crop good and furnishes a staple food of poor. Prices dear. Famine not apprehended. Scarcity will probably be felt in Agra and adjoining districts."

This information shows that the Government of India are doing their utmost to provide against any contingency such as that which the noble Lord apprehends.

ARMY—THE AUXILIARY FORCES—THE YEOMANRY.

QUESTION. OBSERVATIONS.

THE MARQUESS OF BATH asked the Under Secretary of State for War, What arrangements the Government contemplate making this year in respect to calling out the Yeomanry for permanent duty; and in the event of a certain number of troop drills being substituted for the permanent duty, what pay will be allowed the troops attending them, and whether they will be allowed to receive it without having attended the previous three days' qualifying drill? He would suggest that the Government should, as there was considerable distress in some agricultural districts of the country, cause an inquiry to be made of all the regiments, whether they were willing or not willing to be called out this year. He thought that some regiments would desire to be called out, and others not.

VISCOUNT BURY said, that his right hon. and gallant Friend the Secretary of State for War explained in "another place" yesterday why the Yeomanry would not be called out for duty this year; and it was the same reason which applied to the Militia being called out for 20 days instead of for the usual period—namely, the economy that had to be studied in framing the Army Estimates of this year, and it had to take the form of curtailing the permanent duty of the Yeomanry and the period of service of the Militia. The plan suggested by the noble Marquess could hardly be adopted, because it had already been arranged that the system indicated by his right hon. and gallant Friend yesterday was to be carried out, and it could not be re-considered this year. His noble Friend the noble Marquess would remember that the Committee upon this subject suggested that it should be optional with the commanding officers to give the men 7*s.* per diem for every day's training, or 3*s.* 6*d.* per diem for four days when not called out for permanent duty but for troop drill; and, as to the last part of the Question, he might say that, under the peculiar circumstances of the case, the preliminary recruiting drills would not be insisted upon, but the men who came up for four days' troop drill would receive 3*s.* 6*d.* a-day, without any reference being made to those preliminary drills.

THE EARL OF CORK regretted the result at which the Government had arrived, as he thought the number of drills should be increased and not diminished. As in 1860 the Yeomanry were not called out for permanent drill, it would seem that that corps was made to suffer for their wars in India. It should be remembered that the farmers voluntarily gave their services; and he thought that the men who joined the corps should be encouraged to serve their country in the only way they could do. This was bad economy on the part of the Government; and he really did think that his right hon. and gallant Friend the Secretary of State for War might have found some other way of saving such a small sum as £6,000.

House adjourned at a quarter before Seven o'clock, to Thursday next, half past Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Tuesday, 4th March, 1879.

MINUTES.] — SELECT COMMITTEE—Libel, *appointed.*

PUBLIC BILLS — *Ordered* — *First Reading* — Registration of Births, Deaths, and Marriages (Army) * [95]; Wormwood Scrubs Regulation * [96]; Drainage and Improvement of Lands (Ireland) Provisional Order Confirmation * [94]; Blind and Deaf-Mute Children (Education) * [93].

First Reading—Exchequer Bonds (No. 1) * [92]; Consolidated Fund (No. 1) *.

Withdrawn—Libel Law Amendment * [43].

QUESTIONS.

SOUTH AFRICA—THE ZULU WAR—OFFICERS' BAGGAGE.—QUESTION.

COLONEL TOTTENHAM asked the Secretary of State for War, Whether officers of regiments now ordered on active service to the Cape will, if sent on subsequently to India, be allowed conveyance of baggage from England to India in the same proportion as if they had gone to India direct from England?

COLONEL STANLEY, in reply, said, that he had been informed that the officers ordered on active service to the Cape had taken, in all cases, the usual amount of baggage; but if, owing to the shortness of time allowed for making preparations, or any other cause, and from no fault of their own, it could be shown by an individual officer that he had not really been able to procure such articles as were required for India, the War Office would endeavour to make arrangements for forwarding such baggage to India free of cost to the officers.

RAILWAY PASSENGER DUTY—WANTAGE TRAMWAY COMPANY.

QUESTION.

MR. J. COWEN asked Mr. Attorney General, If he would explain to the House on what principle of law or of fact the Wantage Tramway, established under the Tramways Order Confirmation Act, 37 and 38 Vic. c. 183, and 39 and 40 Vic. c. 42, and using a steam locomotive, is exempted from the Railway Passenger Duty?

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Sir JOHN HOLKER): The Act 5 & 6 *Vict.* c. 79, by which the Railway Passenger Duty is imposed, is so framed as to confine the charge to receipts for passengers conveyed on a railway which is the property of a Company or person liable to account for the duties. The question of the liability of the receipts of the Wantage Tramway Company to the Railway Passenger Duty was brought to the notice of the Commissioners of Inland Revenue in September, 1876. It was then ascertained that the tramway was laid upon a public road, and, that being so, there was no railway of which the Company were proprietors, and, consequently, the provisions of the Railway Passenger Duty Acts have no application.

CRIMINAL LAW—CASE OF STEVENSON.

QUESTION.

MR. P. A. TAYLOR asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether his attention has been called to the case of a lad named Stevenson, aged about fifteen, who in May last was sentenced at Glasgow by the stipendiary magistrate to receive fifteen stripes for the offence of throwing (in play) a small bag of pease meal at a girl who had first thrown the same at him and had made no complaint upon the matter; whether, on appeal, the sentence was at once quashed, as illegal, after, however, the flogging had been inflicted, the Judge, Lord Craighill, observing that—

> "As there was no warrant according to the law of Scotland for the imposition of whipping for such an offence as that, which is the only offence, if it is worthy of the name, presented in this complaint, there can be no difficulty in arriving at a conclusion;"

whether on various previous occasions the same magistrate had not inflicted similar illegal floggings; and, whether he still retains his office?

THE LORD ADVOCATE (Mr. WATSON): Sir, in order to make my reply intelligible, it is necessary that I should explain that the power of inflicting corporal punishment in Scotland rests on Common Law, and that the magistrates of burghs, including the stipendiary of Glasgow, have the right to inflict corporal punishment for particular offences, including brawls, riots, and assaults committed in the streets. The Legislature has assumed the existence of that right, and instead of directly conferring it, has regulated it, from time to time, by Statute. The offence charged in this case was an offence under the Glasgow Police Act of 1866—a Statute which imposed somewhat stringent regulations. The Judge before whom the conviction was brought on appeal had nothing before him but the complaint and the sentence. He quashed the conviction on the ground that the complaint did not set forth any Common Law offence, although it might be an offence within the meaning of the Police Act. I think it right to say that the only statement of what occurred rests on the *ex parte* statement made in the appeal papers; and I have found, on inquiry, that the evidence laid before the Judge did not disclose the state of facts which is assumed in the Question. On the contrary, it appears that the lad had gone about with a bag of flour on a wet day, causing considerable annoyance, and doing no little damage to the clothes of the bystanders. The Statutory punishment for such an offence was a fine of £10, or 15 days' imprisonment. Had it been a Common Law offence, there is no doubt the stipendiary could have inflicted corporal punishment. I have not been able to discover any other illegal sentences under the rule of this decision that have been pronounced by the Judge in question. He still continues in office; because my right hon. Friend the Home Secretary concurs with me in believing that the stipendiary of Glasgow is a man who is incapable of inflicting any punishment that would not be upheld by a superior Judge.

INLAND REVENUE—THE INCOME TAX —CO-OPERATIVE STORES.—QUESTION.

MR. BLAKE asked Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, If it is true, as stated in the newspapers, that large mercantile firms trading for profit under the name of "Civil Service," "Army and Navy," and other Co-operative Stores, are exempt from payment of Income Tax and the use of receipt stamps; and, if so, if he will be good enough to state the reasons for such exemption from contribution to the National Revenue?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: The answer to the hon. Member's Question is this—that no co-operative stores are, as such, exempted from the payment of Income Tax. Only one of the institutions referred to—namely, the Civil Service Supply Association, which is registered as an industrial and provident society—is exempt from that tax; the others, the Civil Service Stores, and the Army and Navy Stores, not being so registered, are not exempt from it. None of these institutions are exempt from the receipt-stamp duty. Formerly, industrial and provident institutions were exempt from receipt-stamp duty, but that exemption was repealed in 1876, at the instance of the present Government. That is the answer to the hon. Gentleman's Question. The hon. and gallant Member for Westminster (Sir Charles Russell) has given Notice of his intention to move for a Committee to inquire in the constitution and management of these institutions, and I think that great advantage will result from such an Inquiry, as it will remove some of the doubts that exist with regard to the position of these societies.

INLAND REVENUE—LEGACY AND SUCCESSION DUTY.—QUESTION.

MR. O'CLERY asked Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Whether it is true that the amount of Duty realised by the Legacy and Succession Duty Office during the financial year 1878-9 is nearly half a million less than that collected by the same Department in 1877-8; and, whether this decrease in the revenue has occurred since the new scheme, by which the collection of the tax in the country was taken out of the hands of the local distributors, has been adopted?

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER: Sir, the financial year has not yet closed, and, therefore, I am unable to give a precise answer; but as far as the year has gone, there has been a decrease of £350,000 in the legacy and succession duty as compared with the corresponding period of last year. The main reason for this decrease, I apprehend, is to be found in the depreciation in the value of stock on which the duty was assessed, and the general decrease in the value of property. But it is also a curious fact, for which I cannot account, that the number of wills proved in England last year was 2,000 less than in 1876, and any one year may be roughly said to depend on the number of wills proved. The change in the old system of collection caused some disturbance at first; but that difficulty, I believe, will be only temporary.

THE TREATY OF BERLIN—SERVIA AND ROUMANIA.—QUESTION.

Mr. Serjeant SIMON asked Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Whether it is the intention of Her Majesty's Government, before recognising the independence of Servia and Roumania, to require that such measures be taken as may be necessary to give effect to the stipulations contained in Articles 33 and 34, and 44 and 45, of the Treaty of Berlin, which provide for the full enjoyment of civil and political rights by persons of all religious creeds and confessions in those countries respectively?

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER: Yes, Sir; that is the policy of Her Majesty's Government.

NAVAL EXPENDITURE—THE VOTE OF CREDIT, 1878.—QUESTION.

Mr. SHAW LEFEVRE asked the First Lord of the Admiralty, Whether he will lay upon the Table of the House, before the discussion on Navy Estimates, a Statement showing the details of the expenditure for Naval purposes out of the Vote of Credit of last year?

Mr. W. H. SMITH, in reply, said, he would take care that the Statement which the hon. Member suggested should be laid on the Table before the Navy Estimates were discussed. He hoped to be able to take the Estimates on Monday next.

CANAL BOATS ACT, 1877.

QUESTION.

Mr. PRICE asked the President of the Local Government Board, Whether he has any information with regard to the operation of the Canal Boats Act of 1877, especially in reference to the registration of canal boats; and, whether he has reason to believe that the boatowners and the local sanitary authorities are generally endeavouring to carry out the provisions of the Act?

Mr. SCLATER-BOOTH, in reply, said, he had not sufficient official information to enable him to answer the Question with precision. He knew, however, that in many parts of England the operation of the Act was represented as satisfactory, and he was told that in others that was not the case. The severe weather of the last few months might have had some effect in the matter. It should also be remembered that the Regulations were not laid on the Table until last June. He should shortly make inquiry of the various registration authorities, and would then be happy to render any information which the Department obtained on the subject accessible to the hon. Gentleman.

THE OFFICIAL CORN RETURNS.

QUESTION.

Mr. CLARE READ asked the President of the Board of Trade, If his attention has been directed to the unfairly high average prices of the official Corn Returns, mainly caused by the same lots of corn being returned a second and third time, thus embracing the merchant's profits and cost of transit; by the growing custom of buying corn by weights greatly in excess of the imperial measure; and by the increasing quantities of inferior grain which never appear in the Corn Returns at all; and, whether he will take steps that the average value of all grain grown in Great Britain may be more accurately ascertained in future in the official Corn Returns?

Mr. J. G. TALBOT: Sir, I would remind my hon. Friend that the present mode of ascertaining the average prices of corn, including the re-sales, has prevailed for more than half-a-century, and no question of its being an unfair mode has, so far as we know, ever been raised. I would further say that, whatever may be the custom in sales, the Inspectors of Corn Returns are bound to make their returns in imperial measures, and, again, that the Board of Trade have no means of knowing whether the quantity of inferior corn not sent to market is increasing or not. I can assure my hon. Friend that we shall gladly consider any suggestions he may be good enough to make with a view of making any improvement in the present system of Corn Returns.

CONTAGIOUS DISEASES (ANIMALS) ACT, 1878—DAIRIES AND COWSHEDS.

QUESTION.

Mr. CLARE READ asked the Vice President of the Council, If all farmers in the rural districts selling milk to their neighbours and labourers must be registered as purveyors of milk, and have their dairies and cow sheds inspected and regulated by the local authority under the provisions of the Dairies, Cow Houses, and Milk Shop Order of 1879?

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: Sir, the part of the Order requiring registration was intended to apply to persons whose principal trade is the keeping of cows for the purpose of selling milk, and was not intended to comprise farmers, who only sell milk to their neighbours and labourers as an incident to their general farming business. In framing an Order to give effect to the Act of Parliament, the use of general descriptions cannot be avoided which may seem to include classes of persons who ought not to be included; but, practically, every local authority has a discretion as to what classes of persons it will require to register themselves, and in giving effect to the Order local authorities will, no doubt, have regard to the circumstances of their respective districts. The Privy Council will soon have to revise and consolidate all the Orders made under the Act of last Session; and in so doing they will consider whether this provision for registration of dairymen may not be made more clear.

PUBLIC BUSINESS—COUNTY BOARDS BILL.—QUESTION.

Mr. CLARE READ asked the President of the Local Government Board, When he expects to introduce the County Boards Bill?

Mr. SCLATER-BOOTH: Sir, the draft of this Bill has been completed for some time. I shall be ready to introduce the Bill on any day after this week that may be placed at my disposal by my right hon. Friend the Chancellor of the Exchequer.

Mr. CLARE READ: In consequence of the undecided answer I have received to my Question, I shall move, on going into Committee on the Valuation Bill—

> "That the introduction in the Valuation Bill of a provisional county authority is inconsistent with, and tends to nullify, the Resolution of this House of March 9, 1877, and that the further progress of this Bill should be suspended until the opinion of the House has been taken on the promised Bill relating to County Government."

PARLIAMENT — PUBLIC BUSINESS — THE SELECT COMMITTEE ON PARLIAMENTARY REPORTING.

QUESTION.

In reply to Mr. Newdegate,

Mr. W. H. SMITH said, he believed it was not the intention of the Committee on Parliamentary Reporting to take further evidence this Session. The Committee were to meet on Friday to consider the general terms of their Report.

PARLIAMENT — PUBLIC BUSINESS — ARMY DISCIPLINE AND REGULATION BILL.—QUESTION.

The Marquess of HARTINGTON: Sir, I see that by the Order Book the Army Discipline and Regulation Bill stands the first Order for Thursday. I should like to ask the Leader of the House, Whether it is intended to proceed with the second reading of the Bill on that evening; and, if not, what Business will be taken?

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER: Sir, I do not believe the Bill is yet printed. The Supplementary Estimates and the Public Works Loans Bill will be taken on Thursday.

IRELAND—THE CORK AND MACROOM RAILWAY ACCIDENT.—QUESTION.

Major O'GORMAN asked the Attorney General for Ireland, Whether his attention has been attracted to the fact that the defendants in the case of the Cork and Macroom Railway accident—that is to say, the Directors—did, on the 20th November last, appeal to the Court of Queen's Bench for an order to bring up the inquisition (which had resulted in a verdict of manslaughter against the defendants) to be quashed; whether a conditional order on that occasion had been granted; whether that order had been made absolute; and, whether he had taken any steps to show cause against this conditional order being made absolute; and, if not, whether it is his intention to interfere so as, in the interests of the public, to prevent the verdict of the jury being quashed?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL for IRELAND (Mr. Gibson): Sir, my attention has been called to this matter, and it is true that the inquisition was brought before the Court of Queen's Bench, and the rule subsequently made absolute. From the evidence given at the inquest, and considering the verdict, I did not think that there was any necessity to show cause, and it is not my intention to interfere further in the matter. I may state, that the matter has been investigated in the Civil Courts in Ireland, and the Company has already had to pay a considerable sum in damages.

MOTIONS.

HOUSEHOLD SUFFRAGE (COUNTIES).

RESOLUTIONS.

Mr. TREVELYAN, in rising to move—

> "That, in the opinion of this House, it would be desirable to establish throughout the whole of the United Kingdom a Household Franchise similar to that now established in the English boroughs; and that it would be desirable so to re-distribute political power as to obtain a more complete representation of the opinion of the electoral body,"

said: The Resolutions which I have the honour to again bring before the House are so important, and so intimately connected with every part of our political system, that those who advocate them have never any difficulty in finding something new to say; but, on this occasion, there is a special reason why the debate will be regarded with interest in the country. Unless the letter of the Constitution is to be insisted on in a manner which—such was the wisdom of our ancestors—is almost without a precedent, this will be the last occasion on which the present Parliament will have an opportunity of declaring whether it is just and expedient to exclude so very large, and so very deserving and valuable, a portion of the population from any share in the government of their own country. That is the question on which, as far as domestic legislation is concerned, the forthcoming General Election will infallibly turn. The right hon. Gentleman who represents the University of London (Mr. Lowe) tells us that there is no real demand for this extension of the franchise. What the outward and visible signs of such a demand are to be I hardly know. In the last authentic utterances of the right hon. Gentleman, he appeared to think that we ought to wait for a civil war. Then, he said, it might be wise to concede somewhat. The noble Lord the Member for Woodstock (Lord Randolph Churchill), who is the most promising, if among the very most recent, pupils of the right hon. Gentleman, will be content with what he calls "popular tumults." He thinks we shall be justified in taking action when there has been nothing more serious than another disturbance in Hyde Park. Sir, those of us who were present at the scene on that Sunday in Hyde Park, during the debate on the Vote of £6,000,000—the most vulgar and ruffianly proceeding that ever disgraced a great capital—will not be inclined to take the advice of the noble Lord and the right hon. Gentleman. And let me say that such advice is curious, as coming from one who is for ever preaching the necessity of keeping up the high standard of English statesmanship—this advice to postpone doing justice, and passing what we believe to be a salutary reform, until we have had broken windows, and are afraid of having broken heads. No; I can tell the right hon. Gentleman a much better test of whether there is a demand for this measure or no. Let him go, not to this Radical constituency or that, but to any borough in England, Scotland, or Ireland, which is of a sufficient size to entertain a healthy and genuine public opinion, and let him ask the constituency to return him as a Liberal who is opposed to the extension of the county franchise. No; Sir, the people who are determined to get the franchise extended are not the sort of men who pelt each other in Hyde Park; but they are the sort of men who know very well how to use the Constitutional means by which a free people can obtain what they want. When the present House was chosen, there was very little enthusiasm for these Resolutions outside the House, and still less inside it; but this Parliament, if it has done very little else for the opinions which we on these Benches hold, has, at any rate, done this—that it has matured this question, and brought it from the condition of a not very popular theory to be the most formidable and practical reality. When it was first brought forward in the last Parliament its supporters could only muster 70 votes; and though a good deal of attention had been called just then to the rural districts by the strike of the labourers in Warwickshire, I must frankly confess that I seldom remember a debate which fell more thoroughly dead. But two years afterwards, in this Parliament, we secured 173 votes, and were beaten by only 115. Then the majority fell to 102, and then to 99. Then came the great conference of delegates in Exeter Hall, which was pronounced by the Chairman, the right hon. Member for Birmingham (Mr. John Bright), as equal in weight and importance to any public meeting or conference of his time; and, under the impression, as I greatly believe, of that remarkable manifestation of the genuineness of the demand for this great reform, our numbers so increased that, if at any time a General Election changes 30 seats—and who can say that such a result is outside the probabilities of politics?—a new House of Commons will, before it has sat half a Session, be committed to the extension of the suffrage to the county householders. And this great change has been brought about, not by the usual processes by which questions are forced upon the attention of the House of Commons—by setting up newspapers and distributing pamphlets, and raising great subscriptions and forming extensive and powerful associations. Nobody has been threatened, nobody has been bullied, nobody, I earnestly trust, has been bored. Gradually, and almost insensibly, an honest and spontaneous change of belief has stolen over the minds of public men. Gentlemen who, in the intimacy of private conversation, used five years ago, or three years ago, to express themselves unfavourable to seeing the question stirred, now convinced, I cannot but think by hearing in a succession of debates how much is to be said for these Resolutions, and how very little can be said against them, freely acknowledge that the time has arrived when the question should be settled. This side of the House is unanimous on that point—if there ever was such a thing as unanimity in politics; and the excluded class of our fellow-countrymen may now rest confident in the assurance that if ever the Liberal Party come in again they will bring in with them the county householders. And there is a special reason why this reform, which has long been recognized as ultimately certain, has of late become imminent and pressing. It is the only remedy—at least, the only remedy that there is a chance of Parliament being induced to adopt—for an abuse which has long existed, but which has only of late been brought into such prominence that we have no choice but to deal with it. Last year I described to the House the system of faggot-voting in Scotland, and explained how the small, but very intelligent, resident constituency of Selkirkshire and Peeblesshire was swamped by a troop of Highland lairds and Edinburgh Writers to the Signet, who never came to the neighbourhood, except when they were summoned at the time of a General Election to vote down the real wishes, the real sentiments, the real public opinion of the two counties. That description, which attracted attention in Scotland—where it was well-known that Selkirkshire and Peeblesshire were only an exaggerated instance of what was going on in every Northern county where parties were evenly balanced—as far as this House was concerned, fell upon deaf ears. But in politics, if you only stick fast to a principle, time is quite sure to bring its revenges, and between last Session and this events have occurred which have placed the question of faggot-voting in the very fore-front of Scotch grievances; and it is a grievance which has all the more chance of being removed, because it possesses the rare and peculiar advantage of being capable of being understood by Englishmen. On the 18th of January last the following letter was addressed to a gentleman in Glasgow;

and I may say, before I read it, that its writer attempted to allege that it was a private letter; but upon its having been proved that he was mistaken, he made a complete and frank apology in the public newspapers:—

> "Scottish Conservative Club, Edinburgh,
> "18th January, 1879.
>
> "Dear Sir,—In view of Mr. Gladstone's proposed attack upon Mid-Lothian, a number of gentlemen interested in the success of Lord Dalkeith are acquiring qualifications in the county. I should be glad if you could take one also. They consist of dwelling-houses, well built and finished, and cost from £120 to £360 per vote. The rents are expected to yield quite 5 per cent. You would be joint-owner with another person. Those gentlemen who have already purchased are satisfied that the investment is a sound one. As the transactions must be carried through this month, an answer in course will be obliging.
>
> "Yours sincerely,
> "R. ADDISON SMITH."

Now, the last sentence in Mr. Smith's letter well deserves the attention of the House. The list of voters is made up between July and October, and everybody who desires to be placed on the list of voters as proprietor or as life-renter on house property, must have been registered and officially recognized as such for at least six months before the 31st July. And, therefore, he must have been registered by the 31st of January; and it is during the week that precedes the 31st January that these gentlemen flock to the registry office, who have purchased property or burdens upon property, not for the sake of an investment, but for the sake of a vote. Mr. Craufurd, the late Member for Ayr Boroughs, who, since Mr. Horsman dropped the question of fictitious voting, has been the leading authority on the subject, states that an almost infallible test of a vote being a faggot-vote is the date on which the qualification was registered. Mr. Craufurd states that he looked in the Register of Sasines for Peeblesshire for the date of no less than 34 deeds which he suspected to be of a political character, and he discovered that every one of these deeds had been signed on the 28th, the 29th, or the 30th of January. Well, Sir, never during that very significant period of the year was the Registrar so busy as towards the end of last January. The good seed which Mr. Addison Smith had sowed so diligently over Scotland, England, aye, and Ireland too, brought an abundant and an immediate crop. Between the 14th and 31st of January no less than 94 votes were manufactured in the county of Mid-Lothian alone—votes that answer all the conditions which go to make a faggot-vote of the purest and most unmistakable type; and it is said that there were 26 other faggot-votes made which did not require the ceremony of registration. Let hon. Gentlemen reflect what it is that at the next General Election we one and all of us wish to get from Mid-Lothian; and I am not addressing myself to one side of the House or the other. I am not making a Party speech. We want to know what the population of a Scotch county—as intelligent a population as any in the world—think on the policy of the last six years, and what they wish to be the policy of the next six years. Now, in order to assist us in arriving at this result, four persons who had not votes for Mid-Lothian, acquire property there between the 20th and 25th of January last. They acquire a cottage and a shop in the village of Wester Duddingstone. Two of them take a cottage in common, and the names of these lowly cottagers—who would not even be qualified under my Bill, which would require them to have a cottage a-piece—are Frederick Spencer Hamilton, commonly called Lord Frederick Spencer Hamilton, and Lord Claud Hamilton, Privy Councillor, residing not in Mid-Lothian, but at 83, Portland Place, London. The two gentlemen who keep shop together are Lord Ernest William Hamilton, lieutenant in the 11th Hussars, and William Alexander Baillie-Hamilton, clerk in the Colonial Office, residing not in Mid-Lothian, but at 22, Green Street, Grosvenor Square, London. And these are the people who, next Autumn, or in the Spring of next year, will settle on which side the voice of Mid-Lothian is to be given in the Counsels of the nation; while the real cottagers and the real shopkeepers of the country stand by with their hands in their pockets, and have no more to say to the election than if they were the horses that drag the voters to the poll. Now, let us go a little lower on the list. Here is a yard or back green, being part of a cot tenement of land on the south side of the High Street of the town of Dalkeith.

Now, on the 30th of January last the Duke of Buccleuch burdened this precious spot with a life-rent payable to five persons. Now, if this transaction was not connected with politics, it could have only one meaning. It would mean that the Duke of Buccleuch was in want of ready money; and that money was so tight in his own neighbourhood, that he was forced to apply to five different parties, and to look for those parties at a distance. For who are these five parties? They are Lieutenant-Colonel John Francis Cust, late of the Grenadier Guards, at present residing at Harewood Bridge, Harewood, Leeds; the Hon. James A. Douglas Home, barrister-at-law, of the Inner Temple; Captain George Robert Hope, of the Royal Navy; Herbert James Hope, residing in London; and Edward Stanley Hope, barrister, in London. There you have the Professions fairly represented, and you have more than the Professions represented. You have the Civil Service represented, too, for, almost contemporaneously with his name appearing in the newspapers as having spent £100 or £150 in purchasing a life-rent which gave him a vote for Mid-Lothian, Mr. Edward Stanley Hope was appointed Junior Charity Commissioner of England and Wales, with a salary, I suppose, of £1,200 a-year. The longer I live in public life, the more I am impressed by the diversity of ideas which different men hold as to what is becoming and what is the reverse. Sir, these are strong cases, and hon. Members may suspect that I have picked with some care the instances which would produce most impression upon the House. But as I look up and down the list, the difficulty is to find not a strong case, but a weak one. As I take one group of names after another, it is not easy to say who of these faggot-voters has less connection than another with the rural districts of Mid-Lothian, or who of them has less right than another to speak in the name of those residents of Mid-Lothian who, under the unjust system of political privilege, against which this first Resolution is directed, are not permitted to speak for themselves. Here is a piece of one acre and a bit in the parish of Cockpen, which gives votes to six Edinburgh lawyers and two Roxburghshire bankers. Here are a lot of half-built houses in Myrtle Terrace which give votes to no less than 19 Baronets, lawyers, major-generals, retired surveyors of stamps and taxes, eminent Scotch divines, ready to lay down their lives and their money for the maintenance of the Establishment, resident in Fifeshire, Cumberland, Lanarkshire, Stirlingshire, Peeblesshire, Perthshire—anywhere but in the rural parts of Mid-Lothian. And it is not only the clergy of the Scotch Church. Here we have the hon. and rev. Charles Dundas, Rector of Epworth, and residing at the Rectory there—I do not think we have any rectors in Scotland—and Henry Dundas, his son, residing with him, jointly, and the longest liver of them. These two gentlemen, during the last few days in which they could contrive to foist themselves upon the constituency of Mid-Lothian, became possessed of a triangular piece of ground in the parish of Dalkeith, which went by the name of Gallowshall. Sir, I have but slight acquaintance with the noble Lord who at present represents Mid-Lothian; but that little has inspired me with a great respect for him. No one, if the noble Lord will allow me to say so, is a better judge of the tone and temper in which a public man conducts political controversy than an opponent who is connected politically with the same neighbourhood, and a more fair and temperate Party speaker than the noble Lord does not exist in the South of Scotland. The noble Lord knows much better than myself what sort of men the inhabitants of the rural districts in the South of Scotland are—how frugal, how industrious, how loyal in every sense of the word, how solidly and rationally educated, how admirably worthy of being—as they are not now—full and complete citizens of a free country. Those districts are identified with the name of the noble Lord, and the name of his family, in a manner that will be remembered—such is the spell of literary genius—when half the dynasties that now govern Europe will be forgotten. Is he willing to see the population of these districts, being what it is, being what he knows it to be, gagged, and silenced, and powerless, as unworthy to have a share in the government of their own country; and this while a troop of English rectors and ex-lieutenant-colonels of the Guards come down once in every six or seven years by the night mail to say who is to sit for such counties as

Selkirkshire, Roxburghshire, and Mid-Lothian? I believe it to be acknowledged on both sides of the House that this state of things is an abuse. No one, so far as I know, attempts to defend it on its merits, except one noble Lord, who argued that the constituency ought to be swamped by voters who did not live in the county, in order to save it from the folly of choosing a Member who had no landed property in the county. We have been told before, and I suppose we shall be told again, that faggot-votes were made by the Liberals as well as the Conservatives. Well, Sir, if that is the case, all I can say is, so much the worse, and so much the more does the existing state of things require to be mended. I am not enough of a moralist to argue the question whether this Party or that is justified in making the most of a bad system to its own advantage; but I boldly and unhesitatingly maintain that the guilt and scandal of a bad system lies with the Party which refuses to remedy it. What, then, is the remedy for this great evil which we all condemn? As long as the county franchise is to so large an extent a property franchise, there is, in my opinion, no direct remedy whatsoever. The revising barrister cannot enter into the question of the motive with which a man has purchased a property, and inquire whether he made the purchase as a profitable transaction, or for the purpose of obtaining a vote. Nor, as long as matters remain as they are, is it easy to insist that the owner of a freehold or a life-rent shall reside for a certain part of the year in the county for which he claims to vote. That would have the effect of converting what is now a property qualification into a pure and simple residential qualification. There is one practical remedy, and one only, and that lies in the proposal now before the House. Give votes to the people who ought to have them, and you will cease to be troubled by the people who ought not. When every householder whose rates are paid has a vote for the county, the abuse of faggot-voting will die away from the root. Even now, as we are told by a most accomplished master of the art, it is getting very difficult to find people who will undertake the expense of buying a vote and undergo the trouble of exercising it. Just think what that trouble is. It is no light thing for an elderly gentleman, however deeply convinced he may be that he is doing his duty to his country, to travel from Edinburgh into Ayrshire, then to cross the sea to and from Bute, then vote in Stirlingshire or Dumbartonshire, and reach home only to start on a fresh campaign in the Highlands, or the Border counties. That is all very well as long as he is one among only 500 or 600 voters who go to the poll; but when everyone of the genuine residents has the suffrage as well as himself—when, instead of exercising the 500th, he exercises the 1,500th part of the voting power of the county—he will soon find a better investment for his money than buying half-shops in Dalkeith and half-cottages in the Western Highlands. Pass these Resolutions, and the House of Commons will very soon have heard the last of faggot-voting. Sir, I notice that when hon. Members are asked at public meetings whether they will vote for household franchise in the counties, they are in the habit of replying that they will support it when it comes in the shape of what is called a well-digested scheme introduced by a responsible Government. Sir, if hon. Members really and sincerely desire to see the franchise extended, surely their best course is to say so plainly by voting for as simple and straightforward a Resolution as ever was laid before the House of Commons. If hon. Members are too coy and delicate to ask for the extension of the franchise, they must not expect the Government to force it upon them. Nothing can be more evident than that the present Ministry is trifling with the question. When the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer was speaking last year, I, who am a great admirer of the thorough and practical manner with which the right hon. Gentleman treats matters with which he intends seriously to deal, was almost astonished at the meagreness, and, I must say, the inaccuracy, of some of his remarks. Almost the only argument that he used which had anything tangible about it, was the contention that if we extended the franchise we should have to re-distribute seats, and that if we re-distributed seats, we might have largely to diminish the Representation of Ireland. This argument depended upon a statement made earlier in the debate by an hon. Member who had announced with great confidence that if seats were re-distributed in proportion to the electors, 55 Members would have to be given to Scotland, and 40 would have to be taken from Ireland, in order that Scotland might have 115 Members and Ireland 61. This conclusion, the hon. Member supported by a very long and imposing series of figures, by means of which he had persuaded himself, and had apparently contrived to persuade the Chancellor of the Exchequer, that if we gave a vote to every house in Scotland and Ireland, the country which contained twice as many houses as the other would be entitled to half as many Members. Sir, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, with his experience and sagacity, ought to have felt certain that there must be some radical error in the calculation in order to bring about such a monstrous conclusion; and I will venture to say that such a blunder was never made in the House of Commons since the day when an hon. Gentleman, who had been astonishing his audience by his assertions with regard to the agricultural produce of the country, discovered, towards the end of his speech, that he had all along been mistaking bushels for quarters. Sir, this hon. Member, whose statement as to the representation of the country was adopted by the Chancellor of the Exchequer, had been calculating the number of electors who would vote in Ireland and Scotland under a system of household suffrage in the counties on the base of the number who at present vote in the towns; but the hon. Member was unaware of the fact, which I should have thought by this time was familiar to all of us, that while household suffrage exists in the Scotch burghs, the Irish borough franchise is limited in such a manner as to exclude something like a majority of the householders. The number of electors in the Irish boroughs, under a franchise which is in no sense household suffrage, is no test whatever of the number of electors who would be on the roll if household suffrage became the law of the land. The real truth is, that whether we take the test of population or the test of the number of inhabited houses, Ireland would gain rather than lose in any fair re-distribution of seats. I am ashamed to detain the House by going through the form of refuting an allegation that, perhaps, I ought to have left to refute itself; but some respect is due to any argument, however flimsy, which is employed by the Leader of the House to dissuade the House from voting for a proposition against which no genuine and serious argument can be found. It is not by elaborate and whimsical statistics that you will persuade the rural householders that they are properly represented. An English county election, as at present conducted, is the most remarkable of political operations. When a contest takes place during the existence of a Parliament, the eyes of the whole nation —sometimes, as in the case of Buckinghamshire two years ago, the eyes of the Continent—are directed upon the district; but the mass of the people who live in the district have nothing to do with the business of the election, except to look on like any other spectators. Nobody appeals to them; nobody canvasses them. They go for nothing in the calculation of election agents. Members of Parliament, the most influential who can be found, are brought down from a distance, and make eloquent speeches, but those speeches are not addressed to them. Look at the election for North Norfolk. I read with admiration the vigorous speeches by which the hon. Member for South Norfolk (Mr. Clare Read) did so much to secure the election for the Government which he quitted so honourably and supports so chivalrously; and I admired the ability of those speeches none the less because they were so exclusively addressed to convince the few who had votes, with little or no reference to the many who had none. The hon. Gentleman's speech at Great Yarmouth, addressed nominally and ostensibly to the whole constituency, was, in truth and in fact, as much a farmer's speech as if it had been made at a 2*s*. ordinary or market day in a county town. I can find in it one reference, and one only, to any legislation, past or future, undertaken for the benefit of the great mass of our rural population, and that is a condemnation, wholesale and most emphatic, of the Act by which every locality was forced to provide education for the agricultural labourers. If every respectable father of a family had a vote, such an appeal as that will hardly be made with success in a future county election. And as it is outside the House, so within these walls. When any class of the existing county electors have a grievance, that class never wants champions in the House of Commons. I do not speak of the gentry. They are here to take care of themselves. If any question is brought forward on a Wednesday which affects the county clergy, there are always plenty of county Members to talk about it, and, if necessary, to talk it out. If the interests of the tenant-farmers are concerned, you, Sir, find it difficult to select among a crowd of county Members the Gentleman who is to play the part of the farmers' friend. But how is it with the agricultural labourer? What are the measures which have affected—or that, if carried, would affect—the agricultural labourer the most? Take the legislation with regard to the preservation of commons, and the conditions on which they are to be permitted to be enclosed. It is not easy to name any class of business done within these walls which more nearly touches the interests of the agricultural labourer; and the hon. Gentleman who is conspicuous among the group of Members who have vindicated those interests is not a county Member, but the hon. Gentleman the Member for Reading (Mr. Shaw Lefevre). Take the question of securing sufficient schooling for the children of the labourer, and preserving them from extreme and premature toil. A Bill securing those objects to a certain extent has been passed with the consent of the House; but the hon. Member who started the question was not a county Member, but a borough Member—the hon. Gentleman the Member for Hackney (Mr. Fawcett). The only Division, as far as I know, which has been taken on the question of extending to the cottages of villagers the same salutary regulations which are provided for the inhabitants of towns by the Artizans' and Labourers' Dwelling Act was taken on the Motion, not of a county Member, but of my hon. Friend the Member for Newcastle (Mr. J. Cowen). The only voice which has been raised against the most demoralizing and indefensible form of truck that ever has existed in this Island—the cider truck in the Western counties, and the beer truck elsewhere, the payment of the agricultural labourers' wages in spirituous liquor, instead of in honest money, against which the labourers themselves, whenever they have an opportunity, earnestly protest—was the voice, not of a county Member, but of my hon. Friend the Member for Sheffield (Mr. Mundella). And we ought not to talk—as we are apt to talk—as if this was a question only of legislation. It is a question of administration likewise. If it is hard for the county householder not to have a voice in saying what laws he wants made for him, it is at least as hard and at least as humiliating that, at a crisis in foreign affairs, he should not have a voice in determining on which side his country should fight, or whether it should fight at all. During the last 12 months we have begun two great wars, and have very nearly been involved in a very great war indeed; and the question whether those wars were just or unjust, necessary or unnecessary, has never been submitted, directly or indirectly—and under the existing franchise cannot be submitted—to the class upon which, of all classes, the burden of war falls the heaviest. What are the classes which in time of war are called on for the heaviest sacrifices? We know what some people mean by sacrifices. A friend of mine who had spoken on the Eastern Question —I will not say in what sense—received a letter of remonstrance of rather an abusive type from a very well-to-do gentleman, which concluded with these words—

> "You may imagine how strongly I feel on this subject when I tell you that I have written this during my dinner-hour."

That self-sacrificing patriot, no doubt, was a voter, and had his say in the question whether or not we should go to war with Russia; but the people whose sons, if such a war took place, would die by thousands, and who themselves would be thrown out of work by hundreds of thousands, and if the war was prolonged, by millions—the people to whom the price of bread really matters, and whom the taxes on tea and sugar pinch—they would have no voice in the matter. When a great war breaks out 10,000 or 12,000 families, and as time goes on, 20,000 or 30,000, will at once be reduced from comfort and plenty to something near beggary by the calling out of the Reserves: 20,000 or 30,000 respectable and hard-working men will lose situations which, in the depression of trade that follows a great war, they are certain not to be able to recover; and not one of those poor fellows, if he lives outside a

Parliamentary burgh, will have any more voice in determining the policy for which he bleeds and suffers than if he were a soldier of the Russian Reserve instead of an Englishman. What do hon. Gentlemen who talk of the despotism of the Russian Government and the helplessness of the Russian people say to that? Sir, on a great occasion the noble Lord at the head of the Government wrote a famous letter which met with the warm approbation of hon. Members opposite. When a strong opposition arose in the country against the Afghan War, the noble Lord refused to receive a deputation composed of private individuals. Her Majesty's Government, he wrote, would be prepared to advise Her Majesty to make certain communications to Parliament. The noble Lord said—

> "This would appear to be a not less satisfactory and scarcely less Constitutional mode of meeting the occasion than a process of Memorials and Deputations."

Sir, in whatever spirit the noble Lord may have written these words, there is no question as to the justice and the wisdom of their substance. Parliament it is that should have the final judgment in these high matters of peace and war. It is Parliament which alone has the right to say whether the money of the nation is being spent, and its blood has been bidden to flow, in a just and righteous cause. But it is a sin and a shame that the House of Commons, on which these grave responsibilities are devolved, is one in which neither vote nor voice is given to two-fifths of the taxpayers and the householders of the country; and any hon. Member who desires sincerely to correct that great abuse will not fail to vote for the Resolutions which I now proceed to move.

Sir CHARLES W. DILKE, in rising to second the Resolution, said, that his hon. Friend (Mr. Trevelyan) had dealt with the criticisms that had been offered to the first of the Resolutions last year. He had done full justice to the clever speech of the hon. Member for West Gloucestershire (Mr. R. E. Plunkett). That hon. Member had contended for the introduction of an educational test. But, on a Select Committee, over the deliberations of which he (Sir Charles W. Dilke) had presided, which had sat in 1876—the Committee on Parliamentary and Municipal Elections—the Opposition had, on the Report, recommended the abolition of the special facilities which now existed, and which the evidence had shown to be greatly abused, for the voting of voters so absolutely illiterate, and, at the same time, so stupid, that they could not, after full previous instruction, make a cross opposite to the right name. Who had opposed that paragraph of the draft Report? The majority of the Conservative Members of the Committee. The paragraph was, however, carried, on a division, by 9 to 6, and reported to the House. Who had refused to act on it? The Conservative majority. He hoped that they would hear no more about illiteracy in these debates. The Chancellor of the Exchequer had appeared last year to be alarmed about the great number of new voters who would come upon the register under the first of the two Resolutions of his hon. Friend. No doubt, a large number of suburban voters would get upon the register, who ought, however, by the admission of all the Conservative speakers, to be on it. He confessed, on the other hand, that, as regarded the agricultural labourers, his fears were in the opposite direction. He did not think that enough of them would get upon the register to make any sensible change. A vast number of them would be disqualified by the arrangements made with regard to the rating of their houses, and a great many by the receipt of medical relief. It was not of the receipt of relief in any form by the men themselves, but by their wives or children, that he was afraid. He held in his hand a letter which would show what he meant. He would name the writer privately—he held a high position in the borough from which he wrote. The letter was as follows:—

> "My dear Sir,—There were 104 names struck off the list of voters for the borough of ——, at the last Revision, by Mr. ——, the Revising Barrister, chiefly, if not wholly, on the ground of medical relief. Thirty-six of them belong to the parish of ——. The books of the parish doctor were produced, and their names were found there, although the only medical relief they had received was a box of pills, which, in the case of some, were given by the doctor to the wives when he met them on the highway. He inquired after their husbands, who were at work, and in their usual health. A certain steward—a well-known violent Tory partizan—induced his employer to pay a doctor for her tenantry, lest the Liberal Party should, after the foregoing example, make reprisals.—Yours faithfully, ——."

That showed how much could be done by a judicious use of the principle of disqualification by medical relief, to thin the "million and a-half of new voters" of whom the Chancellor of the Exchequer was afraid. A Party which would act as he had described, and which also objected in London to the votes of men who had been forced, against their deliberate wish, to send their children to small-pox hospitals for the sake of isolation, on the ground that the father had "received parish relief," would probably have no scruple as to keeping agricultural labourers off the register in a similar way. He thought that a man who was independent enough to resist both temptation and pressure, and clever enough to avoid the traps which would be set for him by deceit, and to get upon the register, might be safely declared by anticipation well worthy of the franchise he would receive. He would be a better voter than the majority of those whose names were at present to be found upon the county registers. He had carefully examined a great number of those registers for himself. Besides the squires, and the rectors and vicars, and the farmers, who were rightly there, he found the parish clerks and sextons—but seldom the curates, who were less trusted by the Tory Party—the gamekeepers, coachmen, gardeners, beershop-keepers, farriers, mole and rat-catchers, and a great number of hangers-on, or persons under influence. Many such were over-rated in order that they might get upon the register, with an understanding that they were to receive coals, wood, rabbits, and other perquisites, to make up for the extra rate. There were also, not only in the Scotch and Welsh, but even in the English counties, a vast number of "faggot-voters." There were a couple of hundred leading Conservative partizans, many of them Members of that House, who had sham qualifications in half the doubtful counties. Those faggot-votes could never be extinguished so long as the present special county franchise continued to exist, and was accompanied by power to be registered and to vote in an unlimited number of different constituencies, and by permission to candidates to pay the travelling expenses of voters. The result was, that county elections averaged in cost £10,000 a-side, and that the representation of many counties was falsified in that House. The Liberal Party could not pause in their endeavours to induce the county to adopt an uniform franchise so long as these abuses continued, or such as had been seen last year at Exeter, when 33 of the tenants of the Chancellor of the Exchequer, and of other Tory landlords, residing in the county round that city, claimed to be put on the borough register for rents of two guineas each for a single house, and so to falsify the opinion of the city of Exeter at the next Election. They were well aware by what means the Conservative Party tried to prevent the adhesion of the country to these reforms. It was the habit of Conservative speakers to proclaim that the result of them would be a large measure of penal disfranchisement. As a fact, there would be no disfranchisement at all. All that could happen in any case would be the loss of an unduly great political influence—not its total loss. No voter would cease to have a vote were their reforms adopted; but he might, in some cases, receive a county vote in exchange for his vote for a borough. He now would leave this branch of the subject with the remark that he and his Friends would continue to believe that the burden of proof lay on those who would exclude—on those who would refuse—the franchise in counties and in towns not specially represented to men in a precisely similar position to those to whom they had given it in other towns, arbitrarily selected. The hon. and learned Member for Salford (Mr. Charley) had told them last year that the extension of the franchise in the counties, without a re-distribution of seats, would be a cruel farce. He entirely agreed with him. The two reforms must go together, or, at the least, the first must quickly be followed by the second. In Ireland, however, the Conservative Party had increased the inequalities of representation by changes in the franchise; and, though pledged to a re-distribution, had never attempted to carry out their promise. Still, he could assure the hon. and learned Member that he felt with him so strongly that one of the chief reasons for which he supported an even franchise was that it was a necessary first step to re-distribution. In the debate of the previous year—and his hon. Friend (Mr. Trevelyan) and he himself

(Sir Charles W. Dilke), having to speak first, were of necessity compelled to turn to it for the arguments of their opponents, the Mover of the Amendment to the Resolutions, the hon. Member for West Gloucestershire (Mr. R. E. Plunkett), had said—

> "People talked of the great Reform Bill and the good it did. . . . Would anybody presume to say that, reading the grounds on which the claims for that Reform Bill were based, he saw such grounds for one now? Could anyone advance arguments now which those who carried that Reform Bill would have deemed sufficient."—[3 *Hansard*, ccxxxviii. 192.]

He (Sir Charles W. Dilke) accepted that challenge. He would take up the glove which the hon. Member had thrown down. He would attempt to make a complete answer to the question of the hon. Member. They had been brought up, all of them—Conservatives and Liberals alike—to look upon the days before 1832 as days of electoral darkness, and on the days since 1832 as days of electoral light. They had had books written for them as histories of the great Reform, from which they had been led to think that the borough constituencies before 1832 had contained only from 2 to 12 voters each, and that the populations of the great towns went wholly without representation. Now, it was true that there had been but 7 voters at Gatton, and 11 at Old Sarum, but those had been exceptional cases, even in the old days. In a good many boroughs the elections had been in the hands of the Corporations; but there were a vast number of boroughs which had had a substantial number of electors, and which were much larger than the smallest boroughs of the present day. It was a remarkable fact that, in spite of the increase in the population, some boroughs before 1832 had had as many electors as they had now. A few had had more. The constituency within the boundaries of which they were now assembled had had 16,000 electors in 1831, and had but 18,000 now. The Resolution of his hon. Friend, with regard to the franchise, had been so drawn as to point specially to the case of Ireland, and to call the attention of the House to the fact that there was a different borough franchise in Ireland to that which prevailed in England at the present day. Now, in 1831, in Ireland, there had been a great number of borough electors. If they omitted from their list the boroughs in which the Corporation had made the return, they would find that in the boroughs of Athlone, Carrickfergus, Clonmel, Cork, Downpatrick, Drogheda, Dungarvan, Kilkenny, Kinsale, Limerick, Lisburn, Londonderry, Mallow, New Ross, Newry, Waterford, Wexford, and Youghal, considered together, there were very considerably more electors in 1831 than there were at the present time. It would be seen that Reform in Ireland had been of what might be called a thoroughly Irish nature. He did not quote figures in any attempt to maintain the paradox that the electoral condition of the Realm before 1832 was fairly satisfactory. On the contrary. It was worse than any electoral system that the world had ever seen, unless it was their electoral system of the present time, which suffered candidates who polled 21,000 votes to be defeated, and candidates to be elected who polled 76, and which had lately returned to that House by a majority of 5, and by a total poll of 95, a gentleman whose vote that day would tie that of each of several Members who represented 23,000 voters apiece. The increase of population in the Metropolitan and manufacturing districts had so increased their electoral anomalies within the last few years, that he replied to the hon. Member for West Gloucestershire by maintaining that they were now of nearly as flagrant a character as were the anomalies removed in 1832. The hon. Member's speech had been one marked by great ability; but on his own statements, both as to illiteracy and as to 1832, his action ought to be opposite of that which it was shown to be by his vote. In the division of the preceding year, upon the Resolutions of his hon. Friend, the existing electoral anomalies had produced their customary effect. Giving to each Member as many votes as represented his whole constituency, divided by the number of Members it returned, they found that the 221 of the minority represented 1,243,000 voters, and the 273 of the majority only 1,106,000 voters. The hon. Member for West Gloucestershire had gone back last year to 1832. He (Sir Charles W. Dilke) would go back a little further. In the wise Report of the great Necker to

Louis XVI., in which he recommended to his King reforms, the frank and timely adoption of which, although it might not have prevented the French Revolution, in one sense of that name, would certainly have prevented its excesses, and saved the King and Queen their lives, that illustrious Minister spoke out upon this question. He penned words of the severest blame directed against those Conservatives who wished that all the bailiwicks of France should be equally represented, whatever their population, for, he said, "this would be to confirm and continue inequalities contrary to the plainest rules of justice." He quoted the most extreme case of possible inequality under such a plan. Vermandois would have had nearly 90 times the electors of Dourdan. "It would have been monstrous," the statesman declared, to have given them equal representation. Wednesbury had 150 times the electors of Portarlington. Those two places had equal representation at present in that House. Fifty existing cases could be quoted in the Realm where the disproportion would be greater than in the extreme case which Necker had cited as the strongest which he could select from among those which had excited his indignation in so high a degree. It was annually contended by one of their three opponents upon that side of the House, of whom two were ex-Cabinet Ministers, and one was dumb—he meant by his right hon. Friend the Member for the University of London—that their system, however ridiculous it might look on paper, gave excellent results. Exactly the same plea had been put forward by the Tories in 1832, and with a great deal of truth. Parliament before 1832, on the whole, had very fairly represented the wishes of the nation. It had been a Tory Parliament during a great portion of their history, between the beginning of the French Revolution and the Reform; but it had been a Parliament which fairly represented the opinion of a Tory nation. The Radical minority and the Whig minority fairly represented, both in opinion and in numbers, the corresponding minorities outside. The plea of virtual representation, however well founded, had, nevertheless, been deliberately over-ruled in 1832. It had been found impossible then—as it must be found impossible now—to defend the system; and it must be admitted that it had been true then, as it was true now, that occasions would, from time to time, arise in which Parliament went wrong, as it would not have gone wrong had it been elected on a better plan. The Reform they advocated would be carried, because there existed with reason now, in the great towns, as there had existed in 1832, a sense of unfair subjection to the small.

Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That, in the opinion of this House, it would be desirable to establish throughout the whole of the United Kingdom a Household Franchise similar to that now established in the English boroughs."—(*Mr. Trevelyan.*)

LORD CLAUD HAMILTON, in rising to move, as an Amendment to the Resolution of the hon. Member for the Border Boroughs (Mr. Trevelyan)—

"That this House is of opinion that it is inexpedient to re-open the question of Parliamentary Reform at the present time,"

said, he had been somewhat disappointed at the speeches which had just been delivered. He was afraid that the hon. Members who made those addresses were somewhat disheartened in the cause they had undertaken; and he had been unable to gather from their observations a single new argument in addition to those which had hitherto been brought forward in support of the proposition of the hon. Member for the Border Boroughs. It might be convenient to look for a moment at the position which the House occupied with respect to this great and important question. It would be in the recollection of those hon. Members who had sat in the Parliament which expired in 1868, that the Reform Act of 1867 had been accepted by hon. Members on both sides of the House as a settlement of the question—he would not say as a final settlement, because no such expression had proceeded from hon. Gentlemen opposite sitting below the Gangway; but as one that, at all events, was to last for many years to come. But what had occurred since? Why, in 1872, just four years and eight months after that supposed settlement of the Reform question had been agreed upon, the hon. Member for the Border Boroughs had brought forward a Resolution with regard to the agricultural labourers and the county franchise. He

(Lord Claud Hamilton) ventured to think now, as he thought then, that although the agricultural labourers occupied a most prominent place in the hon. Member's Resolution, they were merely the excuse and blind for again introducing the subject of electoral reform into that House. It was about that period in the history of the last Parliament that it was found that the tail of the Liberal Party below the Gangway was beginning to lead the head; and it required but little sagacity on the part of those who followed the operations of that distinguished body to perceive that in the Resolution of the hon. Member there was an attempt on the part of the advanced Liberals to bind together their Party in the future by the adoption, not of any mild and hesitating Whig platform, but, when the time came, of one founded on the principles of advanced Democracy. Those who had listened to the hon. Member in 1872 would remember the mild, genial, and persuasive language he had used, and how he had told the House that if they would only adopt his simple measure the agricultural labourer would become perfectly contented, and possibly wealthy, while no harm would be done to anybody. The hon. Member had also urged the necessity for the representation of classes, on the ground that, unless they were so represented, their demands would never receive proper attention; and, curiously enough, he included women among those classes. What did the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Greenwich (Mr. Gladstone) do at that time? He was then Prime Minister, bearing on his shoulders all the responsibilities of Office. The right hon. Gentleman then said, that no doubt the question of household suffrage in the counties must be considered sooner or later. But having said so much, he took care to deprecate any further action in the matter, and added—"That instead of being a small proposal, it was a proposal for a new Reform Bill on a larger scale." He also said that "Parliament had ample work cut out for it for years to come of a character more distinctly practical and less tending, perhaps, to exasperate political differences." But what happened? Had things remained as they were, the question of reform in counties would probably have slumbered for some years. The then Government, however, were beaten, in the month of March of the following year, on the Irish University question, and in July Mr. Trevelyan re-introduced the principle of his Resolutions again to the notice of the House, but, on that occasion, in the form of a Bill. A General Election was impending; and the right hon. Member for Greenwich, who, in the days of his prosperity, had said that the question should be allowed to rest for some years, but was then in the depths of adversity, stated that he was prepared to take the question up, and he at once adopted it as a Party cry, and it had served as a Party cry to hon. Members opposite ever since. It was important for hon. Members on the Government side of the House to remember that this question, viewed from any point, was a mere Party one, and that it was being used for Party purposes. Shortly after the time to which he referred Providence, happily, intervened, and the Government, of which the right hon. Gentleman was the Chief, became a matter of history. Since that time the hon. Member for the Border Boroughs had brought forward his proposition annually; until, in 1877, he succeeded in securing the adhesion to it of the noble Lord the Leader of the Opposition (the Marquess of Hartington). Having thus secured the support of the head of the Whig Party, and, through it, the adhesion of the Party itself, the hon. Member came down last year with a totally new and perfectly distinct proposition, which he flashed upon the House, being satisfied of the pliability of the noble Lord, and of the Whigs, and of the Party opposite. By this amended proposition, the borough franchise in Ireland was to be placed upon the same basis as that of England, and household suffrage was to be extended throughout the counties of Great Britain and Ireland. Now those propositions had been argued in this House, in former years, from three points of view. First, it was said that because a householder living on one side of an arbitrary line possessed a vote, it was therefore a great and absurd anomaly that a man living in similar circumstances on the other side of that line should have no vote—that it was a gross injustice and an insult to his intelligence; secondly, that every householder had an abstract right to a vote; thirdly, that unless every class was specially represented in that House, it could not expect its interests to receive adequate attention. If the House at once desired to rush into equal electoral districts, and to repudiate for ever the system of Parliamentary representation under which England occupied the proud position she now held—namely, a marked distinction between urban and county constituencies, and a variety of franchises as opposed to one uniform franchise—why, then they had better accept that argument, that because A on one side of a line had a vote, therefore B, on the other side of that line, had also a right to a vote. But, in considering so vast a subject as Parliamentary Reform, he hoped the House would have some regard to the experiences of the past rather than putting its trust solely in the experiments of the future, and would recollect that it was to the variety of their franchises, and to that distinction between urban and county franchises which had been jealously observed that they owed so much of the independence of action and diversity of opinion which had in the past distinguished the Members of that House, and had gained for it the pre-eminence it occupied in the eyes of the world. Had every householder an abstract right to a vote? The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Sandwich (Mr. Knatchbull-Hugessen) and the hon. Baronet the Member for Chelsea (Sir Charles W. Dilke) said "Yes;" but common sense distinctly said "No." [Sir CHARLES W. DILKE dissented]. He had drawn the fair inference from the hon. Baronet's argument. If a householder had a right to a vote, why should not every adult also claim a right to a vote, and if they once admitted that a vote was right, how could they prevent women from also claiming that right? Where were they to stop? What was the object of a House of Commons? Why, to govern the country. And what was the object of all franchises? Not to give a vote simply because a vote was asked for, but to intrust votes to those whom Parliament believed to be best qualified to use them for the general good and welfare of the country by returning the best men they could get to represent them in that House. And twice during that century had Parliament considered it wise to extend the basis on which it rested, and to intrust the franchise to larger numbers of its countrymen. But neither in 1832 nor in 1867 were those votes given as a matter of right; they were not asked for as a matter of right. Such an idea was never entertained, and he trusted that an idea so subversive of all the principles of sound government would never be entertained by that House. And then they were told that no class could receive adequate attention to its interests unless it had a direct representation in that House. Why, that was a proposition at direct variance with their past Parliamentary traditions. It had always been their object to get a general representation of interests, not a direct representation of classes. Now, who were two of the leading advocates of class representation? Why, the hon. Member for the Border Boroughs and the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Bradford (Mr. W. E. Forster). The latter said the agricultural labourer was the only class unpresented in that House, and he considered it a monstrous insult that the county franchise should be supposed to represent property and not occupation. But the right hon. Gentleman forgot that there were other meritorious classes in the country who had no special representation in that House; and if he carried out his class theories to their full extent he must be prepared to consider their claims. For instance, the domestic servant was a very large and industrious class. The non-commissioned officers and men of the Army were a special class. The warrant officers and men of the Navy were another. But of all people who would jump at their theory of classes, none would be more eager than the ladies. They had already unfurled their banners and extended their demands. These perpetual raids of the hon. Member for the Border Boroughs on their Parliamentary institutions were very catching, and his strong-minded friends in petticoats were jubilant at what they imagined to be prospect of a new Reform Bill. They now asked that all women who earned money should have votes. They would at once, therefore, have two classes among the women —those who earned by their heads, and those who earned by their hands. But suppose they did enfranchise the labourers, would the right hon. Gentleman then contend that every class was represented in that House? Why, if they carried out those proposals, every class in the country would be unrepresented in this House except one class—the working class—and they by their votes would be able to swamp every other class taken together. But were the labourers unrepresented in that House? He was bound to say he thought such a statement a monstrous libel on the county Members. Was it to be supposed for a moment that the 200 or 300 county Members in that House were so devoid of a sense of justice and English fair play that they declined to listen to any application made to them by any portion of the population they represented? He believed the country labourers of England had just as good a chance of being heard in that House as the artizans in towns, and that the county Members were as ever ready to redress any grievance they might labour under as the borough Members were willing to assist those in their boroughs who might not happen to be included in the franchise. Now, what would be the effect of these proposals on their Parliamentary system? The hon. Gentleman the Member for the Border Boroughs had said the present state of things was a gross anomaly; but if they enfranchised the householders in counties, they would at once have the anomaly of 2,000,000 county voters in England and Wales returning only 187 Members, as against 1,250,000 urban voters returning 300 Members. Their next move to rectify that glaring anomaly would be a re-distribution of seats. But did the House wish, after the large re-distribution carried out in 1867, to embark again upon an enterprize of so delicate and contentious a nature? The first proposal in that direction would be very simple indeed. There were in England and Wales 57, and in Ireland 18 boroughs, containing populations of less than 10,000—a total of 75 boroughs. It would be a matter of extreme simplicity to disfranchise those 75 boroughs, and give their Members to larger centres of population, and that would in itself be a considerable Re-distribution Bill. Had the 75 Members who represented those boroughs seriously considered that question in its extended aspect? Had they consulted those they represented as to whether they wished to lose their privilege of returning a Member of Parliament? Because they should recollect that, in any re-distribution of seats, they would be snuffed out with as little ceremony as a tallow candle. But when they had extinguished the 75 Members to whom he had referred and given their seats to larger towns, the county householder—to whom they proposed to give the franchise as a right, and not as a privilege—would come to them and say—"I vote by right as a householder. What possible right has anybody to a vote in my county for a 40*s.* freehold or a £5 leasehold, or under any franchise, except as an occupying householder?" And then it would be proposed to abolish all property qualifications. Now, he believed the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Greenwich had been consistent all his life in his strong advocacy of property franchises. The right hon. Gentleman had repeatedly upheld them in this House as a necessary and desirable part of their political system. The hon. Member for the Border Boroughs had alluded to faggot-votes in the county of Mid-Lothian; but he had been unfortunate in the instances he had given. He (Lord Claud Hamilton) knew perfectly well what faggot-votes were, and he thought the system of pure faggot-voting exceedingly objectionable; and when the hon. Member thought fit to instance the case of two brothers of his, he was, perhaps, not aware that for over a century his family had had a large country place and property in Mid-Lothian, for which his father, being a Peer, was not qualified to vote. Was the £3,000 a-year which that property produced to go utterly unrepresented? Such a proposal was perfectly ridiculous. Then he had mentioned some gentlemen bearing the name of Scott; but every one of them were near relations of the Duke of Buccleuch, who had large estates in the county; and the Mr. Dundas who had been alluded to by him was heir to the property of Lord Melville, who also lived in the county. But what was the origin of the pure faggot-vote? He held in his hand a volume of the speeches of Richard Cobden, edited by Mr. John Bright and Mr. Thorold Rogers. From this book he found that Mr. Cobden, speaking in London, November 26, 1849, said—

"In that great division (the West Riding of Yorkshire), at present containing 37,000 voters, Lord Morpeth was, as you are aware, defeated on the question of Free Trade, and two Protectionists were returned. I went into the West Riding with this 40*s.* freehold plan. I stated in every borough and district that we must have 5,000 qualifications made in less than two years. They were made. The silly people who opposed us raised the cry that the Anti-Corn Law League had bought the qualifications. Such a cry was ridiculous; the truth was that men qualified themselves with a view to aid the repeal of the Corn Laws. We followed the same plan in South Lancashire, and with a similar result. Our friends walked over the course at the next Election, though at the previous one we had not a chance."

Then, on June 29th, 1877, my hon. Friend the Member for Mid-Lincolnshire (Mr. E. Stanhope), speaking in the House on this county franchise question, quoted another speech of Mr. Cobden, in which he said—

> "When you have a son just coming of age, the best thing you can do is to give him a qualification for the county; it accustoms him to the use of property and the exercise of a vote while you are living and can have a little judicious control over it, if necessary."

[*Laughter.*] No doubt, it was reassuring to some of them who represented property for which their fathers could not vote to have this testimony in their favour. He understood, however, that the hon. Gentleman (Mr. Trevelyan) was accompanied by Mr. Stuart, of Galashiels, the last time he addressed his constituents on this question; and he (Lord Claud Hamilton) was somewhat surprised to find that that gentleman was a faggot-voter of the county of Mid-Lothian. His informant added that Mr. Ralph Richardson, the Liberal agent, held qualifications for Mid-Lothian and Roxburghshire identical in character with those which the hon. Gentleman asked them to challenge; therefore, when the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Greenwich came forward in Mid-Lothian, his own election agent would be able to give him a faggot-vote. The adoption of the principle of the hon. Gentleman's Resolution would abolish the property qualification, and then, having reduced the franchise of the Kingdom to one dull, uniform level, the counties would begin to see that the influence of the towns enormously predominated in this House, and they would say—"You have acknowledged our right to household suffrage; why are we, with populations varying from 100,000 to 300,000, to return only two Members, while towns of 40,000 and 50,000 inhabitants also return two Members?" And what would be said to that by those who advocate the theory of numbers, and the abstract right to a vote? They would be absolutely incapable of replying to it, except in the affirmative; and then the crafty politicians who sit below the Gangway would have gained what in their hearts, he believed, they were really striving for—namely, household suffrage, and equal electoral districts. But they would not stop there, for if every householder had a right to vote, why should not every man have an equal right? Besides, the cry of manhood suffrage would be such an admirable one to re-unite a probably again divided Liberal Party. After all, what harm would it do? Why should not a poor fellow, though he were not a householder, have a vote? Was he not their own flesh and blood? Besides, he considered it a gross slight and injustice that he should not have a vote, when heaps of other men no better than he had votes. Of course, he should have his vote, and there they would be, with universal suffrage, and equal electoral districts—pure, unrestricted, sublime democracy. He would now come to these proposals as they would affect Ireland. The House knew the effect of the last Reform Act on Ireland, and on the Parliamentary representation of that country. They were seldom allowed to forget that. And yet the borough franchise was on a higher basis than in England. Lower it, and they could easily imagine the result. But was Ireland in a condition, under any circumstances, for a new Reform Bill? The last Irish Reform was followed by two great measures, as he considered and should always do, of spoliation and confiscation passed by the last Parliament, on the assurance of those who professed to speak for the disaffected Irish, that they would render Ireland pacific and contented. But what had been the result of that legislation? Was Ireland pacific and contented at that moment? Why, Ireland, he ventured to say, was at the present time as much in a state of "veiled rebellion" as when Mr. Disraeli used that celebrated phrase. It was not for him to state the form that hatred of everything English—everything pertaining to their Constitution—had taken; but that it was as strong as ever no impartial person who lived in Ireland could deny. And the class in whom this rebellious spirit was most deeply rooted was the Roman Catholic peasant. Search Europe all over, and he did not believe they would find any population so ignorant, so bigoted, and so utterly devoid of all appreciation of the principles of government as the Irish Roman Catholic peasant; and yet these were the men to whom the hon. Member proposed to hand over the representation of Ireland —a proposal in which he was supported by the noble Marquess who led the Opposition. He (Lord Claud Hamilton) recollected the noble Lord (Lord Carlingford), then Mr. Chichester Fortescue, on March 17th, 1870, introducing the Peace Preservation (Ireland) Bill into that House. And what were the opening words of the right hon. Gentleman's speech? He said—

> "I rise with very deep regret, but without doubt or hesitation, to perform a duty, the imperative necessity of which must have been felt by all who sit on this Bench, and, I may say, by none more keenly than myself—a duty which nothing but that necessity would have induced us to undertake. The duty is that of proposing to the House a measure for the more effectual maintenance of life and, above all, property in Ireland."—[3 *Hansard*, cc. 81.]

He added, in regard to the National Press—

> "What that literature is is well known. It is well known how it teaches and preaches in every form, with an amount of boldness and audacity varying from week to week, and from month to month, hatred of the institutions and Government of the United Kingdom. It is known how that weekly literature poisons the minds of the people in Ireland who read it against all law and against the Constitution of their country. . . . . It is known how it makes it impossible for those who read that literature, and read none other, to know the truth with respect to public affairs, and the real conduct and intentions of the Government of the country."—[*Ibid.* 100.]

In the year following, the noble Marquess, who had then become Chief Secretary for Ireland, introduced another Bill of the same character—the Protection of Life and Property Bill. Again, in May, 1873, the noble Marquess found the condition of Ireland so unsatisfactory that he was compelled to propose the continuance of the Peace Preservation Bill until June, 1875, as a measure without which the government of Ireland could not be carried on. That was the way the noble Marquess dealt with Ireland when, as a servant of the Crown, he was responsible for its safety, and felt that responsibility. And yet, now, four years afterwards, he had the audacity to support a proposition for placing the exclusive Parliamentary power of Ireland in the hands of the very people whom, when he was Chief Secretary, he was unable to govern except by laws of exceptional stringency. Was the noble Lord so ignorant of human nature, and above all of Irish human nature, to believe that four short years had changed the whole feelings and nature of a people? Did he not know now, as he used daily to learn from his Under Secretary, from the chiefs of the Constabulary, and from those numerous sources open to a Chief Secretary, that sedition was still rife in Ireland; that base murders went undetected; that in many cases trial by jury was a farce, and that the spirit of confiscation was more widespread than ever? Was he not aware that a vile and seditious weekly Press, projected by the so-called Nationalists, poisoned the minds of the people far and wide with its lying and slandering publications? The pernicious teaching of that Press continued unabated at the present day. A few days ago, *The Flag of Ireland* said in reference to the disaster in South Africa—

> "Altogether this is the most cheering news we have had to communicate to our readers for many a day, and we trust that it will prove to be but the precursor of still more gratifying intelligence."

The leader on the subject ended as follows:—

> "God has defended the right; for a more unholy war has never been declared, excepting that against Afghanistan, and that which has been waged in Ireland for 700 years. The marauding hordes have been smitten as if by an unseen hand, as if by a supernatural power sent down from Heaven, as in the case of Sennacherib's ungodly host. *Te Deum laudamus.*"

Again, there had hitherto been one policy on both sides of the House in regard to Irish education. Parliament had repeatedly affirmed the principle of mixed education, whereby children of all denominations might be educated together without detriment to their several religious feelings. It was the only system by which the youth of Ireland could be brought up as united Irishmen, instead of with all the distrust and bitterness engendered by denominational education. And yet the priests hated united education, and would get rid of it if they could. Parliament had also again and again insisted on the principle embodied in the Queen's Colleges, and extended that principle by opening out the honours and emoluments of Trinity College to students of all denominations. But yet the priests hated those Colleges, and would establish a strictly denominational University under a Royal Charter if they could. Even when the late Prime Minister endeavoured to carry out the views of the priests, and proposed to degrade the University teaching of Ireland, Parliament stood firm and would have none of it. But if they gave every householder in Ireland a vote, they would hand the whole representation of Ireland, with the exception of one or two seats in Ulster, absolutely and entirely into the hands of the priests; and where would the settled policy of Parliament be then? They would, as the result, have 94 Obstructionists sitting on those Benches, who would have no option but to obstruct, for their independence would be crushed and their votes controlled by their masters in Ireland. But having discovered their power and received the theory of the rights of man, they would soon push the principle to its logical conclusion, and agitate with their Republican allies in England for manhood suffrage. Ireland under universal suffrage would soon be Ireland independent of England, and hon. Members could then imagine what would soon follow; and yet the noble Marquess supported these propositions. But then the Liberal Party was in want of a cry. Many hon. Members in that House would recollect the reasons the noble Lord at the head of the Government, then Mr. Disraeli, gave for proposing household suffrage in boroughs after throwing out a Bill for establishing a £7 rating franchise. He said that if he selected a £5 franchise, or any other fixed sum as a basis of the suffrage, the moment the Liberals were in want of a cry they would propose a new Reform Bill, accompanied by all the agitation and bitterness of feeling inseparable from such a proposal. Therefore, he proposed househould suffrage as a basis of the borough franchise, with every prospect of its being accepted as a permanent basis. They all felt at the time that so sudden a descent was a somewhat bold experiment; and how had it answered? Why, the prophecies, both of unlimited evil and unlimited good, had been disappointed. But two things were quite clear. Not only had that House suffered in character, but it had also lost much of that individual independence which was the chief glory, and one of the brightest characteristics, of former Houses; while in the borough constituencies it must be evident to anyone who had had practical experience of the subject that there was at present a considerable percentage of voters who were both intellectually and morally unfitted to exercise the franchise. It was, he admitted, no fault of theirs. They had household suffrage thrust upon them without their asking for it, and before they were ready for it. But the fact remained all the same, and the old generation must pass away before the younger and in every respect better educated voters took their place. What was the result of having a large number of voters in possession of the franchise, many of whom were totally ignorant of the most ordinary political knowledge? Let them look at their old friend, the Bulgarian atrocity agitator. Those misguided and designing men, by their misrepresentations, exaggerations, and inventions, raised such a storm of indignation in the boroughs of England that he would admit that, had an Election been held at the time, the Government would have emerged from it without a majority. But why was it? Because at least half the audiences who passed those indignant and violent resolutions were in entire ignorance of the Eastern Question as a whole, and probably quite unaware of the geographical position of Bulgaria. These were town meetings with a low suffrage; but in the counties with a high suffrage, where the voters were more highly educated and better informed, they heard nothing of any such meetings, because their political knowledge enabled them to see the gross humbug of the whole agitation. But how did this agitation terminate? A year afterwards these same voters, having had time for reflection and for acquiring information, discovered that the agitators were wrong, and that the Government was right, and instead of the Government being censured or defeated in its Eastern policy, that policy was approved by majorities in that House treble the number of the usual Government majority. The great danger of a low suffrage coupled with the ballot was the liability of voters to be carried away by a sudden wave of impulse, and to do irretrievable mischief before they had time to find out their mistake. And now, after only 11 years' trial of large urban constituencies, it was proposed to flood the county constituencies with a class of voters, 1,500,000 in number, equal, possibly, in intelligence to the urban voter, but greatly his inferior in education and a general knowledge both of politics and municipal institutions. He was not aware that any real demand ever had been made for the extension of the franchise. Of course, Petitions had been organized, and there had been some talk of a meeting held at Exeter Hall; but it was got up by the Agricultural Union and Mr. Arch, together with the leaders of trades' unions; but they knew what value to attach to such manifestations. Members on that (the Ministerial) side, who lived in the country and daily mingled with the country people, had some right to a better opinion on this subject than the self-constituted champions of the people, who pretended to speak on their behalf; and he would appeal to them whether there had been any genuine agitation in the counties on the question? But what did Mr. Arch and the union leaders tell the labourers would be the result of their having votes? Occasionally, Mr. Arch told them they would get rid of kingcraft and priestcraft, which, in plain English, meant the deposition of their most gracious Sovereign and the Disestablishment of the Church; but he always worked upon the imagination of these men by promising that they would be able to use the franchise as a lever for higher wages. How, he did not state; that might be inconvenient. But the burden of his song was—"Get your vote, and you will get higher wages." If he meant they were to revert to the old system of supplementing wages out of the rates, he could understand Mr. Arch's meaning; but if, by some political process, he meant that the farmer was to be compelled to pay higher wages than those regulated by the only sound process—namely, that of supply and demand, he was at a loss for his meaning. But one thing was clear—the moment these men were in possession of votes some gigantic county agitation was intended. What an admirable moment patriotic Gentlemen opposite had selected for this great social and economic revolution in the counties! Who paid the labourers, and on whom were they dependent as a rule? Why, the farmers; and, taking them as a class, a more industrious, respectable, and loyal body of men was not to be found in the Kingdom. But the farmers had suffered from three years of bad harvest, and last year they had an indifferent one; they had suffered also from the cattle plague; they had the importation of foreign meat to contend with; and if they had a bad harvest this year hundreds of them would be ruined. And that was the time which hon. Members opposite had chosen to introduce a great social and economic revolution throughout the country for the purpose of enabling the labourers to squeeze more wages out of the farmer! Was such a policy a wise one? But what of that—did not the Liberal Party want a cry? It was most gratifying to listen to all the disinterested and philanthropic remarks which fell from hon. Gentlemen below the Gangway, and to witness the zeal they showed for the enfranchisement of the labourer. They doubtless wished him to exercise his franchise to the best of his ability, and with perfect freedom of action. But, judging them by their policy and not by their professions, the very opposite were their intentions. They would wait till he had got the vote, and then use him as a voting-machine, as they were attempting to use the artizan in boroughs, not for his own advantage, but for the sinister ends of the advanced Liberal Party. That contemptible system which emanated from Birmingham, and which even the noble Marquess had not yet swallowed, by which the freedom of the electors was controlled by a wretched caucus, was in full play in many constituencies. But he believed it would not answer; it was too opposed to the free thought and independence of Englishmen. His Amendment said that the present was an inopportune time for reopening the question of Reform; and could anyone doubt it? Even if he admitted, which he did not, the abstract justice of conferring votes on labourers, he should contend that the present was a most unfavourable period for any changes in their electoral body. The whole attention of Government and

Parliament had been concentrated for three years on the progress of affairs in Eastern Europe; and now, for some time to come, their relations with the internal affairs of Turkey in Asia would be of a most delicate character. In North-West India they had to work out a problem of great difficulty, while in Africa their energies were concentrated on the subjection of a nation of savages and the consolidation of their South African Dominion. At such a moment hon. Gentlemen would, if they could, add 1,500,000 voters to the electoral body; but there was not the remotest shadow of a necessity for such a course beyond the mere exigencies of the Liberal Party. Was such a course wise? Was it honest? Was it patriotic? The day might come when Parliament in its wisdom would think fit to make some extension of the county franchise; but he trusted that day was far distant. They had that day a distinct duty to perform—a duty from which he hoped no hon. Member would shrink from a misapprehension of the true nature of this proposal. It was a proposal designed to subvert the whole fabric of their Constitution and to trample under foot the glorious traditions of the British House of Commons. In conclusion, he begged to move the Amendment of which he had given Notice.

Sir CHARLES LEGARD: Sir, I rise to second the Amendment of my noble Friend the Member for King's Lynn (Lord Claud Hamilton). We have heard to-night, as we have heard before, that there is no just cause why the borough franchise should not be extended to counties. Sir, I am bound to admit that that plea alone would carry great weight with it, if it could also leave alone the present Parliamentary representation, without any fresh redistribution of seats; but as that is impossible, and as it would create and diffuse a new and a large voting power over the country, I will endeavour to show why I am opposed to it. It was once said by a great statesman—"All power is, or ought to be, accompanied by responsibility." All power, I venture to say, is vicious that is not accompanied by proportionate responsibility. Personal responsibility prevents the abuse of individual power; responsibility of character is the security against the abuse of collective power, when exercised by bodies of men whose existence is permanent and defined. Sir, I do not suppose there is any hon. Member on this side of the House, any more than there is any one on the other, who fears the mere fact of adding an additional 1,000,000 voters to the Constitution. But that is not all. The last Reform Act was considered a final settlement of the question; but only five years elapsed before the present proposal was made. So that I am justified in believing that, if this measure is now carried, in a very few years we shall have universal suffrage proposed to Parliament. But it has always struck me as extraordinary that there should be hon. Members prepared to entertain the question of a change in so important a feature of the Constitution, without considering in what way that change must affect the situation of the other Members, and the action of the Constitution itself. Sir, I venture to think that the House of Commons must, for purpose of clear argument, be considered in two views. First, with respect to its agency as a third part in the Constitution; secondly, with respect to its composition, in relation to its constituents. As to its agency as a part of the Constitution, I venture to say, without hazard, as I believe, of contradiction, that there is no period in the history of this country in which the House of Commons will be found to have watched more carefully over, and to have occupied so large a share of, the functions of Government as at present. Whatever else may be said of the House of Commons, this one point, at least, is indisputable—that from the earliest infancy of the Constitution the power of the House of Commons has been growing, till it has almost, like the rod of Aaron, absorbed its fellows. I am not saying whether this is, or is not, as it ought to be. I am merely saying why I think that it cannot be intended to complain of the want of power and of a due share in the government as the defect of the present House of Commons. Sir, I admit, however, very willingly, that the greater the share of power of the House of Commons exercises the more jealous we ought to be of its composition; and I presume, therefore, it is in this respect, and in relation to its constituents, that the state of this House is contended to want revision. Well, then, is there any period of our history in which the rights of electors were not as various, in which influence of property was more fairly distributed, in which recommendations of candidates were not as efficient as they are now? Sir, I conclude what the Radical Reformer really desires eventually to effect is a direct effectual Representative of the people; representing them not as a delegate commissioned to take care of their interests, but as a deputy appointed to speak their will. Now, to this view of the matter, I have no other objection than this—that the British Constitution is a limited Monarchy; that a limited Monarchy is in the nature of things a mixed Government; but that such a House of Commons as the Radical Reformer requires would eventually constitute a pure democracy—a power, as it appears to me, inconsistent with any Monarchy, and unsusceptible of any limitation. Sir, for my own part, I am undoubtedly prepared to uphold the ancient Monarchy of the country by arguments drawn from what I think the blessings which we have enjoyed under it; but all I am now contending for is that whatever reformation is proposed should be considered with some reference to the established Constitution of the country. That point being conceded to me, I have no difficulty in saying that I cannot conceive a Constitution, of which one-third part shall be an Assembly delegated by the people, which must, before long, sweep away every other branch of the Constitution that might attempt to oppose or control it. I cannot see how, in fair reasoning, any other branch of the Constitution should pretend to stand against it. If government be a matter of will, all that we have to do is to collect the will of the nation, and, having collected it by an adequate organ, that will is paramount and supreme. By what pretension could the House of Lords be maintained in equal authority and jurisdiction with this House, when once this House should become a direct deputation, speaking the people's will, and that will the rule of the Government? In one way or other the House of Lords must act if it is to remain a concurrent branch of the Legislature. Either it must uniformly affirm the measures which come from this House, or it must occasionally take the liberty to reject them. If it uniformly affirm, it is without the shadow of authority. But to presume to reject an act of the deputies of nearly, if not quite, the whole nation! By what assumption of right could 500 great hereditary proprietors set themselves against the national will? Grant the Reformers then what they ask, and I venture to say that the Constitution will before very long consist only of one body, and that one body a popular Assembly. Sir, I am not aware that hon. Members on either side of the House have any great reason to fear the further extension of the franchise. All I contend is that that should not be granted until the Government of the day think the time has arrived for another Reform Act, which must necessarily bring with it the destruction of many seats which are now worthily held by many hon. Members, and the creation of many new ones; and I need scarcely add that I could hardly hope or expect the borough I have the honour to represent to retain two Members when the measure is passed. And, Sir, as by previous Reform Acts all close and pocket boroughs have been swept away, it is an additional reason why there is no immediate hurry for this measure. Very different was it, Sir, in former times, when the electors in many boroughs had no choice either in the selection or the election of their Representatives, as shown by a letter addressed by the Duchess of Norfolk to her agent—

> "Right trusty and well-beloved, we greet you heartily well; and forasmuch as it is thought right necessary for diverse causes that my Lord have at this time in the Parliament such persons as belong unto him, and be of his menial servants, we heartily desire and pray you that at the contemplation of these our letters, ye will give and apply your voice unto our right well-beloved cousin and servants, John Howard and Sir Roger Chamberlayne, to be knights of the shire."

And, Sir, there is a famous letter from that most famous lady, Ann, Countess of Pembroke, who, amongst her great titles and possessions, was undoubted patroness of the then, I presume, free and independent borough of Appleby. This great lady writes thus to Sir Joseph Williamson, Secretary of State to Charles II., in answer to his suggestion of a Member for the borough of Appleby—

> "I have been bullied by an usurper; I have been ill-treated by a Count; but I won't be dictated to by a subject; your man shan't stand."

Now, Sir, I cannot help thinking that our present representation will bear favourable comparison with the days of one or other of these heroines, and therefore it is I am satisfied with the present system, because it appears to me that a complete and democratic representation, such as the Reformers aim at, cannot exist as part of a mixed Government; and dreading, therefore, the danger of total, and seeing the difficulties as well as the unprofitableness of partial alteration, I object to this step towards a change in the Constitution of this House. Sir, other nations, excited by the example of the liberty which this country has long possessed, have attempted to copy our Constitution, and some have shot beyond it in the fierceness of their pursuit. I grudge not to other nations that share of liberty which they may acquire—let them enjoy it—but let us warn them that they lose not the object of their desire by the very eagerness with which they attempt to grasp it. Inheritors and conservators of rational freedom, let us, while others are seeking it in restlessness and trouble, be a steady and shining light to guide their course, not a wandering meteor to bewilder and mislead them. Sir, it is asked over and over again whether the House of Commons ought not to sympathize with the people. I answer undoubtedly yes, and so I believe the present franchise enables them to do so. But I also maintain that this House does not betray its trust, if on points of gravity and difficulty, of deep and of lasting importance, it exercises a wary and independent discretion. I do not believe at the present time that the changes proposed by my hon. Friend the Member for the Border Boroughs (Mr. Trevelyan) would infuse into the House of Commons a more wholesome spirit. I do not believe that the partial concession now asked would, at the present moment, tend either to reconcile to the frame of the House of Commons those who are discontented with it as it at present stands, or to enable Parliament to watch more effectually over the freedom, the happiness, and the political importance of the country. Sir, I know not whether to-night, or how soon, any change may be considered necessary for the Constitution of this country; but I do know that our lot is at the present time cast in the temperate zone of freedom—the clime best suited to the development of the moral qualities of the human race, to the cultivation of their faculties, and to the security as well as the improvement of their virtues. Let us be sensible of the advantages which it is our happiness to enjoy. Let us guard with pious gratitude the flame of genuine liberty, that fire from heaven, of which our Constitution is the holy depository; and let us not, for the chance of rendering it more intense and more radiant, impair its purity or hazard its extinction.

Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "this House is of opinion that it is inexpedient to reopen the question of Parliamentary Reform at the present time,"—(*Lord Claud Hamilton,*) —instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

MR. OSBORNE MORGAN admitted that the noble Lord (Lord Claud Hamilton), and the hon. Member who followed him (Sir Charles Legard), had made very amusing speeches; but he had some difficulty in answering their arguments, for he was not quite sure that he knew what they were. The faggot-vote system, at any rate, did not become good because it had been endorsed by Mr. Cobden or adopted by the Liberals. Nor did he quite see the connection between the Zulu War and the county franchise. The Amendment of the noble Lord was what, in his (Mr. Osborne Morgan's) Profession, was called a plea in abatement. It did not deny the justice of the original Motion—it only said it was untimely; but why untimely, or when could be a more proper time for discussing the system of representation than when they were about to face a General Election? There had seldom been a time when tamer programmes were presented by both political Parties, for apparently the only two things about which either Party cared was how they were to get buried, and where they were to get their beer. They had had 10 years' experience under household suffrage, and if a mistake had been made in 1867, they ought to have found it out before this. He would challenge the Leader of the

House to say if it was not the case that nearly all the leading Members of the front Opposition Bench and some of the foremost occupants of the Ministerial Bench were the elect of household suffrage, as even the Mover and the Seconder of the Amendment were. Why, then, when such Members were returned by boroughs, should they be afraid of household suffrage in the counties? The boroughs had now flowed over into the counties, and the distinction between them was in many places, particularly in parts of Lancashire and Yorkshire, becoming every day more and more a distinction without a difference; and newspapers circulated in counties as well as in towns. Owing to the spread of education, the agricultural labourer was as much qualified to exercise the franchise as the artizan in towns. Zeal for education and willingness to bear sacrifices for it were nowhere more conspicuous than in the rural districts of Wales. There was, of course, a modicum of drunken, stupid voters in every constituency, whether county or borough; but as to the "wave of democracy" objection, they had as little chance of resisting the wave of democracy by opposing this proposal as the Danish King had of resisting the rising of the tide. It was his belief that the instincts of the peasantry in England, as in France and Italy, were essentially Conservative; but if the Government wanted to make the peasantry revolutionists, let them deprive them of all art and part and the citizenship of the nation. It was an evil that, in any great dispute such as the agricultural labourers had with their employers during the lock-out, one party should be represented in Parliament and the other unrepresented. The man who had a vote always had a champion in the House, and for the sake of justice, and of avoiding the creation of a sense of injustice, the measure should be granted. Their laws took their complexion more or less from the governing class; and hon. Members naturally listened to those who had votes more patiently than to those who had not. Did they think that the Factory Acts or the Mines Regulation Act would have been passed if the classes benefited by those Acts had not been enfranchised? A German gentleman one said to him—"When I read my lease I always think your laws were made by landlords, and not by tenants." Could it be said that their Game Laws, for instance, showed any sign of the handiwork of agricultural labourers? There was now a sense of injustice entering into the question which did not exist before 1867, when a vote was given on one side of a boundary line and not on the other. Nothing could be politic that was not just. There was a finality about household franchise, but there was no principle in a £12 rating. He had always heard it said that it was not safe or comfortable to sit down on an inclined plane; sooner or later you must advance—or descend; and it was wiser now to take the plunge than to linger shivering on the brink. Yet that was the position taken by Parliament in regard to the subject.

MR. WHEELHOUSE said, that if the argument just used by the hon. and learned Member for Denbighshire (Mr. Osborne Morgan) meant anything it meant the full length of household suffrage, and, in opposing the Motion, he would ask the hon. and learned Gentleman, was he prepared to go in for that suffrage in its widest meanings? When the question was answered, then, and not till then, would they really understand where the proposition before the House would lead them. They were told that it was to be a remedy, a sort of panacea for a great evil. Now, he did not hesitate for one moment to express his opinion that the alleged evil only existed in the fervid imagination of hon. Gentlemen on the other side of the House, who were more or less idealists. He was aware, and others on the Conservative side were aware, that the present state of the county franchise was a legacy left them since the days of Richard Cobden. They in the West Riding of Yorkshire remembered very well the time when Mr. Cobden, wisely or unwisely, decided that the West Riding should have 5,000 additional votes. Well, the votes were got, and how were they really obtained? Simply, by the creation of faggot-voters sent from Lancashire to swamp the opinions of residents of the West Riding. Did they imagine for one moment that the people of the great county constituencies forgot what was said and done at the time those votes were created? No. They knew that the attempt was made to swamp them long ago, and they would see in the proposition before the House only an extension of an evil and tyrannical principle. They were aware that it was intended to swamp the genuine opinions of residents in the West Riding, and here was a deliberate attempt to carry out the experiment on a much larger scale just for the advantage of the boroughs, so that not only the West Riding would be inundated by faggot-votes, but every county constituency throughout the length and breadth of the land. They were not prepared to accept the proposal in any stage or form, for they were unfortunately too well aware of the manner in which people in Manchester and other parts of Lancashire could come into the West Riding and create votes which should not exist. Unless the theory of their system of representation was a mockery and a farce, he trusted that, after the House had expressed its decided opinion on the Motion before them, they would not hear of the question again for many years to come. On the other side of the House, there appeared to be some diversity of opinion on the subject. Hon. Gentlemen below the Gangway said—"Oh, change the entire rule, not only of your county franchise, but of the borough franchise also." Hon. Gentlemen above the Gangway said, in a mild deprecating way—"Do not change it at all." Well, the supposed finality of the question had been alluded to, and they all remembered that a certain noble Lord had years ago gained for himself a sobriquet connected with finality which had never left him. He (Mr. Wheelhouse) was not one of those who believed in finality in human or mundane affairs; but what he did believe in was consistency of thought and consistency of action. Some people were prepared to take, not one but 50 leaps in the dark, while others said—"The settlement is final; no change is necessary, and no change ought to be made." Yet all hon. Gentlemen expressing this diversity of opinion sat on the so-called Liberal Benches. They were divided into Whigs and Radicals, who did not hesitate to express their views about an extreme policy in every direction. Well, he would venture to advise the other side, before professing to do anything, first to agree amongst themselves as to the course they should take—let them first be satisfied with their own consistency before they came to ask the House of Commons to help them to do that which was absurd. They were told by the hon. and learned Gentleman that sooner or later they must descend. Now he declined to follow the hon. and learned Gentleman in any descents which he or his Friends might choose to make in connection with this or any other matter. *Facilis descendus Averni.* He declined to go into an abyss of darkness with hon. Gentlemen below the Gangway. Again, he would call their attention to the state of the West Riding. While the county voter had merely his vote, because he was rated at a certain amount, the owner of the property, let him reside where he might, might come into the county in right of his proprietorship and give a vote perhaps in direct opposition to what the residents of the constituency considered their most vital interest. Was it reasonable that they, occupying different statuses in the counties in which they lived, should have their votes rendered worthless by those who could have no possible interest in their circumstances, except that they were the possessors of faggot-votes? The Radicals wished for greater power in that direction, and he sincerely hoped that they would never obtain anything of the kind. Why, if the principle of the Motion was adopted, they could never know for certain what was the state of the overseers' lists, and claimants for votes would suddenly be sprung upon them at a moment's notice, of whose existence they had not been previously aware. It would be said, as in the case of West Yorkshire, such and such a county required 5,000 more voters, and three-quarters of a year afterwards the requisite number of faggot-votes would be in existence. The attempt really was one as undisguised as the unclouded sun on a summer's noonday to wrest from the residents of the counties the little power and authority which was left to them. He knew that those who were proposing the Motion would confess, if they chose to be frank, that they were not doing so really in the interests of the farmer, the resident labourer, or the cottager. No; what they wanted was to aggrandize into their own hands all the power in the country, and by putting the agricultural labourer forward on the same platform with those who had a real residential qualification in the county, deprive property and intelligence of their just rights. It was absurd for hon. Gentlemen on the other side to say that what they wanted was an equalization of votes in borough and county, when they knew very well their real intention was to swamp Conservatism and make every constituency as Radical as it was possible to make it. The question was not for a moment one between Whiggism and Toryism; but it was a question between extreme Radicalism and every other influence in the country. Why should the boroughs get privileges which were not asked for by the counties? They never went into the boroughs to create faggot-votes. Nor did they ask for any so-called equalization of the qualification. He altogether denied the assertions which had been made as to the superior intelligence of the inhabitants of boroughs as compared with those in the counties. No doubt, on some subjects, residents in towns were better informed than those in rural districts; but let them take the results of school board and other examinations, and they would find the balance of intelligence was in favour of the children in the country, and as regarded morality in almost every form, he would say that the cities were far behind the counties. Now, were they who had a fair standard of education, of morals, and intelligence, to be politically swamped by the hordes of large cities? And he would contend that the franchise in this country was not held as a right, but as a trust connected with a right. It was a trust to this extent—that those who had the right to ask for representation, not only asked it for themselves and for their own interests, but as a trust also for those who could not ask for direct representation. From time to time this privilege, connected with a right, had been extended in various directions; but now that a further extension was asked for, it would be well to consider what history taught them—not only their own history but that of other nations—that there was a pace at which it was dangerous to proceed; nor did those who brought the matter forward proceed in the manner with which the House of Commons was most familiar. They did not put the question on a satisfactory footing, for instead of dealing with abstract Resolutions they should be asked, if the cry was a genuine one, to legislate upon it. But the Radicals were endeavouring to get an expression of opinion from an unwilling House—if possible from a divided House—without putting anything very tangible before it. If they really wished to put the question in a practical form, and had really the intention to deal with it, why did they not forego the Resolution and bring forward a Bill? The House would in that case be in a position to judge of what they really proposed to do. Of course, they would be told that a re-distribution of seats necessarily went with an extension of the franchise, such as now proposed. Of course, that was to be expected, that Radicals, having got the power of creating a number of faggot-votes, would like to have the manipulation of the constituencies in their hands. Perhaps hon. Gentlemen below the Gangway thought that the Conservative Party did not understand the meaning of a re-distribution of seats. Well, he knew very well what it meant; and if anyone was ignorant on the subject, let him go to some municipality in which there had been a re-distribution of wards. He would find that the voters did not all fancy the change. Indeed, it was a well-known fact that a re-distribution never took place until those who promoted it were in a position to manipulate the seats. That was the history of Parliamentary life, of Municipalities, of Boards of Guardians, and almost every other public body in the country. They were asked to take this leap in the dark; but he did not think the country was prepared for so dangerous an experiment—dangerous not only in the present state of the country, but dangerous to posterity. Whether the franchise had already been extended too far, he would not say at present. It was a question into which he would not enter; but it was a point on which the country was very divided in opinion. A great deal had been said about the property qualification; but no one suggested at the time of the last Reform Bill that it was ridiculous to fix an arbitrary limit of £10 or £12. No; they were told that it would be dangerous to go below £10 because there was a residuum, and that the very reason why all under the £10 line were to be disfranchised, as they thereby were, was that that class of the population was "drunken, venal, and corrupt." Such was the character given of them by a so-called Liberal Leader in the year 1830 or 1832—a *soi disant* Friend of the people. Now, when it suited another purpose to go lower, they heard nothing of a hard-and-fast line of demarcation, nor did they hear anything of a "drunken, venal, and corrupt" population. They were told, in fact, that there should be no difference made with respect to a money qualification. He thought, and had always thought, that there was no difference between an £8 or a £6, and so on. He had always believed, ever since he could form an opinion on the subject, that those who contributed directly to the taxation of the country should have a voice in the distribution of that taxation; but when it came to a question between the borough and county franchise, he was one of those who said, let well alone. On the whole, the present system worked well, and ought not to be disturbed because of the strong argument put forward from below the Gangway.

MR. COLMAN, in supporting the Motion, expressed his surprise at the remark of the last speaker (Mr. Wheelhouse), that the object of the Motion was to swamp the resident owners by Radical votes. He (Mr. Colman) had carefully looked at the terms of the Motion, and could see nothing which would justify that remark. The Motion was to give votes to householders resident in the counties, and they might be Radical or Conservative. But the hon. and learned Member afterwards, somewhat inconsistently, proceeded to argue that those who contributed to the taxation should have a voice in the management of the taxes, though he satisfied himself by saying the present plan worked well and could not be easily improved. This Motion referred undoubtedly to agricultural votes. As he (Mr. Colman) happened to know something of the agricultural labourers in the districts which would probably be most affected by a measure of the kind, he ventured to say a few words upon the subject rather than give a silent vote. Excluding Cambridge University, as not being in the county itself, and the vote of the right hon. Gentleman who was above Party (the Speaker), he believed that out of the whole of the votes in the four Eastern Counties of Norfolk, Suffolk, Essex, and Cambridge, 32 in number, only two would be given in favour of this Motion. He, therefore, was not wrong in saying that a very considerable proportion of the majority by which the Motion would be rejected belonged to the Members of those agricultural districts. It seemed rather anomalous it should be so. When the noble Lord who moved the Amendment (Lord Claud Hamilton) appealed to his Friends around him, as to whether there was anything in the circumstances to justify them in supporting the Motion, and whether they had heard any appeals from their district for the vote to be given, there was a remarkable silence. He (Mr. Colman) believed there was among the agricultural labourers a very strong desire that they should be admitted to the franchise; and he was borne out in that view by the number of Petitions which he had on various occasions presented to the House in favour of that object from the labourers themselves. Judging from the speech of the noble Lord the Member for King's Lynn, which said that it was not expedient to extend the franchise to the counties at the present time, it appeared to him (Mr. Colman) that the noble Lord was not in favour of any extension —even in the future. The speech of the noble Lord certainly went far beyond the Amendment. Hon. Gentlemen on that (the Ministerial) side of the House, now gave the impression that they had altered their tone in respect of the subject, and that, instead of intending that the Amendment should merely postpone the extension, they meant to defer the question indefinitely. One could well imagine that the farmers, squires, clergy, as a class, and others, did not wish to give up the power they now possessed. He believed, however, that many of them had a strong desire to see the agricultural class enfranchised. The number of voters at present in the districts to which he had alluded was about 100,000, and he believed there would be something like 200,000 or 220,000 if the Motion were adopted. To his own knowledge it was a very common remark at agricultural meetings to hear men say there were three classes equally interested in the soil — namely, the owner, the occupier, and the labourer. Now the latter was the one class which was not allowed to have a voice in that House. He hoped the time was not far distant when hon. Gentlemen opposite would see it was expedient to give their assent to a Motion of the kind. The time would come when matters relating to agricultural affairs would have to be discussed in Parliament, and it was a very anomalous state of affairs that two of those classes should be represented, while the labourer should be excluded. He would ask the attention of the House to the speeches of the hon. Member for South Norfolk (Mr. Clare Read) during the recent contest in North Norfolk, from which speeches it appeared he evinced no desire to add the agricultural labourers to his constituents; but the hon. Gentleman was strangely inconsistent in the views which he developed at a diocesan conference held about the same time at Norwich. When the rules in reference to the election of members of that conference came up for discussion, a resolution was adopted requesting the ministers and churchwardens to invite the adult male members of the parish to participate in the election. The previous suggestion, however, was that only "adult male communicants" should have that privilege. His hon. Friend made a very good speech on that occasion, and said he hoped they would not attempt to limit the constituency by adopting the latter course, so that it amounted to this—that agricultural labourers belonging to the Church of England were qualified to elect members to that conference; but if it should come to the election of a Member of Parliament, they were unfit for such a privilege. He (Mr. Colman) presumed if that conference was not of a legislative character in the broad sense, it had for its object the influencing of the Legislature. If men were qualified for one, there was no reason why they should not be qualified for the other. He trusted the inhabitants of North and South Norfolk would take that to heart. The passing of the present Motion would, in his (Mr. Colman's) opinion, be productive of good, by lifting the labourers from ventilating their grievances as now in the village ale-house, and inducing them to take a greater interest in the affairs of their country. In conclusion, he would merely remark that if, as the noble Lord suggested, it would be a good thing to give a vote to the sons of gentlemen, it must follow that it would be equally as good to invest the agricultural labourer with the franchise.

Mr. ELLIOT, in opposing the Motion, said, that the hon. Member for the Border Boroughs (Mr. Trevelyan) had changed the form of his Resolution. What the object of the change was he could not tell, unless it was to catch the votes of the Irish Members. Hon. Members opposite were very jealous of anything which looked like what was called class legislation; but of all class legislation that could be devised, surely this was above all a piece of class legislation. Its effect would be to place in the hands of one section of the working class the control of the legislation of the country, and it would particularly offend the 40*s.* freeholders, who had worked hard to purchase the freeholds which they held and of which they were justly proud. The hon. Member had not given the House an idea as to the machinery by which he would work out his scheme. It would, he presumed, include re-distribution of seats and disfranchisement. In fact, the great object seemed to be not so much to enfranchise those who were at present disfranchised, as to get rid of the county franchise altogether. Now, he had himself, after much consideration of the subject, arrived at a scheme which he had advocated in a pamphlet published last year, and embodied in a Bill which, if he could not bring forward that Session, he hoped to have an opportunity of submitting next year. Under his proposal, the boundaries of the boroughs would be greatly enlarged, and every householder rated under £12 would be given a vote, while the existing county franchise would not be interfered with. At the present time, however, the House had to deal with the proposal of the hon. Member opposite, and he hoped it would be rejected.

Mr. BRISTOWE said, the hon. Member who had just spoken (Mr. Elliot) had asked by what machinery his hon. Friend's proposal would be carried out. The answer was that the machinery now in operation in the case of boroughs would be amply sufficient for all purposes; for he (Mr. Bristowe) found, from a study of the population Returns and of other Returns before the House, that in the case of no single constituency throughout the United Kingdom would the number of the constituency of Manchester—namely, 62,000 or 63,000, be exceeded. It was, therefore, beside the question to maintain that the new constituencies which might be created would be unworkable. He did not follow the noble Lord the Member for King's Lynn (Lord Claud Hamilton), when he said that their aim was to destroy every system of representation but that of the occupation franchise. If such were the case, he would not support it. If the principle of the Motion were adopted, the result would be that the right of voting would be extended to a class partly urban and partly rural, the former of whom would be practically the same as the existing borough constituencies. It was noticeable that that urban element would be about 25 per cent of the county population; and he could not admit the force of any argument that refused the suffrage to men simply on the ground of their living, not in a borough, but within the county boundaries. He estimated the total county population at 11,270,000, one-seventh of which might, he thought, represent the voting population; from that he deducted the present constituency of about 785,000, which would leave about 825,000 as the number that would be enfranchised if this proposal were adopted. The question had been asked, how could those who represented small boroughs like himself vote for a Resolution of the nature of that proposed by his hon. Friend (Mr. Trevelyan), which would involve a re-distribution of seats? His answer to the question was very simple. Whether the Resolution involved a re-distribution of seats or not, he knew that those whom he represented looked upon this as a great question which ought to be solved and settled; and that if he did not support, as he heartily and sincerely did, the proposal of his hon. Friend, he should have but a small chance, when another General Election came round, of again representing the constituency with which he had now the honour of being connected. Whatever the precise figures might be, the question involved very large issues and deserved the most careful consideration of the House. He had listened very carefully to the speech of the noble Lord the Member for King's Lynn, and had arrived at the conclusion that the arguments in favour of the Motion had in no way been affected.

Mr. WADDY said, that they had been taunted by the noble Lord opposite (Lord Claud Hamilton) with making the question a Party cry. If it were really a Party cry, he (Mr. Waddy) knew what the end would be. They had only to persist in their endeavours to convince the House and the country of the justice of their cause, and they would find it simply a question of time. They might rely upon it, if they themselves did not succeed in settling the question, the Conservatives would ultimately take it up and settle it for them, as they had done other things. In any case, he certainly must decline to fight under false colours; the struggle should be carried on openly, with the avowed object of gaining all the present advantage possible, and as much more as might be obtainable at some future time. The principle for which he contended was that each man should have one vote only, and that in the place in which he lived. They had also been told that this was an unfortunate time to raise the question. It seemed to him a very good time. An appeal to the country must soon be made, and it was desirable to have some good home domestic policy with which to go to the constituencies, after having been kept so long on the tenter-hooks, and after the foreign scares which had occurred year after year. He had heard no reason given why the county franchise should not be extended; and, with reference to the question of "faggot" votes, whatever might be said as regarded them, he held that the creation of votes of that description, on the one side or the other, was equally immoral; that their creation, while perhaps technically legal, was in reality an evasion and a breach of the Constitution; and that the only way to get rid of such a state of things was to insist upon a residence qualification. The existing anomalies were great. In England taken by itself, one out of every seven of the population in the boroughs was an elector, and in the counties only one out of every 14; and it must, moreover, be borne in mind that of the county voters a large proportion had faggot votes. For the whole United Kingdom very similar figures held good. In the counties, again, there was a Member for every 4,874 voters, while in the boroughs there was a Member for every 3,937. What reason could possibly be assigned for this difference? As to the question of re-distribution of seats, he was perfectly ready to admit that it necessarily formed a part of the scheme. Exactly the same anomalies existed in both, and both must go together. In that House 133 Members sat for constituencies of under 2,000 electors. There sat for the whole Kingdom 652 Members. That was to say, one-fifth of the representation of the whole country was in the hands of the electors of those small constituencies. If those small boroughs were allowed to exercise four times the political power that was exercised by such places as London and Birmingham, how could it be said that other country towns containing exactly the same class of people were not qualified to possess the franchise at all? Sooner or later they would have to divide the large boroughs as they divided the counties, and so obtain a system of representation which it would be possible for a man with some care for logic and common sense to defend. He had no doubt they would be beaten in the Division to-night, but after a Session or two of discussion the reform would be effected.

Mr. LEIGHTON said, he was very far from supposing the present representation to be perfect; it was very imperfect in all sorts of ways, and the only justification for things as they were was to be found in the poverty of legislative invention which had not yet discovered a basis of reform both logical and practical. They had listened to a good deal of arithmetic in the course of the debate; but arithmetical calculations did not constitute the sole element, or the most important in the solution of this problem, and if they proceeded upon such lines alone, they would come to a conclusion both one-sided and inaccurate. The idea was based upon a hazy notion that all men were equal, when they all knew that there were not two men equal in all the world. This continual appeal to the simplicity of numbers, and these vain relations which merely showed inequality and disproportion, were beside the mark, and were based upon an unsound foundation. Instead of assuming that the existing state of things in the boroughs was so admirable that all they had to do was to reproduce it in the counties, it would be much wiser to take stock of some of the patent and admitted inconveniences connected with electoral matters in boroughs, and then to forecast, as far as they could, the consequences of extending the same system to the counties. It was admitted by many hon. Members opposite that household suffrage in the boroughs was a failure. It was found that the existing franchise in the boroughs was so cumbrous and unwieldy that it had to be manipulated by the machinery of the Birmingham caucus. The method was instructive. As a perfect representation of opinion in the boroughs could not be obtained under the present system, an arrangement was devised by which the voter was deprived of the privilege given him by the Constitution of selecting a Member to sit in Parliament, and another, with which alone the junior Member for Birmingham (Mr. Chamberlain) thought the household elector could be intrusted, was substituted for it—namely, the privilege of selecting a Member to sit in a caucus. It was not the same thing to sit in a caucus as to sit in the House of Commons, and he thought the borough elector had rather the worst of the bargain. He, for one, deprecated the wholesale disfranchisement by that contrivance of those whom the Constitution had enfranchised. Again, it was most important that there should be easy access to the House for men who, by a long career and considerable labour, had acquired special knowledge. The Indian Service, for example, was hardly adequately represented in that House. During the last few months, when Indian matters had come so much to the front, it was a remarkable fact that the voices outside the House had more weight with the country than those inside of it. Again, they remembered how long the hon. and learned Gentleman the present Solicitor General (Sir Hardinge Gifford) was kept knocking at the door of the constituencies before he could get returned, and that his learned Colleague for Scotland was still kept knocking. The hon. and learned Gentleman the late Attorney General (Sir Henry James) had a tremendous battle to fight for his admission to Parliament. That leader of legal reform, Sir James Stephen, whose legislative capacity was of so high an order that the revision of the Criminal Code had been intrusted to him, also knocked at the door, and was refused admittance. It was becoming more and more difficult for specialists to find their way into the House, when the country had more and more need of them. Success, moreover, was often attended with conditions such as a promise to vote for "Home Rule," or for the release of the "unfortunate nobleman, Sir Roger Tichborne." He was bound to admit that those who were returned in that way did not very often trouble the House with their views on such matters. They, indeed, paid the homage which vice paid to virtue by acting like other men who were free from such pledges; but they kept those passports in their pockets, ready to be reproduced before that section of their household-suffrage constituents who might at any moment call for them. He was himself a Reformer, as might be gathered from his remarks—it was the natural disposition of an independent Tory, like himself, to be so; and he should be happy to assist the hon. Member for the Border Boroughs if he would devise some scheme for abating those electoral nuisances. It would be a more honourable task than the easy and popular one he had undertaken—namely, that of flattering the humblest class of voters, and endeavouring to perpetuate and stereotype the very evils which their enfranchisement had to a certain extent created. If the Resolutions before the House were adopted, their effect would be the disfranchisement of whole classes. It would disfranchise the 40*s*. freeholder and the yeoman. The independent freeholders were still a political power in the State—they were still examples of the broad and deep foundations of liberality on which the British Constitution was based. The next class these Resolutions would disfranchise were the farmers—a class which, according to Mr. Caird, represented an annual interest of £250,000,000. Perhaps those who had been returned by that class would think twice before they adopted the present proposal. Lastly, it was said the Resolution would endow with political life the agricultural labourers. The result would be exactly the reverse. The labourer would not be enfranchised by the Resolutions; on the contrary, the voice of the whole class would be swamped by mingling with it a heterogeneous mass of artizans and unskilled labourers, iron workers, colliers, and others, who had no part or lot, and very little sympathy, with them. At present, under the 40*s*. franchise and the occupation £12 franchise, the agricultural labourers were represented far more than hon. Gentlemen opposite were disposed to admit. The proposal would, in fact, turn counties into nothing but grouped boroughs, and introduce to them the army of wire pullers, who already in the urban constituencies formed so great an element in elections, and who were a scandal to representative institutions. He should oppose the Motion.

MR. LEATHAM: Mr. Speaker, I do not rise with any intention of making a speech; but, if the House will permit me, I should be glad to offer some reply to arguments which have fallen from hon. Gentlemen opposite. And, first, let me congratulate hon. Gentlemen upon the more courageous tone of their speeches. The noble Lord the Member for King's Lynn (Lord Claud Hamilton), at all events, has put his foot down, upon this question; and since he was so loudly cheered by hon. Members upon that side of the House, we may fairly conclude that the Motion of my hon. Friend (Mr. Trevelyan) will henceforth have their uncompromising opposition. Last year, they seemed to be skirmishing with the whole question, and I recollect one hon. Member raising the objection that this proposition, if carried, would augment our election expenses—as though the length of hon. Gentlemen's breeches pockets were a satisfactory standard by which to measure and limit the representation of the people. Now, one hon. Gentleman has told us—reviving an argument of the Chancellor of the Exchequer's—that the House would be unwise to assent to this Motion, because it is in the form of an abstract Resolution, and does not lay down all the details of a plan. But, surely, the constructive feebleness of the Government has not reached this point—that when the House lays down in marked outline what it desires to have done, Government are unable to fill up the details. Right hon. Gentlemen seem to have a positive horror of legislation. They seem to have reduced legislative sterility to a science. It is not enough to abstain from legislating themselves; every avenue to legislation must be jealously guarded. And I should like to know what reforms have ever been carried in this House, the parentage of which is not to be found in abstract Resolutions; and, further, what abstract Resolutions have been carried in this

House which have not resulted in practical legislation? The noble Lord has striven to alarm us by the picture which he has drawn of the immense system of re-distribution which he tells us will be rendered necessary when this Motion is carried. I congratulate the noble Lord upon the sudden and overpowering awakening of conscience. If it be absolutely essential to equalize the voting power of everyone who votes, why do you not set about it now? But if anomaly and inequality in every shape are borne with perfect equanimity by hon. Gentlemen now, why should they become so intolerably frightful the moment that you give votes to those who, by a mere whim of the Constitution, are excluded from them? Give the man a vote, and he will not care very much whether he forms part of a vast or a small constituency; but give him no vote at all, and he feels as though he scarcely formed part of that great self-governing England of ours, of which the right hon. Gentleman the Member for the University of London (Mr. Lowe) is so terribly afraid of losing sight, but of which he is almost equally afraid, lest his poorer neighbours should get so much as a glimpse. The noble Lord has told us that, if we grant what my hon. Friend demands, we shall find no logical resting-place short of manhood suffrage. I wonder whether hon. Gentlemen think that they have found a logical resting-place now. They certainly did not think so when the subject of the county franchise was under discussion, 12 years ago; because they told us then that if we once surrendered the £50 occupation franchise for a £12 occupation franchise, there was no logical reason why you should not surrender the £12 occupation franchise for something lower, and so on, until we reached manhood suffrage. Now, let me say a word or two upon this argument before I go any further, and I will put a parallel case. Suppose that the age of legal ability, and, therefore, of voting ability, had been fixed in this country, as it was fixed in some of the communities of antiquity, at 30, in place of 21, years; and suppose that the idea grew up that, after all, men did reach years of discretion—some do not—before they were 30 years old; and suppose that, in order to give expression to that idea, some hon. Member who busies himself about practical reforms—say my hon. Friend the Member for North Warwickshire (Mr. Newdegate)—brought in a Bill to lower the age of legal ability from 30 to 21 years, what should we think if, for example, the right hon. Gentleman the Member for the University of London should rise in his place, and, with every sign of consternation, denounce such a measure as revolutionary in the extreme, and as leading straight to pædocracy, or government by children; and on this ground—that if we once surrendered the 30 years we should in time be called upon to surrender the 21 years, and so on, until, at last, our voters would present themselves in pinafores, and, perhaps, in the next generation, would arrive at the poll, not, as they do now, in vehicles illegally hired by the candidates, but in the wholly inexpensive conveyance of their mother's arms? Well, so much for this argument; but let me point out that whatever force there may have been in it when it was used 12 years ago, vanishes, nay, turns against you now; because we are not proposing to extend the franchise in this fashion at all. It is perfectly competent to the advocates of household suffrage in counties to point to the permanent basis which Lord Beaconsfield found in a household qualification, and to say that the householder, because he is a householder, has direct relations with the State which are distinct from those possessed by any other person. In proposing household suffrage, therefore, it is we who are proposing the logical resting-place, and you, who cling to the £12 occupation franchise, who are clinging to the dangerous sliding scale. Again, if this argument be good against any future extension of the franchise, against what previous extension would it not have been equally good? If you have the right to ask us to what point we are prepared to descend, we have an equal right to ask you to what point you are prepared to return; and so logically to force you back along the whole way which we have come, until we reach the bad old times of which everybody is ashamed, and to which no one could seriously propose to revert, without expecting to receive an early and somewhat formal visit from a couple of physicians. But even if we were to grant that when this proposal has become law we should be nearer manhood suffrage than we are now, what then? Manhood suffrage may be desirable, or it may not; but what is there in the speeches of hon. Gentlemen to show that it is not? The only approach to argument is a vague expression of disgust for the countries in which manhood suffrage happens to prevail. It would not be difficult to show that we should approach manhood suffrage in this country under widely different conditions from those which are found in America, or in France. But what is there in the recent experience of France or of America so terrific that we can scarcely bear the remotest reference to anything which the French or Americans are doing? Take America. When I think of what has happened in America during the last 20 years, instead of reviling the free institutions of America, I am lost in admiration of their strength. They have enabled America to survive a Revolution which must have been the death or the disruption of any State less strongly constituted; and to survive in such a fashion as to strengthen the hands of Liberty throughout the world. Nor is it to France that we must turn for this solemn warning. France, under manhood suffrage, has risen so completely out of the calamities into which she was plunged by the Imperial system, she has just passed with so much ease and dignity through the last great necessary crisis, and she is in the enjoyment of so much material prosperity in the midst of this universal European gloom that, if her example is to be cited at all, it certainly must not be in political matters, unless we are prepared to initiate the discussion of changes, the bare mention of which no hon. Member would willingly introduce into this House. But why are we to make these foreign comparisons at all? Surely English experience is the best for us, and our experience, since the suffrage has been placed upon a household basis in boroughs, has been such as to encourage us, without misgiving of any kind, to place it on a household basis in counties. I am aware that some hon. Members deny the value of that experience altogether. I remember the hon. Member for Hertford (Mr. Balfour) telling us last year that—

> "An experience of 10 years in one country was far too short to admit of any profitable speculation on so intricate a problem, through the difficulties of which the experience of the whole world was hardly a sufficient guide."—[3 *Hansard*, ccxxxviii. 225.]

Well, Sir, at that rate, I fear that we shall have to solve it without reference to experience at all; since that portion of the population which we persist in excluding from the franchise are scarcely likely to wait for our verdict until the experience of the whole world is at our command. But the noble Lord is a little more explicit. He professes to have discovered the ill effects of household suffrage already in what he calls the deterioration of Parliament.

Lord CLAUD HAMILTON: I said that Parliament had lost in character both within and without.

Mr. LEATHAM: I am amused at the candour with which the noble Lord speaks of the loss of character which has been sustained by the Parliament of which he forms a part. During the 20 years for which, with a short interval, I have had the honour of a seat in this House, there have been times when I, too, have fancied that I had discerned a loss of character in Parliament; but it has always been when hon. Gentlemen opposite have been in power. Parliament is sure to seem to lose character when it has very little to do, and there are no measures of real importance before it. But let the Government give us a Home policy. Let them touch any one of the great questions which are awaiting their solution—for example, this great question, and I will engage to say that they will not long have to mourn over the deterioration of Parliament. But my right hon. Friend the Member for the City of London is more explicit than the noble Lord. In the course of a speech which he delivered upon this subject last year, he seemed to argue that it was the function of this House to resist public opinion. I should like very much to hear my right hon. Friend's notions of what is meant by the representation of the people. We come here, it seems, to represent the people by resisting them. My right hon. Friend spoke at a late hour—so late that I am ashamed to say I dozed during a portion of his remarks; but I distinctly remember waking up with the idea that I had been listening to a speech in "another place"—a place in which there would have been no impertinence—I use the word in no offensive sense—in enunciating them. In enunciating them here, I could not help thinking that my right hon. Friend forgot for the moment, not only the side of the House from which he was speaking, but the House itself. Now, it must have been a very strong motive which induced my right hon. Friend, who is so sound a Liberal upon other questions, to desert his Party upon this cardinal one, and to go and sit with the right hon. Gentleman the Member for the University of London—I do not say in his cave, but in his grotto—for I think the party only musters three, all told. There are the two right hon. Gentlemen, and the one disciple whom they are able to count between them. We know that "the blood of the martyrs is the seed of the Church," and perhaps it is with the view of adding to the number of his followers that my right hon. Friend has proclaimed himself the protomartyr of this new Liberal faith; but he must allow me to remind him that, whatever may be the case in other forms of martyrdom, in political martyrdom there are but few aspirants to the crown. But my right hon. Friend's overpowering fear seems to have been lest, if the agricultural labourers were admitted to the franchise, we might have a feebler administration of the Poor Laws than at present, a little less polical economy, and a little more philanthropy. Now, I am prepared to maintain that it is a scandal—and in this self-governing country a scandal of the first magnitude—that the whole class which, in the rural districts, is chiefly interested in the administration of the Poor Laws, should be absolutely excluded from possessing any voice whatever, not only in the election of those who make these laws, but of those who administer them. And when I hear arguments like that of my right hon. Friend, and those of the noble Lord, I feel inclined to ask myself why it is that we cannot trust our fellow-countrymen? What are the facts upon which we build our theory of misgiving and suspicion, and consequent exclusion? If there are no such facts, surely of all suspicions the most unworthy, of all fears the most cowardly, are those which we permit to arise in our minds with reference to men of the same race with ourselves. If, on the other hand, the facts exist, why do not we hear them? We should then have something tangible to which to reply. Why do you not tell us at once that the men whom we propose to enfranchise are such blackguards that you dare not trust them with the franchise? As regards Irishmen, the noble Lord has already almost told us so to-night. I leave it to Irishmen to defend the character of Irishmen. But the right hon. Gentleman the Member for the University of London has said as much of Englishmen as well. When the borough franchise was under discussion, he told us that to give the franchise to the £6 householder was "to degrade it into the dirt;" and this was very much the line pursued by the right hon. Gentleman all through those delightful speeches of his. I call them delightful, because they delighted everybody, except, perhaps, those who were mainly interested in the question. And this is very much the line which the right hon. Gentleman pursues still. For he tells us that

> "The intellect, and all that adorns the legislation and gives strength to the nation in its Legislature, would be trampled under foot,"—[3 *Hansard*, ccxxxviii. 185,]

if this Motion were carried. And why? Because "the poorest and least educated of the community would become absolute masters of the situation," and, if they have this preponderating influence,

> "And know that they have it, they will be sure to use it, if they think that they can get benefit from it."—[*Ibid.* 184.]

That is, I think, a fair epitome of this portion of the right hon. Gentleman's argument, and it is given in his own words. He argues as though any class which happens to have a numerical majority in the constituencies possessed the whole political power in the State. Now, surely this is the argument of a man whose only estimate of political power is derived from a counting of noses, and who regards the electors as so many units, each possessed of equal weight in the body politic. It is the argument, further, of a man who regards these units or atoms as incapable of any principle of cohesion, except the instinct of the most brutal selfishness, unrestrained by any reference to right and law. Surely, this is an argument altogether unworthy of the intellectual position of the right hon. Gentleman. Why should he, who is the intellectual superior of so many of us, deny the existence of intellectual superiority, and of the prodigious hold which it has upon political power? Why should he, who, in the course of his career, has made so many sacrifices to principle and honour, deny the existence of principle and honour in any class in the State? Does he think that Providence, who has given us so many other good things, has given us also a monopoly of conscience, a monopoly of right feeling, a monopoly of the sense of justice? To listen to the right hon. Gentleman, one might almost think that it was the poor camel, not the rich camel, which found such extraordinary difficulty in getting his humps through the needle's eye. I venture to differ from the right hon. Gentleman. I do not believe in the rascality of classes. I believe that any class in the country, be it high or humble, may, as a class, be trusted to act fairly by every other class, whenever its honest prejudices do not come into play; and I believe, further, that in time, and under the influence of reason, it may be trusted to discard even those. The right hon. Gentleman is fond of putting the landed classes in his pillory, and citing the resistance which they offered to the passing of the great Reform Act, and to the repeal of the Corn Laws, as a proof of his proposition. But I would ask him how long he thinks the Reform Act would have remained unpassed, and the Corn Laws unrepealed, if numbers of those very classes had not bowed before the cogency of argument, and thrown themselves at the very head of the movements which accomplished both? But who was it, who, to the bitter end, resisted either change? Why, the logical progenitors—if I may use the term—of the right hon. Gentleman; the very men whose arguments re-appear in his speeches, and whose argumentative ingenuity he has made his own. I never listen to the right hon. Gentleman's speeches upon Reform without being reminded of the ingenious productions of the artists in mosaics. Those indefatigable gentlemen grope about among the ruins of antiquity in search of their materials. When they have found them, they grind the fragments together into striking designs, and polish the surface of the whole. The right hon. Gentleman is an artist in argumentative mosaics. His designs are striking, his polish is exquisite, his materials are of the most venerable antiquity. You may almost lay your finger upon fragments of verd-antique, and morsels of *sterco imperiale*, upon bits of Burke, and whole slices of Croker. There is hardly an argument adduced by the right hon. Gentleman, which was not answered 45 years ago. There is hardly an argument which would not have remained buried and forgotten, but for the archæological researches which the right hon. Gentleman has instituted upon the spot. What is his great stock proposition? He says—

> "What you have to show is, not that people want this thing or that, or that the people are fit or unfit for exercising it, but that the safety and welfare of the Empire will be promoted by your proposal."—[*Ibid.* 180.]

Well, this is an argument which belonged to the logical edifice of a Party which has now happily passed away, and the edifice along with it. There are several ways of arriving at a Constitution. One is to sit down and put it upon paper, taking care to adjust every part, and nicely to balance every interest. Those who do this invariably tell us that their paper plan is what is best for the safety and welfare of the Empire. There is another method, and it is the one which we have been following for centuries—it is to give the people every right and every privilege which experience proves that they are capable of using well, and to assume that this is what is best for the safety and welfare of the Empire. Now, I very much prefer the method of the centuries to that of the right hon. Gentleman. He would cease enfranchising the moment that he found any one class acquiring a numerical majority in the constituencies, no matter how intelligent or how well qualified the applicants might be. But how could you do this? With the capacity comes the ambition to exercise it. How could you confront and resist that ambition? By force of arms, or by force of argument? You could do neither. Arms would fail you in the presence of numbers; argument would fail you, because reason would be the first to desert to the other side. How can I tell the man who is as well qualified as myself to exercise the franchise—"You must not exercise the franchise, because if you do you may outvote me?" Will he acquiesce in an arrangement which must make me his master in perpetuity, merely because I am afraid of him? Why, Sir, Law and Government themselves would ultimately be in danger, if we were to persist in imposing such a shameful silence upon the people. And because we are not prepared to do this, the right hon. Gentleman threatens us with what? With a descent "far below the level of the United States"—whatever that may mean. Yes, the most amusing thing of all is that the right hon. Gentleman produced the whole of these arguments, and the whole of these prophecies, only 12 years ago. Unabashed by the non-fulfilment of every prophecy in which he then indulged, he comes up smiling, with the innocent assurance of people who are doing the prophetic for the first time. He takes his triumphant stand upon everything which ought to have disappeared—and of all gifts to which a man may lay claim—and few can justly lay claim to more than he can—he selects prophecy as his peculiar *forte*, and prophesies again—

> "It is a revolution," he says, "which we can never undo, and which, when once done, will part us once and for ever from the England which we are all so proud of, and whose history for a thousand years we read with triumph and joy."—[*Ibid.* 187.]

Yes; and what is that history which we read with triumph and joy? Is it not the history of British freedom? Is it not the story of the struggles of a principle, so ancient that our forefathers brought it with them from the forests of Germany, so full of vitality that it has survived conquest, revolution, and civil war? We are persuaded that this ancient conflict has entered upon its last stage, and that the final triumph of this immemorial aspiration is at hand. It has been the boast of previous centuries that, through violence and suffering, they have achieved its victories; let it be ours that, without violence or suffering of any kind, we have closed for ever the passionate controversy of a thousand years.

Sir WALTER B. BARTTELOT said, that, in the hope of learning something new, he had listened with marked attention to the hon. Member for Huddersfield (Mr. Leatham); but the hon. Gentleman's speech had mainly been directed against the right hon. Member for the University of London (Mr. Lowe), who, notwithstanding the criticisms of the hon. Gentleman, had, at any rate, pursued the even tenour of his way with regard to this question; and time would show whether the right hon. Gentleman was right or wrong. The hon. Member had used some very strange, indeed, he might say unjust and ungenerous, language when he asked—Did they think these people were too great blackguards to receive the franchise? That was neither a fair or reasonable way of putting the question. The fact was, men might be very hard-working, honest, and industrious—in short, they might be very good citizens — and yet it might not be wise to intrust them with the franchise. He believed that a fatal mistake was made some years ago, when Parliament departed from the principle that the direct payment of rates should be an essential condition for the exercise of the franchise. The Reform Bill was drawn up on the principle that no one was to have the franchise unless he paid the rates. But to the astonishment of everyone, in a hurry, without any warning, at the dinner-hour that principle was abandoned. Hon. Gentlemen opposite were perpetually dinning into their ears that representation and taxation ought to go together; but now it was proposed to enfranchise people who paid nothing directly towards the expenses of the State. When it was proved that agricultural labourers were willing to take upon themselves those responsibilities which persons possessing the franchise ought to assume, he would be ready to enfranchise them. But the fact was, they paid nothing whatever to the local taxation of the country. It was said that the landlord paid the rates and put them on the rent. But hon. Gentlemen knew that that was not so, and that these men absolutely paid nothing. He would go a step further, though, in doing so, he might cross the path of the Chancellor of the Exchequer. The right hon. Member for Pontefract (Mr. Childers) said, when the last remissions for the income tax were given, that 500,000 persons would derive benefit from what was done. But he would say that direct taxation ought to be borne by everyone who had a vote. Considering the wages that people earned, there ought to be no difficulty in coming to the conclusion that those who had a vote ought to pay, not only local rates, but direct taxation, and a scheme could easily be devised for collecting such taxation. Hon. Gentlemen opposite argued that county government ought to be taken out of the hands of the magistrates, because they were not elected, and taxation and representation did not go together. A great deal had been said as to what had fallen from his noble Friend (Lord Claud Hamilton) with regard to Ireland. But there was not a man sitting below the Gangway and calling himself a Home Ruler who would deny that if in the counties of Ireland, as well as the boroughs, the franchise was extended on the lines now laid down, none but a certain class would be represented in that country, and that was all his noble Friend meant. [MR. PARNELL dissented.] The hon. Member for Meath shook his head. But did that hon. Member himself represent all classes in Ireland, or, he would say, in his own constituency? He was very much mistaken if the hon. Member did. He would put it to the hon. Member whether he would think it more for the interests of his country that hon. Gentlemen from Ireland on that (the Ministerial) side should not have seats in the House? For his own part, he (Sir Walter B. Barttelot) had nothing to say against the labouring classes, but everything in their favour. Some hon. Gentlemen on the other side had been good enough to say that hon. Members on that (the Ministerial) side did not represent the labouring classes. He ventured to say that there were no persons who were more anxious for the welfare of those classes than those who were thrown among them as neighbours and friends, and were mixed up with them in every relation of life. But were they to be told that the franchise was to be extended to men who did not pay even for the education of their children? He was bound to say that since household suffrage had come into play many things had been done in the interests of the working classes which were not for their interests at all. There was the shortening of the hours of labour, for instance. They had been, he would almost say, pampering these men, and now they would not exert themselves to the degree that was necessary to maintain the enterprize of this country in competition with foreign nations. The hon. Baronet the Member for Chelsea (Sir Charles W. Dilke) had said that there were people who would give men medical relief, in order to disqualify them from voting. He was not going to contradict the hon. Baronet, speaking, as he said, on authority; but such a case was of so microscopic a character that they might go over the whole country and not find another like it. But what did it show? It showed, as the right hon. Member for London (Mr. Goschen) said last year, that this class, which comprised such great numbers, did not think it beneath them to receive benefit from the Poor Laws. The late lamented Mr. Cobden had been referred to by his noble Friend in connection with the subject of faggot-votes, respecting which it struck him (Sir Walter B. Barttelot) that the hon. Member opposite (Mr. Trevelyan) appeared not to know much about. He seemed to think that when a man paid his money for a property, and thereby became a voter, that this constituted a faggot-vote; but was he aware that the right hon. Member for Birmingham (Mr. Bright) had done what he could to create votes of the same sort in Lancashire, Yorkshire, and other places. Therefore, the making of such faggot-votes was an old affair. When the man held the parchment which entitled him to a vote, and got the rent for the holding, it was quite right he should vote. There was nothing that made a man so independent as having a cottage of his own, and he was very sorry, and always had been sorry, that the 40*s*. freeholders should have been so much swamped; but if the franchise were extended as was now proposed, they would be swamped altogether. When the men to whom the Resolution referred raised themselves to a position in which they would pay their own rates, and contribute something to the direct taxation of the country, then would be the time to consider whether the county frachise should be extended.

MR. PARNELL: Mr. Speaker, until I heard the speech of the hon. and gallant Baronet the Member for West Sussex (Sir Walter B. Barttelot) I had no intention of saying a word during this debate, and even now I will only venture to say just a very few words —I will not say in reply to what has been said, but rather in reference to something he said. I think, Sir, it is a very lamentable thing to calumniate any person; but I think when hon. Gentlemen and noble Lords in this House undertake, not only to calumniate any individual, but to calumniate a large section of a nation, the position becomes rather more serious. The noble Lord the Member for King's Lynn (Lord Claud Hamilton) to-night spoke of a large section of the Irish people as being ignorant and bigoted. Now, Sir, if a large section of the Irish people are ignorant, it is due to the action of the Party of which the noble Lord is a Member—an action which for centuries has deliberately kept that people in ignorance. But I deny, Sir, that the people of Ireland are bigoted. I stand here as an example of this, and I bear testimony to the fact that I, a Protestant, a member of the late Disestablished Church of Ireland, a member of the Synod, represent the Catholics of Meath. Let the noble Lord, when he charges the Irish people with bigotry, show from amongst his own countrymen such an example as this. The hon. and gallant Baronet the Member for West Sussex asked me, just now, whether I could deny that Irish constituencies were subject to the influences which are supposed to be adopted by me in my views? I can only remind the hon. and gallant Baronet that the two Members of this House whom he, perhaps, thinks the most objectionable—namely, my hon. Friend the Member for Cavan (Mr. Biggar), and myself, are returned to Parliament by county constituencies, and that the valuation of those constituencies is equal to the valuation of the constituency which returns himself. And I think that the hon. and gallant Baronet, if he were to look round the ranks of the Irish Members, would be able to choose many Members representing Irish borough constituencies returned by a very much lower franchise—a franchise which very nearly approaches that desired by the Motion which my hon. Friend (Mr. Trevelyan) has moved to-night. He would find many more of those Members holding opinions in accordance with his own views than he would find among Members representing Irish county constituencies. Well, Sir, I will appeal to the House, in conclusion, whether they think these are worthy arguments? This is a great question—a question upon which depends the future of England—and, I repeat, are these worthy arguments to use in regard to such a question? I think this matter ought to be dealt with without pausing to consider or collect these petty and miserable contingencies and considerations, whether under such a scheme some half-dozen men, more or less, holding particular views, should have seats in this House? I trust that the attention of the House in future discussions upon this franchise question will not be drawn aside by the pursuit of such hares as have been started by the noble Lord the Member for King's Lynn and the hon. and gallant Baronet the Member for West Sussex.

Mr. LOWE: Sir, I have no fault to find with the Mover and Seconder of the Amendment, except that they appear to me to have put rather more zeal into the occasion than was required. The Amendment, which I presume they moved and seconded at the request of Her Majesty's Government, was one which came to neither more nor less than the Previous Question. It was an Amendment saying in substance that, at the present time, it was not expedient to raise the question of lowering the franchise. Such an Amendment as that seemed to require delicate treatment, and I am bound to say it did not receive such treatment from the noble Lord (Lord Claud Hamilton), or the hon. Gentleman (Sir Charles Legard), to whom it was confided. Their arguments went to prove one part of the case—that there ought to be no lowering of the franchise; but as to limiting it in point of time I heard nothing from either of them that went in that direction at all. Seeing that the noble Lord and the hon. Gentleman made such speeches, I am unable to understand why the Government thought it necessary to prepare such an Amendment. Why could they not take the Previous Question? What is the use of translating the Previous Question into other language when we have got a formula so well known to the House? I have exercised myself to find out what is the reason, and—I hope I am not uncharitable—I can only suppose that the reason is that if they had moved the Previous Question nobody outside the House would have understood anything about it; whereas, by proposing the Amendment, they use a formula which may be extremely useful in case of an Election, which cannot now be far distant. Because people must either be on one side or the other; they must either wish or not wish for a lowering of the franchise. If a man wishes for the lowering of the franchise, the Government would say to him—"See what we have done; we said this is not just the time to do this, but we are quite ready and open to consider the question." On the other hand, if a man is against the lowering of the franchise, it would be easy to say—"Why, see what we did; we said that on no account are we to open the question again." It therefore seems to me an ingenious formula, calculated to cut both ways; and if that is not the reason why it was adopted, I profess myself unable to account for it. At any rate, as the noble Lord and the hon. Gentleman, who are in the confidence of the Government, have discharged their office with so much ability, as I believe, to their own satisfaction, and certainly to mine, by proving that it is not desirable to re-open the question, I hope the Chancellor of the Exchequer will see the wisdom of dropping the last clause, which seems to hold out a hope to those who wish for the extension of the franchise, and then there will be no occasion for me to move my Amendment at all. And now I shall be very glad to offer one or two remarks on this very important subject. What I want to point out to the House is this—that this question really depends entirely upon the side from which you view it, and it is no more a wonder than it was in the dispute between the knights about the gold and silver sides of the shield that we do not come to the same conclusion. I do not blame hon. Gentlemen in the least for the view they take; but I do not look upon this question of Parliamentary Reform in the light which hon. Gentlemen do who advocate this lowering of the franchise. They put it as a matter of personal hardship, of inequality, of denying something which is granted to others, and as a matter of justice or injustice, rather than anything else. They treat it as a matter of kindness, fairness, and good feeling, and from that point of view I am not surprised at the conclusion to which they have come. The question is, not whether these views are entitled to respect, but whether that is the real point of view from which we ought to look at it; whether it is not the point of view which, however much they may press it upon us, we ought not to put aside, and for which we ought to substitute a much harsher, drier, less attractive, and sentimental point of view, and one which has the merit that it is founded on truth, experience, and good sense. It is not because I cannot feel for my fellow-countrymen like the rest of you that I have not been able to bring my mind to adopt those arguments held sincerely by many Gentlemen for whom I entertain the highest respect; it is because I believe that that point of view, however seductive and philanthropic, is not the sound and true point of view from which it becomes us, sitting here as legislators for a great country, to look at it. We have to look exactly at the contrary side of the question. We ought to consider, not what is agreeable to the feelings of our fellow countrymen, to the sentiment of equality, not what is popular among them, not what they may like, not any little advantage they may derive from what is proposed; but what we have to prove is that we are really worthy of the place in which we sit, and to perform the duties we attempt to discharge. We ought to consider what will be for the interest of England, not for the little time we fret and strut our little hour upon the stage, and then disappear, but what will be for the interest of England in ages to come. It is because my mind is full of those ideas I have not been able to give—perhaps I have failed very much to give—sufficient attention to the expression and feeling with regard to the case that is made out on the other side. Very much, I believe, depends upon the side of the question you look at. I believe further—and I do not say it for the sake of terrorism or alarm, but simply looking to what seems to me to be the inevitable course of events—if we go on lowering the franchise, nothing on earth can prevent each successive step leading to another lowering of the franchise. The same principles, the same sentiment and feeling of kindness, which I can admire in hon. Gentlemen from whom I differ—all the influences that lead them to a certain point—will be brought into action the moment they have lowered the franchise to induce them to lower it further. I cannot bring myself to believe that when you have lowered the franchise as now proposed you will stop there. It is not possible you can do without a large redistribution of seats, and I cannot believe that re-distribution will be a final one as long as there remain honest, hard-working men, against whom nothing is to be said, who are yet excluded from the franchise by arbitrary and aristocratic rules. I cannot believe that the same state of things which now exists—the same pressure on all sides for lowering the franchise—will not continue to exist. I do not believe that they can stop, as long as there is any grade to which the franchise remains to be lowered. Holding that conviction—which may be erroneous—I ask myself what is the duty of the House of Commons in such circumstances as these? I say it is the duty of the House of Commons to consider what the state of Government at this moment is; what is the state of the country and of our institutions; and how they will be worked upon by the change that is proposed. As to the state of the Government, there are remarks to be made which are extremely important, if hon. Gentlemen would consider them. Most of us have been brought up in the doctrines of De Lolme and Blackstone. We have been told that the English Constitution is one above all that have ever existed; that it is nicely and carefully balanced; that it is made up of different bodies, each of which has proper functions assigned to it, to which it confines itself, and that by the proper discharge of its duty it controls and prevents excess in any of the others. We have Blackstone's theory that the King represents power, the Lords represent wisdom, and the House of Commons represent good intentions; and that each of them discharges its functions, without in the slightest degree trenching upon the functions of the other. We have indulged in these dreams long enough; let us awake from them, and see what is the reality. No doubt, the time was when the King had predominant power in England; but who can say that is the case now? Without going into details, it is sufficient to say that the Regal power is of such a nature now that it really affords no strong or sufficient check or balance at all in our Constitution. Then take the House of Lords. I am old enough to remember when the House of Lords measured itself with the House of Commons, and challenged or overthrew its decisions when they did not meet with their assent. Who can say it is so now? That check also has departed. The fact is, the whole power of Executive Administration is vested in the Government of the day, and that depends for its existence upon the House of Commons; and the whole power of this country—all that we have read of as divided among the different Estates of the Realm—has really now entirely centred itself in the House of Commons, and everything turns upon its will. If that be the case, it is not merely a question whether we shall gratify the wishes and aspirations of a number of people who wish for the franchise; but the question is, what effect will it have on the House of Commons? Because, whatever effect it has on the House of Commons, it will have directly upon the institutions and the very existence of the Empire. I say that, so far from these things being a complicated system of checks and balances, our Constitution has been reduced to a state of what I can only call tremendous simplicity. We have put all on a single foundation; all depends upon the House of Commons, upon their ability to conduct the Business of the State properly; all depends upon their being able and willing to keep the Ministers of the Crown within bounds and to fulfil their duties to the State. We have, instead of a complicated Constitution, the most simple and elementary Constitution in the world now. We have simply an Elective Assembly, and in that Elective Assembly all the powers of the State are really gathered up, and in it they are centred. If that be so, and if that Elective Assembly misconducts itself, the only remedy is to go back to the constituencies from which it is elected, and to refer the matter to them—and from their decision there is no appeal, however momentous it may be. Having a body to which we have given the whole power over the State in this country, which really has the single supreme power which everything bows before, we should take care that it is fit for the discharge of that duty. That is the point of view from which I would suggest that hon. Gentlemen should look at this question; and they should consider whether, in the circumstances which must necessarily arise if we enter upon this downward course we are invited to follow, we can answer for the safety of our institutions.

It appears to me it is impossible for us to be continually lowering the franchise without also continually altering the structure of the House of Commons. It is said that in America this thing is done. Look what America has done, and what we have not attempted to do, to obviate the evils of a very low franchise. I know in America they have nothing to work with but universal suffrage; but look how they vary it. The President is elected for four years by one vote, but his power infinitely transcends that of our Sovereign; and, so long as he keeps himself clear of that for which he can be impeached, there is no power which can assail him. What have we similar to that check on universal suffrage? The House of Representatives is elected by universal suffrage, but the Senate by the States; so that there are different bodies having different bases, while the immensity of America makes it certain that there will be differences which cannot arise in a small compact country like this. And yet, with all these things in their favour, they can only furnish such a Government as they have now. If we approach to a similar level without any of the precautions named, we cannot expect to carry on our Government in a manner worthy of the great trust reposed in us. I am not going to say anything against democracy, except this —there is no instance in history of the durability of a purely democratic Government, where everything was put upon the deliberations of a single Assembly, elected by a certain number of persons, and that should make us pause. If these things are to be considered, they ought to be looked at from the point of view I have ventured to suggest. We ought to elevate our view above the mere question of the little feeling of vexation that might be expressed by persons who are not granted the franchise, and ought to consider whether, by admitting them to the franchise without any attempt at balance, which has now become absolutely impossible, we are not putting the very existence of our institutions in peril and landing ourselves in difficulties from which there will be no retreat. I now apologize to the House for having detained it so long. I have not attempted to go into the details of the argument; but I wanted to impress upon hon. Members that this question is not so easy a matter as they think it is; that failure in it is not the small thing they are apt to think it is. If you go forward and succeed, you may have done well; but you will not be much better than you now are; while, if you fail, you incur nothing less than absolute perdition to the interests of the country; and we must look forward, not to trifling reforms and alterations, but to a reconstruction of the whole framework of the institutions of this country from the very bottom to the top.

MR. KNOWLES: Mr. Speaker, when I entered the House it was not my intention to speak on this Motion; but the remarks that have fallen from several hon. Members induce me to offer a few observations. In the first place, let me say that I am opposed to any reduction in the county, qualification; and in the second place, that I cannot support the Motion of the hon. Member for the Border Boroughs (Mr. Trevelyan) as I think the time inopportune and the question too large and important to be dealt with by an abstract Resolution. Now, I have observed that almost every hon. Member who has spoken on the Opposition side of the House has treated it as if it was the agricultural labourer only whom they wished to enfranchise, and that their only opponents in this House are the squire, the farmer, and the parson. Now, to my mind, this subject is of far wider importance than that of the agricultural labourer. When we come to look around and see the great revolution that our railway systems have made—they have created towns where none previously existed in county parishes all over the country, and these places are populated by the most skilled and best class of artizans, and a class of people most of whom have been imported from our boroughs where they had the franchise and could give their vote. Now, can it be assumed for one moment that these people do not feel aggrieved? It may be said they are represented by the county Members where they happen to be. I admit that is the case; but these people, not having a direct voice in the election of their Member, do not feel that they are represented. Now, by way of illustrating what I mean, those hon. Members who have travelled by the London and North Western Railway, no doubt, have some idea of the importance of Crewe with its population of from 30,000 to 35,000. Very few years since this was an agricultural district with a very small scattered population. Then, again, take Widnes, which has grown since railways were introduced to between 30,000 and 40,000 inhabitants. Then we pass on to Earlestown, with its large railway works and numerous population. Then there are St. Helens and Southport, with, I am told, nearly 40,000 each, and I say that most of this great mass of people are without any direct representation. I mention these places, because during this debate the South Western division of Lancashire has been referred to as the most populous electoral division in the Kingdom, and I refer to them merely as an illustration of what is taking and has taken place all over the country. Now, I will by the permission of the House, refer to what is the position in and adjoining the borough I have the honour to represent. In the Parliamentary borough of Wigan there are about 40,000 people, and just outside that borough, where the houses are almost continuous, there are nearly double that number, or nearly 80,000 inhabitants. Now, Wigan is the market town for this immense population. They are, to a great extent, connected either by relationship or marriage, their occupation is of similar description, they work together in the mines, mills, and workshops; and still, when there is an election, the 40,000 in the borough can take a direct active interest in it, but their 80,000 friends from the outside have to look quietly on. Now, I ask the House, if it can be supposed for one moment that these 80,000 people can feel that they are represented? But while on this subject, I may point out that in 1868 this House ordered a Commission to inquire into the desirability of extending the Parliamentary boundary of Wigan, and I find that that Commission did recommend an extension of the boundary, which, for some reason or other, was not carried out. I do not know why it was not carried out, but the prevailing opinion in the district at that time was, and I believe it was the correct one, that we had then a Liberal Government, and Wigan at that time had two Liberal Members, and it was thought that those people living outside the borough boundary were too Conservative in their views to be enfranchised. Now, I ask the House if these great masses of people can long be left out in the cold, and if some inquiry will not soon be necessary? I fully believe in county and borough representation, and think there are various ways by which these people may be enfranchised—such, for instance, as extending the borough boundaries where convenient, and in grouping large and populous places together; but as the question is a large and comprehensive one, it will require very careful and mature consideration, not by a private Member, but by the Government of the day, whether Conservative or Liberal.

MR. BLENNERHASSETT: Sir, the Amendment which stands in my name on the Paper, to add to the Motion of my hon. Friend, the Member for the Border Boroughs the words—"and to provide, as far as possible, for the fair representation of minorities," is not framed in any spirit of hostility to that Motion. Believing, as I do, that the distinction between the borough and the county franchise is one which should not be maintained, I have always, even before he received the aid of the front Opposition Bench, supported my hon. Friend in his efforts to remove it. I look upon the representation of minorities as the natural and fitting complement to the changes which the Motion before us would make in the electoral system, and I think I can show that my Amendment may be supported on all the strongest grounds on which we have been asked to accept the Motion. Minority representation would secure a more complete reflection of the opinions of the electoral body, and would admit to political power large numbers who at present are unjustly excluded. It would give direct representation to various interests and shades of opinion now unrepresented, and would foster the sense of political responsibility and the spirit of public duty in the minds of those who are careless and indifferent because they are destitute of power. I plead, quite as earnestly as my hon. Friend, for the admission of excluded interests, and the representation of opinions shut out from the means of Constitutional expression. The words which I propose to add express a broad and intelligible principle, which I venture to hope will commend itself to the sense of justice of both sides of the House. It is a principle which is in harmony with what is best in the distinctive doctrines of hon. Members opposite and of those who sit here. The Amendment is strictly limited by practical consideration; it does not contemplate what I freely admit to be impossible—that we should attempt to secure the actual representation of every minority. My hon. Friend has not attempted to produce, nor is he called upon to do so, any detailed scheme for the large measure of re-distribution of seats which he contemplates. I also refrain from asking the House to express a preference for any of the various methods by which the representation of minorities can be effected. Let the principle that minorities ought to be fairly represented be affirmed, and the best means of giving practical operation to that principle will become matter for careful examination and inquiry. For the present, I confine myself to the broad and simple statement, the justice and expediency of which I think it will be hard to contest, that concurrently with the great changes in the electoral franchise and in the distribution of political power, the necessity for which we are asked to affirm to-night, provision shall also be made to secure as far as possible the fair and just representation of minorities. Last Session, when I ventured to call the attention of the House to this subject, the hon. Member for Hertford (Mr. Balfour) said that my Motion was an abstract Motion with aggravating circumstances, because in allusion to the fact that the Resolutions of my hon. Friend had a short time before been rejected, I was offering an antidote after the House had refused to take the poison. I do not regard the proposals of my hon. Friend as poison; but I hope that the hon. Member opposite, and those who take his view, seeing the persistency and determination with which this so-called cup of poison is presented every year, and the great improbability that they will always be in a position to reject it, will admit that it is not inopportune to keep the antidote, if there be one, well in view, and that it is desirable that the public mind and the opinion of Parliament should be as ready for its reception as for the proposals the ill effects of which it may serve to counteract. It would be impossible to exaggerate the large and serious nature of the proposals laid before us by the hon. Member for the Border Boroughs. My hon. Friend wishes to introduce into the electoral body a larger number of new electors than has ever been admitted by any previous Reform Bill. He speaks on behalf of nearly 1,500,000 of our countrymen, who ask to be admitted to a place in the Constitution, and to have a voice in the management of the affairs of the nation. So far as my hon. Friend pleads for enfranchisement, my sympathy is heartily with him. The claims of the great urban population outside the boundaries of existing boroughs to the same rights and privileges as the precisely similar population within the boroughs commends itself to us on the plainest principles of justice. You cannot continue to restrict the rights of citizenship by arbitrary lines drawn upon no intelligible principle, and indicating, in no respect, the presence or the absence of those qualities which fit men to be intrusted with the responsibility of the vote. I am equally ready to admit that the great mass of the agricultural population are wise and prudent in demanding electoral privileges, because they have come to feel, what all experience teaches, that so long as they remain an unrepresented class their interests will never be adequately attended to. I can see as plainly as my hon. Friend that the day of a restricted and arbitrary franchise is at an end, and that it would only weaken and imperil the institutions of the country to adhere with obstinacy to the illogical and discredited methods of the past. Even those who have no sympathy with the plea for enfranchisement cannot fail to see that the ultimate success of that plea is certain. You may, indeed, obtain a temporary triumph in out-voting this Motion to-night. A wave or two may flow backwards, but, all the time, the great tide is steadily rising. It does not need much discernment to see that the change which my hon. Friend proposes must, at no distant date, become an accomplished fact. This change is not only inevitable—it will also be irrevocable. The step once taken, we shall never be able to retract. When you have established a wide democratic franchise all over the country, you will never be able to take that franchise away. Whatever precautions we may adopt, whatever skill we may employ to temper our reforms with wisdom, now is our time. We are asked to make an addition to the county electoral body, so great, that the new voters will far outnumber all the present constituency. This addition will be largely, if not entirely, composed of those who depend on manual labour for their support, and in their hands we are invited to place the power of electing, not a majority merely, but the entire body of the House of Commons. The class on which this tremendous responsibility will devolve is made up of those who have but little education, and the scantiest means of obtaining information on which to form a sound judgment of public affairs, while they are peculiarly exposed to the disturbing influences of distress and privation. I do not wish to press this argument too far. It has often been used against any extension of the franchise which would include the working classes. We have heard it employed, with all the skill of a great master of debate, by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for the University of London. I do not use it for this purpose. But I think these are considerations which may fairly be urged, not against the admission of the working classes, but against their admission in such a way as to give them, at any time they please to exercise it, the power of excluding every other class from any share whatever in the representation. While I am ready, and even anxious, to welcome the working man to the polling-booth, I cannot shut my eyes to the facts. I cannot conceal from myself the probability that the proposal before us, which is presented for our acceptance as a great enfranchising measure to widen, by the admission of many hundreds of thousands of new electors, the basis of popular assent on which the Government rests will have, in some respects, a difficult and even a contrary effect. This great measure of enfranchisement will also operate as a great measure of disfranchisement, and there is no little reason to fear that one of its effects will be to diminish instead of increase the number of those who take an intelligent interest in public affairs, and exercise a reasonable and independent influence on the course of practical politics. Moreover, this great concession of popular right may have results injurious to that sturdy independence of individual opinion, that perfect freedom of thought and action, which it is the highest function of Representative institutions to develop and encourage. Assimilation of the franchise will very largely increase the average size of constituencies. The most perfect electoral machinery, the most complete and elaborate political organization, will be necessary to reach and to wield the new masses of voters. The professional politician, the skilled electioneer, the accomplished and unscrupulous wire-puller will be all-powerful. What will the unfortunate farm labourer or artizan be able to do except to follow blindly where he may be led, and to give his vote at the bidding of others? There is nothing more significant than the recent development of Party organization in many constituencies. I cannot refrain from saying that, from a Liberal point of view, I regard some features of that development with profound regret. I cannot doubt, however, that Party organization, whether Conservative or Liberal, will grow, as time goes on, more stringent, more oppressive, more crushing. Discipline can only be perfected by the surrender of individual will. But what is admirable in a band of well-drilled soldiers may be deplorable in the citizens of a free country. Independence of thought and freedom of action are the salt which keep the public life of the nation sweet. One man who thinks boldly for himself and acts honestly according to his judgment is, to my mind, worth more to the country than a thousand mechanical puppets crowding into the ballot-boxes to register their votes for a candidate of whom they know little and care less, except that he has pronounced the Shibboleths of Party and is recommended by the wire-pullers of some electoral machinery. The Conservative Party, from the nature of its composition, is capable of more perfect discipline, and can be more quietly and effectively organized so as to make the most of its forces, than the Party which sits on these Benches. But the Liberal Party will not be content to leave the direction of affairs in the hands of their opponents, while they believe that better organization would give them the victory to which their numerical superiority in the country entitles them. How far Liberal principles may suffer in the end from the stringent suppression of everything that may cause division in the ranks is not a question to discuss here. I do not care to ask how Liberalism may bear to be divorced from Liberty. The new organization is a great fact. It has received the sanction of high authority, and is directed by earnest and able men who are resolved to make it an effective instrument of Party warfare and a prominent feature in our public life. Thus, even on the side where individual action might naturally be expected most to flourish, the iron hand of Party exigency is beginning to efface every distinctive feature, and to crush out the last traces of personal independence. Nothing could more effectually protect that free and varied character of our public life than recognition of the rights of those minorities who wish to call their souls their own, and are unwilling to play the part of mere pawns on a political chess board. Though there is still a great difference between public life in this country and in America, there are features of American politics which we may study with advantage. An able and eminent American gentleman, whose name many hon. Members will recognize—Mr. Sterne, of New York—has recently drawn attention to the combined results of electoral organization and a democratic franchise in the government of that city—

> "To have," says Mr. Sterne, "by political machinery the franchise so manipulated that before the voter goes to the poll he either knowingly or unwittingly is merely going through a form to give validity and sanction to secret caucus resolutions, is not the exercise of free suffrage. We thought," he regretfully adds, "that it was money and life well expended to secure the freedom of the Negroes in our Southern States, and to wipe out the blot of slavery from our escutcheon. Our better class voters, in our large cities, are as much disfranchised in effect—although in theory and in practice the ballot is given to them—as any plantation Negro was anterior to 1860."

Mr. Sterne, and those who think with him, have tried—of course, in vain—to get the municipal franchise of New York restricted. They would eagerly grasp at the slightest provision by which the voice of the more educated and thoughtful minority would be enabled to make itself heard in the management and control of the enormous taxation of their city. We are asked to enfranchise a large number of persons who have not hitherto had votes. Have we provided that those whose claim to the franchise is already recognized are, in any practical sense, able to exercise it. Are there none of our present electors who, as regards any direct influence they can bring to bear on elections, are labouring under an exclusion from political power as complete and absolute as that to which the unemancipated Negroes of the Southern States were subject? Is it not inconsistent and absurd to talk of calling new classes within the Constitution before we have made sure that full justice is done to those already in? I shall not detain the House by entering into the well-known arguments on this subject. They are familiar to everyone who has studied the Representative system. But, as a simple matter of fact, what voice or influence in the selection of the House of Commons does that large and important portion of the electoral body possess which is in the minority—a minority in many cases permanent—in the various constituencies. There are thousands on the electoral roll, qualified by property, by education, by intelligence, to take a useful part in public affairs who, from their cradles to their graves, are never able to influence in the slightest degree the election of a Member to represent their views. In the words of the illustrious statesman and historian, whose life has been so admirably written by my hon. Friend the Member for the Border Boroughs—words used, if I remember rightly, in the debate on the great Reform Bill of 1832, but equally applicable to the present occasion—

> "We say, and we say justly, that it is not by mere numbers, but by property and intelligence, that the nation ought to be governed. Yet we exclude from all share in the government great masses of property and intelligence, great numbers of those who are most interested in preserving tranquillity, and who know best how to preserve it."

Many of those persons who, under the rough and rude operation of mere majority representation, are excluded from political power are among the very best, the most moderate, the most thoughtful, the most enlightened and independent of the population. Town Conservatives and country Liberals are, as a rule, among the most favourable examples of their respective Parties. Yet, looking even at England alone, to how great an extent are they excluded from political influence. Take county Liberals first. A few days after the subject of minority representation was discussed here last Session, a letter appeared in *The Times* newspaper giving some figures with respect to the exclusion of Liberal opinion in the county representation. I do not know who wrote the letter; but I have carefully verified the figures, and I think they are not unworthy of attention. There are 21 counties in England which have no Liberal county Representative, and the population of these counties amounts to upwards of 13,000,000, or nearly two-thirds of the population of England. The Metropolitan counties —Middlesex and Surrey—with a population of 3,600,000, have no Liberal county Representative. The Eastern Counties, Norfolk, Suffolk, and Essex, with a population of 1,250,000, have no Liberal county Representative. The North-Western Counties, Cheshire and Lancashire, with a population of 3,380,000, have no Liberal Representative. The South-Eastern Counties, Kent, Sussex, Hants, and Berks, have only two Liberal Representatives. And the North Midland Counties, Leicestershire, Lincolnshire, Notts, and Derbyshire, have only two Liberal Representatives. Look at the exclusion of Conservative opinion even during the Conservative re-action of the last General Election, in many of our great towns. There are ten large boroughs with a population of nearly 2,500,000, which have not a single Conservative Representative. The three great Metropolitan boroughs, Finsbury, Lambeth, and Hackney, with close upon 1,200,000 inhabitants, have no Conservative Member. Bristol, with 182,000 inhabitants, and a large number of Conservatives among its 25,000 electors, is represented exclusively by Liberals. Last, though not least, Birmingham, the great home of the caucus, with a population of 343,000 and 63,000 electors, returns three Liberals and not one Conservative. In the only remaining class of constituency the unfair exclusion of the minority is not less apparent. In all the Universities there is a strong Liberal Party. In that which I know best—namely, Oxford—the Liberal minority embrace a large proportion of the men who take the most active and prominent part in University life and work. Yet, what is the state of the representation? Notwithstanding a recent ineffectual struggle, Oxford University returns two Conservatives and no Liberals. Cambridge does the same, and also Dublin. The Scotch Universities, with a single distinguished exception, are represented by Conservatives. I think it was my hon. Friend the Member for Perth (Mr. C. S. Parker) who said that, as regarded the one eminent instance of a Liberal representing an English University—London University was as different from other Universities, being merely an Examining Board, as the right hon. Gentleman who represented it (Mr. Lowe) was different from other Liberals. I know we shall probably be told that these calculations are fallacious, because those who are not directly represented in their own constituencies are represented indirectly by the election in other places of persons holding the same opinions. This is a rough, unsatisfactory, and inaccurate test even of Party predominance. While it allows no scope whatever for the expression of the feelings, interests, and opinions of minorities from mere Party issues, it deprives them of any power to express their confidence in particular men, and it holds out to them not the slightest inducement, beyond what is common to the unenfranchised masses, to concern or interest themselves in public affairs. We are debating whether we shall not admit to the franchise a fresh multitude who will have the power, whenever they choose to use it, of reducing to a condition of political nullity the whole body of existing county electors. Minority representation would not only give a due share of influence to the large unrepresented minorities of which I have spoken, but it is also the only means by which you can protect from political obliteration those who form the majorities in the constituencies as they are at present. Before we hand over the control of the representation to those of whom it has been too truly said that they are "ignorant from want of leisure and irritable from a sense of distress," ought we not to make some provision that those who may have to bow to the supremacy of numbers shall, at all events, be saved from utter and complete effacement. Shall we establish a democratic franchise and neglect even the safeguards with which democracy itself provides us? We may resolve to extend the franchise to that great unenfranchised class for which my hon. Friend pleads; but shall we also practically disenfranchise every class which is now enfranchised? We may be willing to admit, under a wider suffrage, those who are now excluded; but shall we perpetuate the unjust exclusion of that large section of the electorate, which, though possessed of high and undoubted qualification, is at present for all practical purposes absolutely powerless? My hon. Friend proposes a measure of enfranchisement which, if accepted without qualification, will operate as a measure of disfranchisement affecting large numbers of those who on every ground that can fit men for the vote are best entitled to possess it. I accept the enfranchisement, provided only it be complete and just. Against the disfranchisement I most earnestly protest. I have said that I would not enter into any discussion of the various methods by which the representation of minorities may be obtained, nor do I ask the House to express an opinion on the point. This is not because I am afraid to enter into details. On the contrary, I believe there is hardly anyone who will take the trouble to make himself thoroughly acquainted with the details of this subject who will not be impressed with a strong conviction of the justice, the reasonableness, and the practical nature of my proposals. With some forms of minority representation —the restricted and the cumulative vote —we are already familiar. Personally, I am disposed to think that these are imperfect expedients for doing what might be better done by other means. Last Session I endeavoured to point out a way in which the fair representation of every minority worthy of being taken into account could be attained with ease, with simplicity, and with perfect justice. All I ask on the present occasion is recognition of the great principle that minorities should be represented. Full and careful inquiry will afterwards show the best means by which this greatest blemish on our representative institutions may be removed, and free expression be given to the opinions of all who can fairly claim to be heard. The majority of the electoral body must, indeed, enjoy a majority of the representation, and the ultimate expression of the national will must always rest with them. But this is the limit of their right. It may fairly be placed beyond the power of any majority, however great, to monopolize the representation, and altogether to exclude those who differ from them. Let us make certain that in this House, at all events, the better opinion, though it be held only by a few, shall always make itself heard, and that here shall ever be a place where crude and ill-conditioned proposals, popular though they be, shall be submitted to the examination and criticism of varied and independent opinion. It is one thing to allow the will of the majority of the nation, carefully formed and clearly expressed, after full and free discussion, to determine the course of legislation. It is a very different thing to permit the numerical majority of electors in the various districts to silence all opposition at the polling booths, and to exclude those from whom they differ from raising their voices by even a single Representative in what ought to be the Legislature of the whole nation. In presence of the proposals before us this evening, these considerations are grave and urgent. I feel convinced that if the views of my hon. Friend be adopted, without some compensation or counterpoise such as I have indicated, we shall have lost an opportunity, precious it may be, for its briefness as well as for its rarity, and we shall have entered upon an untried and perilous path.

"You know
That these two parties still divide the world
Of those that want, and those that have, and still
The same old sore breaks out from age to age."

To one party, "those that want," we shall give potentially, if not actually, exclusive control over the complex and delicate machinery by which the government of this great Empire is regulated. The other, "those that have," we shall at the same time condemn to political annihilation, and to what, sooner or later, will follow with unfailing certainty on the loss of political power, social downfall, and economic disaster. The assimilation of the franchise is wise and just, and, therefore, if so, let it be done. But let it be accompanied with those safeguards which are essential to the preservation of the characteristic features of the Constitution, and the protection of the rights and liberties of every section of the people. You can easily introduce those safeguards now. As concurrent parts of your scheme of reform, they will be freely accepted by those from whom, the possession of exclusive power having once been tasted, you may vainly seek to win them. If we are to have a fresh Reform Bill, let it be marked by prudence and intelligence as well as by generosity. While we give a hearty welcome to those new comers whose claims to the franchise we frankly admit, let us guard with watchfulness, and preserve with reverent care, the rights and liberties of every section of the community. In the words of one of the greatest of Liberal orators—

> "Let us combat the Spirit of Democracy by the Spirit of Liberty, the wild spirit of Democratic Liberty by the regulated spirit of Organized Liberty."

It is to this end that I venture to ask the House to accompany the declaration in favour of the extension of the suffrage, to which my hon. Friend invites us, with the expression of an opinion that those whose fate it may be to differ from a tyrant majority, should still have a place left them in the Councils of the nation. My hon. Friend asks us to affirm that—

> "It is desirable that political power shall be so re-distributed as to obtain a more complete representation of the opinion of the Electoral Body."

I desire to give point and force to that statement, and to base it on the principles of justice and fair play by adding, in the words of my Amendment—"And to provide, as far as possible, for the fair representation of minorities."

Mr. COURTNEY said, as he did not intend to go into the Lobby with his hon. Friend (Mr. Trevelyan), he would venture to trespass on the indulgence of the House for a short time while he explained why he was unable to do so. He hoped this might be permitted, because it was not usual for a man, especially on a subject of this interest and importance, to separate himself from his Party without explaining the reasons for his action. This extension of the county franchise was certain to come, more especially since the declaration made by the noble Lord (the Marquess of Hartington) in his recent speeches, and notably at Liverpool. Yet, when he was elected a Member of that House, though that was not very long ago, the question was not then part of the Liberal programme. It had never been voted for by the noble Lord, and it was not raised at the hustings when he appeared before the electors. But the noble Lord had since adopted it, and at Liverpool had declared that he was ready to offer it to the country. It, therefore, became essential that a Member who hesitated to accept this proposal in the unqualified way in which it was now put before them should explain why he could not accept it. He regretted extremely that the form the debate had taken had prevented his hon. Friend the Member for Kerry (Mr. Blennerhassett) from moving his Amendment, because, had that Amendment been taken as a qualification of the original Motion, he (Mr. Courtney) would have accepted it; while, as it now stood, he was unable to do so, unless, indeed, the noble Lord, in the speech he was about to deliver, should show some leaning towards that Amendment. He could not accept the position of his right hon. Friend the Member for the University of London (Mr. Lowe), though he sympathized with much that he had said, and appreciated as heartily as he did the evils of their present system. He saw as keenly as the right hon. Gentleman that those evils must be aggravated if the House moved in the direction indicated by the Motion without some Amendment. But he could not rest content in a position of mere opposition, because he felt certain that this Motion would be passed in some way or another within a very few years. There was no real resistance to it from the other side of the House, any more than there was from that—in fact, the hon. Member for Wigan (Mr. Knowles) had told them that his feelings were in favour of it. If those were the views held by those round him, the Motion would soon be passed. Was it not, therefore, the part of a wise man to see if there were not some way by which these changes could be qualified by accepting the good and rejecting the evil of them. He would briefly explain first why he could not accept this Motion, and, in doing so, he was afraid he could not use mincing phrases. It seemed to him deficient both in insight and in foresight. It was deficient in insight, because he could not discover in any speech by his hon. Friend, including that he had made that night, any perception of the great and growing evils which infested their electoral system. It was deficient in foresight, because his hon. Friend had not shown in his address to the House any appreciation whatever of what it was for which he was preparing the country. His hon. Friend did not know what was coming, but he said—"Let us be free, come what may, hoping for good." He might be satisfied with that, but it was not a reasonable hope, unless they had some arguments presented to them recommending the Motion to their intelligence. It neglected, as he believed, the greatest evils of their representative system, while it aggravated others, and led them further and further away from the true method of amending their system. Looking back at the history of this business, they saw that it was hap-hazard legislation. How did it first get introduced? Before the Reform Act of 1867, some hon. Gentlemen achieved distinction by bringing forward proposals of Reform which were consummated in that Act. Seeing the success of their predecessors, it was not unnatural that others should attempt something in the same line. "If all this honour and glory can be secured," they said, "by following up the plans of our predecessors, why should we not do it?" True, it was only gleaning along the old paths—a kind of work, he might remind the House, which was usually left to women and children; but if it was successful, it was successful, and so it was worth the trial. Even in this reckless way of treating a subject, there were two things to be considered. Of the two proposals made before the Reform Act was passed, one came from Mr. Locke King. What had happened? His constituency had rejected him, and the very people whom he brought into existence had turned him adrift. The same thing had happened to Mr. Edward Baines, than whom no man was a better Representative, amiable, excellent, respected by all. Yet he also had been rejected, and at the two Elections since he had not even been brought forward. His hon. Friend was, it was true, exempt from this danger. The danger from his Motion only affected the counties, and, as he was a borough Member, his own seat was safe. He could not, therefore, dig a pit and fall into it himself. But it was worth while for the Liberal Party to consider whether they were not digging pits into which they might fall themselves, though that consideration was not one to which he should pay much attention. His hon. Friend from time to time brought out this Motion of his—and at first it met with very little acceptance. But one day he caught a big fish in his net, the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Bradford (Mr. W. E. Forster), and next year he was able to come down to the House and say that the Leader of the Liberal Party was also prepared to declare himself in favour of the Motion. But what happened? No sooner did success promise, than the hon. Member for Hackney (Mr. Fawcett), who then sat for Brighton, got up and said that the measure could not be passed in that way. It was then a Motion for the extension of the county franchise without any suggestion of re-distribution; and his hon. Friend declared that he would oppose the measure, for which he had hitherto voted, if the Government, taking it in hand, did not add to it a re-distribution of seats. He never could quite understand his hon. Friend's action. What it was right for him to do, it was surely right for the Government to do. He was afraid that that action of the hon. Member for Hackney was simply an illustration of the easy way in which many of them assented to an enfranchising suggestion, or rather was an illustration of the extreme difficulty the Representative of a popular constituency found in opposing an enfranchising suggestion. It was perfectly clear that his hon. Friend had prematurely given his assent to the Motion, for when he saw it was likely to be carried, he said it must be qualified. Since then two Motions had been always put upon the Paper, the second of which was never moved, and in respect of which not one word was ever said. In the course of the speech that night of his hon. Friend (Mr. Trevelyan) not a single reference was made to the second Motion. Therefore, they were now practically in the position against which the hon. Member for Hackney protested, of having before them a mere enfranchising Resolution, and they were going to assent to that, although he held that in that form it was not desirable to accept it. This, then, was the way in which they had gone on, tumbling one over another, one after another giving in, until at last the noble Lord (the Marquess of Hartington) had given in, and the whole Party, with but two exceptions, had given in. The noble Lord was not much given to quoting poetry; but sometimes, in thinking over this subject, he might say to himself in the words of the Laureate—

> "I strove against the stream, but all in vain;
> Let the broad river take me to the main,
> Ask me no more, for at a touch I yield."

The noble Lord was now ready to go to the main; but whether he would sink or swim when he got there he could not tell. They should, at all events, ask themselves whether they would sink or swim before they were tumbling amongst the billows. This Motion, to his (Mr. Courtney's) mind, neglected the great evil of their system, and failed to realize the great object it promised. Why was this Motion recommended to them? It was designed to secure the representation of the agricultural labourer. How? By enfranchising him. But there was a considerable difference between enfranchising a man and giving him representation. They might insure the enfranchisement of the labourer by passing this Motion; but would that give him representation? If it would he should value it much more; but, to his mind, all the arguments of experience were against the suggestion. Nothing would be more valuable than to get a Representative of the agricultural labourers in that House. He would tell them what that class—the true dumb class in their midst—thought of their poor laws, their military system, their game laws, their drinking laws. He would certainly be delighted to have such a man in that House. But would they get him? If they would get him under this plan, why had they not got him already? In these agricultural boroughs, which were, practically, small counties, they had already got household suffrage. But what was their experience of such places? He was told that, if the Bill were passed, Mr. Arch would have the pick of half-a-dozen county divisions. He believed he would be a very valuable addition to the House, and he should be glad to see him in it. But, then, why was he not there already? Why did he not go to Cricklade, a great agricultural constituency? There he ought to be able to get in. A working man had tried Aylesbury, but he never had a ghost of a chance of being returned. Look at Retford again,, which was a little county in itself. They had there the enfranchisement of the agricultural labourer, and they had not got his Representative at all. They had not, in fact, the slightest promise of the realization of the hope, which to him was the greatest hope underlying this proposition. The distinction between enfranchisement and representation was vital. Had they in that House any Representative of the artizans in towns? Those men had enjoyed household suffrage through two General Elections, and yet the House did not contain a single Representative of the feelings, hearts, and interests of the town artizan. Mr. Odger tried at Southwark, but he never had a chance of getting in. Had they in that House a single Representative of the operatives of Lancashire? If they could have their secretaries telling the House what the operatives thought of the present distress, of the present political situation, telling them what they now wrote to the newspapers, they would have some valuable discussion. But they had not in the House a single Representative of that class, and they had not a ghost of a chance of getting them. They must have some entirely new plan, if they wished to secure the representation of the classes now excluded. Since, then, it was the representation of the unrepresented, and not the enfranchisement of the unenfranchised, that they wanted, it seemed that his hon. Friend's Motion would fail to secure the boon they desired. It was too late an hour for him to go into many of the evils of the present system, upon which he should have liked to have dwelt. But he must say that the system did not give any security that even a General Election would bring into the House Members the balance of whose thoughts and feelings would in the least correspond with those of the electors, and there was no security that that would be realized under any such system as that proposed by the hon. Gentleman. By getting the representatives of local majorities scattered about, they only got the representation of local majorities, and the balance of their judgment did not invariably correspond with the balance of the general will of the electors. In the General Election of 1868 Lancashire gave as they knew a decided Tory — Conservative — what might he say—Constitutional Return of 22 Conservatives against 11 Liberals, He had taken the trouble to add up the votes in these Lancashire constituencies, and what did he find to be the result? That was nearly as possible 104,000 Liberal electors voted against 102,000 Conservatives, the latter returning 22 Members, while the 104,000 electors returned only 11. [Sir CHARLES W. DILKE: Hear, hear!] His hon. Friend the Member for Chelsea cheered that statement, and why? Because he had already formed a false deduction from it. His hon. Friend thought it was due to the irregular size of the Lancashire constituencies; but he could assure him it was due to nothing of the kind. They might have constituencies of precisely the same size returning the same number of Members, and yet the division of the electors through those constituencies be so made that the minority of the electors would return a majority of Members. The proposition of the hon. Member for the Border Boroughs would not meet this defect at all, because with equal electoral districts they would still be exposed to the chance of a minority of electors returning a majority of Members. It was highly probable that this would be so if they had a great concentration of one opinion in any set of constituencies. They might have a considerable concentration of Liberals in the towns, where they would be of no use, while in the country they might have a nearly equal division of opinion between Liberals and Conservatives. If they spread the Conservative electors with the greatest economy and the Liberals with the least, the Liberal electors would abound where they were no use, while the Conservatives would exist where they were of the greatest use, and from that would result the conclusion which he had pointed out. The hon. Member for Chelsea had said — "See how things are divided here. On this very question last year there was a large proportion of hon. Members against the Motion, yet the minority in its favour represented a larger number of electors." He might again say that that was a totally unfounded deduction, and that by the simplest possible illustration. Suppose they had two constituencies, one a very big one, in which there were 10,000 voters and a Liberal was returned by a narrow majority of 100, and also a small constituency of 1,000 voters in which a Conservative was returned by a majority of 200. How monstrous, his hon. Friend would say, that a Conservative representing 1,000 voters should counterbalance a Liberal representing 10,000! If, however, they added the two sets of electors together, since there was only a Liberal majority of 100 while the Conservative was 200, the Conservative would really represent the majority of the two constituencies altogether. He had heard an observation just now as to what all this had to do with household suffrage in the counties, and the very fact that that question was asked appeared to him to show that the hon. Member who put it had not reflected on the whole extent of the problem which he had taken in hand. If he had done so, he would have seen that it had a good deal to do with that question. His aim was principally to secure a better representation of the people, and he held that the hon. Member was going away from that end and was leading them farther adrift from it. There was another set of considerations which had something to do with the question. This extension of the suffrage would, of course, increase the number of electors in each constituency, and therefore increase the necessity of the cohesion of Parties in order to carry the constituency. The necessity of cohesion was much larger then than in the case of a small constituency, and the greater the number of big constituencies the more would the necessity be felt throughout the whole of the country for the cohesion of the Party. The mind of the majority of the electors was always directed to this necessity of maintaining this cohesion of Party, and what was the simple and direct effect of that? Suppose a contested election in a populous district; the first thing was to keep the seat. In order to do that they must have a safe candidate – one who would offend no one section of the Party, a man of great moderation, a judicious, moderate, respectable man—a mediocrity, in fact—and the extension of the number of electors in the way proposed would, he believed, result in extending the number of mediocrities in that House; and since mediocrities must depend upon the persons by whom they were supported, upon this depended the question of the character of that House. On that question he did say that there was a degeneracy of the independence of that House. It was indisputable, and he was not afraid to say so, that hon. Members would not stand up and support unpopular measures. They depended upon the masses outside, and these were the people to whom hon. Members were constantly looking. [Mr. LEATHAM: No!] The hon. Member for Huddersfield questioned that; but he (Mr. Courtney) would quote an authority which he, no doubt, would acknowledge. The writer spoke in this way—

> "I am one of those who think the evils of our Parliamentary system very great, and I go so far as to admit that no extension of the suffrage, wise and right as it may be, will cure them. The longer I live the less do I see in the public institutions of our country even a tendency to approximate to an ideal standard. Turning to our own, amid all our vaunted and all our real improvements, I see in some very important respects a sad tendency to decline. It seems to me that, as a whole, our level of public principle and public action was at its zenith in the 20 years or thereabouts which preceded the Reform Act of 1832, and that it has since perceptibly gone down. I agree with Mr. Lowe that we are in danger of engendering both a gerontocracy and a plutocracy."

Now, who was it that expressed those opinions? Why, the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Greenwich.

MR. GLADSTONE said, the report, as quoted by the hon. Gentleman, contained a very remarkable mistake. It should have said that the highest level of public action during the 20 years that "succeeded" the Reform Act.

MR. COURTNEY acknowledged the mistake. He had misread the word. It should be succeeded. The quotation, he might say, was not from a speech, but from a deliberately written article in *The Nineteenth Century*. He confessed that when he read that he thought the passage one of the most perverse he had ever read in his life, and he still thought so. For this reason. The right hon. Gentleman recognized what the hon. Member for Huddersfield would not, a decline in their Parliamentary standard, and a falling off from the position reached in the years immediately following 1832; but he absolutely refused to acknowledge what had caused that falling off, and he refused to associate it with the steady progress of democratic institutions. If the right hon. Gentleman was conscious of this decline, and refused to connect it with the development of democratic institutions, it was surely his duty to offer them another solution. But he offered them none. Did they not see a Bill brought in last year which passed through that House without a Division, because nobody ventured to challenge one, though the right hon. Gentleman the Member for the City of London (Mr. Goschen) got up and said a good many things to show that it was a doubtful transaction. Yet in the other House it was altered, in its vital parts, by a large majority. It was a Bill to amend the Poor Laws in the interests of friendly societies. He was inclined to believe that the Members of the House of Lords were of the same flesh and blood as those of the House of Commons, and to him it appeared a considerable puzzle how Members of the House of Lords, both Liberals and Conservatives, should join to amend in a vital manner a Bill which no single Member of the House of Commons had ventured to oppose. Was it not a fact that they had persuaded themselves to consent to a Bill which they did not like, which they thought introduced very dangerous principles into the administration of the Poor Law, because they had evidence, right and left, that a very large interest was felt in it by a great part of the constituencies which they dared not resist. He ventured to think the evidence of fact led to the truth of that. But that was not all. When he spoke last year on the Motion of the hon. Member for Kerry (Mr. Blennerhassett), he referred to other evils of an aggravated character—he meant the manner in which the opinions of the House was swayed by the oscillations of public opinion outside, and the introduction of popular passion and feeling as a great moving power of legislation. He would refer to two instances, to show the extreme dependence of hon. Members on the movements outside the House. Last year there was a day of great excitement—"black Thursday" it might be called—it was the Thursday after the night on which there was a rumour in the House that the Russians were in Constantinople. The rumour was false, but it was believed. It came at a time when they were discussing the Amendment of the right hon. Member for Bradford. Great anxiety was felt as to what was to be done with the Amendment, and, eventually, the right hon. Gentleman withdrew it. Did he think the

Motion had become false in principle? No; but he thought that the feeling outside was so excited that it would be dangerous to the Liberal Party to resist it. [Mr. W. E. FORSTER: No!] No? Why, on that Thursday, an ardent Liberal, most zealous on the Eastern Question, had come up to him and said that it was no use going further with the Motion. The hon. Gentleman did not doubt his own opinion, but the necessity arose for giving in to the popular feeling outside. If he might be allowed to make another reference to a personal remembrance, he would go back two years. Two years ago they were debating with much energy a question which had since become a burning one, by reason of the unfortunate events in South Africa, and on which he took a strong view. A representative man of the modern democracy had said to him—"Your Party is not with you; your front Bench is against you; the newspapers don't report your speeches; and the people outside don't understand you. You had therefore better give it up." He only cited that as an illustration of the way in which the influences of the people outside were growing, so that the strongest Members in that House altered or suppressed their opinion, on the ground that the masses of the people were against them. The fact was that the dependence of hon. Members upon the feelings of the people outside was growing rapidly, and was undermining their independence of thought. How was all this to be cured? Did it not show the necessity of providing for the representation, not only of the majority, but of the minority, or of what might be termed the totality of the electorate? That had been done in the school boards by the cumulative vote, and there was no reason why the same principle should not be carried out in the representation of the people in that House. They had secured the representation of Roman Catholics, of artizans, and of other minorities on the school boards—minorities which, so far as Great Britain was concerned, found no Representative in that House. If that principle were fully carried out, they might go on extending the franchise as much as they liked, because then, at all events, every class of thinkers would be fully represented; and thus, without extinguishing independence, they might reconcile the progress of democracy with the maintenance of individual liberty. With the permission of the House, he would read one more extract. He did not know whether he was a pessimist in all things, but he was sometimes inclined to think this generation had produced few books that would live. The extract he was about to read was from one that had all the promise of enduring life—the autobiography of a thinker, which told the story of the growth of a mind. He was going to read from Mr. John Stuart Mill's Autobiography—

> "This great discovery, for it is no less, in the political art, inspired me, as I believe it has inspired all thoughtful persons who have adopted it, with new and more sanguine hopes respecting the prospects of human society; by freeing the form of political institutions towards which the whole civilized world is manifestly and irresistibly tending from the chief part of what seemed to qualify or render doubtful its ultimate benefits. Minorities, so long as they remain minorities, are and ought to be outvoted; but under arrangements which enable any assemblage of voters, amounting to a certain number, to place in the Legislature a representative of its own choice, minorities cannot be suppressed. Independent opinions will force their way into the Council of the nation and make themselves heard there—a thing which cannot happen in the existing forms of representative democracy; and the Legislature, instead of being weeded of individual peculiarities and entirely made up of men who simply represent the creed of great political or religious parties, will comprise a large proportion of the most eminent individual minds in the country, placed there, without reference to Party, by voters who appreciate their individual eminence. I can understand that persons, otherwise intelligent, should, for want of sufficient examination, be repelled from Mr. Hare's plan by what they think the complex nature of its machinery."

And he begged attention to this sentence, for to him it did seem most pregnant—

> "But anyone who does not feel the want which the scheme is intended to supply, anyone who throws it over as a mere theoretical subtlety or crotchet, tending to no valuable purpose and unworthy of the attention of practical men, may be pronounced an incompetent statesman, unequal to the politics of the future."

Then came a little consolation for some of those who might have felt the force of the last words—

> "I mean unless he is a Minister, or aspires to become one; for we are quite accustomed to a Minister continuing to profess unqualified hostility to an improvement almost to the very day when his conscience, or interest, induces him to take it up as a public measure and carry it."

He believed most solemnly those words.

That was a scheme destined to re-create their political life. Those who rejected it as a crotchet, by that rejection showed themselves to be "incompetent statesmen, unequal to the politics of the future." It was because he was so impressed by the importance of that principle, and of that mode of raising up their political life from the degradation into which it was falling, and of cherishing the elements of individual excellence and independence, while, at the same time, they gave the utmost freedom to the will of majorities, that he was unable to support the unqualified proposition of the hon. Member for the Border Boroughs.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: Sir, it is unnecessary for me to trespass at any length on the time of the House. This is not the first occasion on which I have ventured to speak on the same Motion, and the arguments by which I have resisted it in the past on behalf of the Government are equally applicable to it now. But, nevertheless, I do feel it necessary to say one or two words in regard to the debate. I think I may say that the debate has been characterized by a considerable amount of reasoning and of eloquence, which goes far, in my opinion, to refute the very unfavourable descriptions which some hon. Members on both sides of the House have chosen to give of the present House of Commons. Two speeches have been delivered from the opposite Benches to-night which ought, I think, to make a very considerable impression upon the minds of hon. Gentlemen and upon the country. I refer, of course, to the speech of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for the University of London (Mr. Lowe), and also to the speech to which we have just listened with so much pleasure from the hon. Member for Liskeard (Mr Courtney). I take those two speeches together in this sense. The speech of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for the University was a grave and solemn and statesmanlike warning that we were undertaking to deal with a question of great magnitude and great perplexity, which involved considerations not only of Party, not only of the position of the country at the present time, but also of the position of posterity and the country for all time to come. The right hon. Gentleman also, in a manner which must, I am sure, have greatly impressed all who heard him, told us that we should not lightly commit ourselves to any great change of this kind which we had not first carefully considered and examined, and were not thoroughly prepared to accept. The hon. Member for Liskeard has followed that speech with another, of which the destructive part—that part which was destructive of the proposition of my hon. Friend the Member for the Border Boroughs (Mr. Trevelyan)—must have made a great impression on the House, and must have shown us that whatever may be the ultimate solution of this question of proper representation, we have not arrived at, and my hon. Friend the Member for the Border Boroughs has not yet presented us with, any scheme which is complete enough for us to accept with due regard to the warnings we have just received. The right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Lowe) told us at the opening of his speech that he was not prepared to quarrel with the Mover and the Seconder, to whom I wish, in passing, to pay a just tribute for their speeches, which were well worthy of themselves and also of the House—or to quarrel with the opinions and views they expressed; but that he was disposed to demur to the form of the Amendment, which he rightly supposed the Government accepts and supports. He said that that Amendment in reality amounted to very little more than the Previous Question, and he asked—"Why did not you move it?" He asked the question, and he himself gave the answer that the Previous Question is a matter very little understood by the country; and that it was very desirable in our opinion, and I think also in the opinion of my noble Friend behind me (Lord Claud Hamilton), that the grounds upon which we refuse our assent to the proposition should be clearly understood in the country. We do not lay down any position of absolute finality under all circumstances. I do not think we should be justified in doing so. I think it would be wrong to say that the representation of this country is incapable, at any time and under no well-considered plan, of amendment; but we do lay down, with a clear and distinct voice, that at present it is not desirable to re-open this question, and at the present we have not before us any plan which makes it either wise or prudent to re-open it. The time has not come, and the solution has not been presented to us. I think that is a proposition which a very slight reference to facts will commend at all events to this side of the House. What has been the history of this Reform Question? In the year 1832 a very large Reform was made, which introduced 500,000 electors to the franchise. That settlement lasted for a generation—for 35 years—and then another Reform Act was passed, which added something like 1,500,000 voters. Now, within 12 years of that time, we are asked again to come forward and make another alteration in the Constitution, and we are encouraged to do this by the Motion of my hon. Friend, who rather seems, as the hon. Member for Liskeard pointed out, to have fallen into the position he now occupies by accident. My hon. Friend originally had a Motion which he used to bring before the House, calling attention to the condition of the agricultural labourers. He coupled with that, almost as an after-thought, the question of agricultural reform, and out of that has grown another and separate proposition, until we have got at last to the point we have now reached, being still left, nevertheless, very much in ignorance of what he proposes and how he means to carry it out. He has talked about the propriety of admitting a vast number of agricultural labourers to the franchise, and he has added a few words to his original Motion about re-distribution; but he has never grappled with the whole question upon anything like a consistent or complete plan. He is followed and supported again by the hon. Baronet the Member for Chelsea (Sir Charles W. Dilke), who begins by cutting the ground entirely from under his Leader's feet. His Leader said his object was to introduce a large number of agricultural labourers into our representative system. He harangued us a good deal about the class who sent their children to the war, and so on. He did not say much about the representation of this class, for he took it for granted that they were not represented as they ought to be. But what was almost the first remark of the hon. Baronet? He said he thought very little of this proposition in that sense, because he did not think it would enfranchise anything like the number it was desirable to enfranchise—and a totally different mode was advocated. My hon. Friend made a very smart speech, and he appealed to our feelings in a way he is so capable of doing; but I must say I think there was a little approach towards what I may call flattery. He asked who were the real sufferers by war—and reminded us who were sending their children out to fight, forgetting that in all other classes, and even amongst noble Lords, there are some who go to war, and for whom family feelings exist, and for whom family sacrifices have to be made—a point which my hon. Friend rather lightly passed over. He made a confession also which threw some light on the grounds of his Motion. He referred to the North Norfolk Election, and the excellent speech which was made there by my hon. Friend the Member for South Norfolk (Mr. Clare Read) who sits behind me. He referred also to another speech made by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Bradford (Mr. W. E. Forster), which, he said, although an admirable one, did not convert those to whom it was addressed. If it did not, is it obvious that it is necessary a change should be made in the constituency? That appears to me to open our eyes to the source of this agitation. In 1867 we made a great change in our electoral system. What were the circumstances under which that change was made, and what was the position of the House? A Conservative Government was in Office, but the majority of the House was a Liberal majority. The Act of 1867 was passed with the general consent of the great body of the House, including the Liberal Party, which had the power to have rejected it or to have enforced concessions. This question of the county franchise was distinctly raised by Mr. Locke King, who was the parent of the whole question; and though there was not, I believe, a Division, there was, at all events, a general consent that the county franchise might and should be settled in the way in which it was settled at the time. That was the opinion of the House in which there was at the time a Liberal majority. But there was more than that. We had a Dissolution shortly after, and in the subsequent Elections the question was never mentioned. We had a Parliament in which a Liberal Ministry had a very large majority, and during all that time nothing was done to deal with this crying evil, which was one of so serious and grave a character that it must have attracted the attention of the Ministry of that day, and have challenged some measure to set it right. Nothing of the sort took place. My hon. Friend did, indeed, call attention to the subject; but he did not receive much encouragement from his Leaders, and the matter was allowed to drop. Then came an Election, at which the country thought the Liberal Party had misbehaved themselves, and it rejected them and turned them out of Office. Then a new light began gradually to dawn upon them, and they began to think that they had not succeeded so completely in getting as good a representative system as they imagined they had done. The process of conversion has been slow, but the great bulk of the Liberal Party, with two or three brilliant exceptions, have committed themselves to a pledge, which they will find it very difficult indeed not to embody in their policy, if they come into Office. They will feel themselves compelled to introduce a Reform Bill which must be of a very large and comprehensive character. It is impossible that they can limit it to the demands of this one class for the suffrage, and they must couple with it a good many other things. With reference to these measures there have been suggestive hints from the hon. Baronet and the hon. Member for Huddersfield (Mr. Leatham), and others. They seem to have some ideas which may give us a good deal of trouble when we come to settle this question. The hon. Baronet was very frank about the anomalies of the present system, and declared they were as great as they were before 1832. In point of fact, he says, all the changes that we have made are changes for the worse, and that we have been going on, getting worse and worse, until we have arrived at the very worst representative system the world ever saw. That, at all events, is a pleasant reflection for those who have taken part in the promotion of Reforms on the lines which we have hitherto followed. It is not merely a question of extending a little the work you did in 1867, and admitting a few more persons to the franchise, because that is the line we followed in 1832 and 1867, and that we now learn is a line which is unsatisfactory altogether to the hon. Baronet, because it leads from bad to worse, until we have adopted the very worst system the world has ever seen. Well, we are told when things come to the worst it is time for them to mend, and probably we shall now see something in the direction of amendment. What is that proposition to be? Well, we have it very skilfully and carefully shadowed forth, with sufficient reserve, not to alarm anybody. The hon. Member for Huddersfield told us he was not going to argue the question of manhood suffrage, but that he did not see why we should be so afraid of it. The hon. Baronet did not actually commit himself to it, but I think his arguments led directly to it. There seemed, also, to be an intention on the part of some other hon. Members to throw over the property qualification. If you will analyze all that was said, you will find it went rather further than merely attempting to deal with faggot-votes. It went to the point of overthrowing the property qualification altogether, and of substituting an occupation or a residential franchise; of doing away with all distinctions between county and borough by abolishing altogether the property qualification in counties. I do not say that that is the plan proposed; but we ought, at all events, to know what the plan is, and we have some very suspicious indications from hon. Gentlemen who are taking part in this matter. Therefore, I think, acting upon the wise and cautious advice of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for the University of London, we had better think twice and thrice before we overthrow this Constitution under which we have been able to do a great deal, and I believe to manage the affairs of the country in a manner not so unsatisfactory as you would have us believe, until we see something proposed which will be better, and which we are satisfied will be for the national benefit. I do not at all go into the points raised by the hon. Member for the Border Boroughs about the labouring classes getting all their good from the borough Members. I might turn the tables, and say that the working classes get their chief benefit from the county Members. I might ask who passed the Factory Acts and abolished the Truck system? But I do not go into these questions. It is not fair—it is hardly decent—for hon. Members on one side of this House to accuse hon. Members on the other side of having lessened the influence of the House. That is not the point before us. The question simply is—Can we, at so short an interval and on such insufficient reasons, make a change which, in its magnitude, its dimensions, and still more in its consequences, will be one of the most serious and important that can be proposed?

THE MARQUESS OF HARTINGTON: As I have already, on several occasions, addressed the House upon this subject, I am sure that hon. Members will be glad to learn that, even if I wished to do so, which I do not, I am to-night physically incapable of detaining the House for more than a few minutes; but as I have been rather pointedly alluded to by the noble Lord (Lord Claud Hamilton), and by the hon. Member for Liskeard (Mr. Courtney), I am unwilling that the debate should be closed without saying a few words upon the position I have taken on the subject. The noble Lord has been extremely severe upon what he calls my "pliability," and his observations were repeated, to a considerable extent, by my hon. Friend. It is very indifferent to me by what epithet my conduct is described, and it may be very easy and, perhaps, perfectly satisfactory, to the noble Lord and my hon. Friend, so long as they remain below the Gangway, to maintain an absolutely inflexible position upon this or any other question. But I think it is often found by Gentlemen who sit on this side that a time comes when it is necessary to make up their minds upon a question of this kind, and when a decision upon it can no longer be indefinitely postponed. I am perfectly willing to confess that I was as unwilling as any hon. Member could be —having a lively recollection of the many nights and weeks we spent not long ago over the Reform Question—that that question should be once more suddenly re-opened. The time came, however, when I found that the question was no mere crotchet of the hon. Member — no crochet supported by a small minority in the country and destined soon to be dropped again. We found it was seriously and soberly put forward by a very large body of the county constituencies, and supported, I believe, by a majority of the borough constituencies. That is a demand which cannot be for ever ignored, and one to which sooner or later "Aye" or "No" must be given. It is perfectly possible that different answers will be given. Two of my right hon. Friends on this Bench are disposed to answer "No;" but they admit with me that it requires an answer, and cannot be everlastingly postponed. The noble Lord is extremely severe upon my connection with the Peace Preservation Act; but I must say I am not at all able to follow the noble Lord in not discerning the difference between a vote on the Peace Preservation Bill and the extension of the franchise in Ireland; and I cannot see the connection between that Bill and the extension of popular rights. It may well be, however—and I am not referring to the present case—that the unjust and unwise refusal of the extension of popular rights may become the cause of those very Peace Preservation Acts. The noble Lord says that I cannot be so simple as to suppose that any change has taken place in the temper and feelings of the Irish people in a few short years. I am quite willing to admit that I believe that those measures have not been without their effect upon the people of Ireland. At all events, the present Government—the Government with which a Relative of the noble Lord is connected—did think some change had taken place in the opinions and feelings of the people of Ireland, because that Government thought it was now possible to make certain relaxations in the provisions of that Peace Preservation Act. It is, therefore, not altogether improbable that a change may have occurred since I was a party to those Acts, which would make it not so unreasonable as the noble Lord appears to imagine that I should not be opposed to the extension of popular rights even in that country. But the argument of the noble Lord, as it appears to me, rests not entirely upon the ignorance and want of independence of the Irish people. His argument went a great deal further, for it extended to the disfranchisement of the Roman Catholic population altogether, and doing away with the popular representation, or, at all events, returning to the principle of the representation of select Protestant minorities. If that is not the extent of the argument of the noble Lord, I must say I am unable to see in what other direction his remarks point. There appeared to me some confusion in the arguments of the noble Lord, for he appears not to have formed any very distinct opinions as to what has been the effect of the extension of the franchise in this country. He has told us that Providence itself happily interfered to remove the Government of my right hon. Friend near me, to substitute that which now occupies the opposite Benches. But what was the unworthy instrument used by Providence to effect that change? Why, household suffrage; and yet, as to the result of the operations of it, the noble Lord seems to have much doubt. At a later period in his speech the noble Lord expressed the opinion that the character of this House has greatly deteriorated, and the hon. Member for Liskeard followed with a similar statement. I can hardly reconcile the two statements of the noble Lord. The hon. Member for Liskeard thinks that the proof of the deterioration of the House is found in the fact that there are few Members who will now stand up and say unpleasant things or defend unpopular measures. Now, I must say, as to the expression of unpleasant views, that if the saying of them is a proof of the virtue and merit of the House of Commons, I do not think it has deteriorated. On all occasions, and from all sides of the House, hon. Members are ready to say unpleasant things, both as to their opponents and their friends. But I must protest against the test which my hon. Friend applies to the character of the House as proved by its proceedings. It is not my intention to make any general observations on this subject, which has been so thoroughly discussed on former occasions, as well as to-night. After the very original and very able speech of my hon. Friend the Member for the Border Boroughs (Mr. Trevelyan), it is not very easy to say anything new on this subject. When the time comes the subject will be discussed, both as to principles and details. I think my hon. Friend is perfectly right in annually renewing this Motion. He has a right to review his own forces. He has a right, above all, to give fair warning to the constituencies that at the next Election, whenever that may be, this will be a serious question which will be put to them. It is doubtful whether or not this great extension of the franchise will be carried out within the next five or six years; but, at all events, it will depend upon their decision, and the hon. Member is perfectly right to bring the subject forward annually. The question, however, in its present form, is only an abstract one, and our debates upon it, therefore, must necessarily assume the character of those of a debating society. It is not surprising, therefore, that the House should not show any great anxiety to enter into its details. What, however, is the position which Her Majesty's Government have taken up with regard to it? Every speech that has been delivered from the opposite Bench — even that of the right hon. Gentleman to whom we have just listened—has been theoretically in favour of the Previous Question, and the Amendment which was moved by the noble Lord was distinctly in favour of the Previous Question. But the character of the Amendment has not been supported practically by the majority of the speeches which have been delivered by hon. Members opposite. Even the noble Lord himself, in moving the Amendment, delivered a speech in which he entirely objected to the principle of the Resolution. Again, the speech of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for the University of London, which has received such encomiums from the right hon. Gentleman opposite, was not in favour of the Previous Question, but of meeting the Resolution with a direct negative. Why is it that the Government have adopted the Previous Question? The time will come, and probably very soon, when Her Majesty's Government will learn that some more decided answer must be given to this demand which has been put forward by a very large portion of the people of the country. It is as well we should see what the meaning of this on the part of the Government is. It is easy to say what its meaning is not. The excuse which Her Majesty's Government have made for not dealing with the subject is that they have not had time to do so. It is certain, however, that their legislative enterprize during the life of the present Parliament has not been such as to have prevented them from dealing with this very important question, had they desired to do so. What is clear, however, is that they wish to keep in their hands the power of treating this part of the Reform Question as they treated that of Reform itself on a previous occasion. We all recollect how the question of Reform was treated in 1867 by the Conservative Government. We remember that, having no conviction of the necessity of Parliamentary Reform at all, and not being convinced by the arguments in favour of it, but being convinced that there was a very strong, indeed, an irresistible, popular opinion in its favour, and finding that it stood as an insurmountable barrier between them and accession to power, the Conservative Government was willing to make itself the instrument—perhaps the unwilling instrument—of the popular demand, and to bring in, not a measure but measures of Parliamentary Reform as to the necessity for which they never showed any conviction. We saw Bill after Bill introduced without adequate consideration, withdrawn with very little regret, and replaced by others drawn, perhaps, with even still less reflection; and the ultimate result was that the Bill which was passed was much less the work of the Government than of the Opposition in this House. When I say the work of the Opposition, I do not mean that it was done by means of fair Party Divisions; but there were conferences in tea-rooms, and elsewhere, and other matters of which, up to that time, we had heard but little in this House, and as to which it is most desirable we should hear as little as possible again. What I want to know, then, is, whether these scenes and proceedings are to be repeated with regard to this further measure of Reform? Is this question to be left to be taken up or to be dropped by a Conservative Government according as it may suit their convenience? Because, if that be so, we shall have one of two things—either the question will be taken up in a time of popular agitation and excitement, which cannot for a moment be supposed to be the most favourable for the consideration of such a question; or else it will be taken up at a moment when it is considered necessary to revive the waning popularity of Government, and treated as the question of Reform was treated before. I do not think that the precedent of the treatment of Parliamentary Reform to which I refer is one which ought to be repeated. It was one which did not meet the approval of many Members who sat on the Conservative Benches; and it undoubtedly dealt a very severe blow to the best traditions of the conduct of Business in this House. The most important functions of the Government of the day are not merely its executive functions, but those which it has to perform in guiding the legislation of the House; and if Parliamentary Reform—the most important domestic question which can be brought before Parliament—is to be dealt with in this way, without conviction, without any settled opinions on the subject, and merely as a matter of Party convenience, it must, I think, strike a severe blow at our Parliamentary procedure and traditions. The Government have to-night had the question fairly presented to them in the Motion of my hon. Friend the Member for the Border Boroughs, and the direct negative to that Motion which has been moved by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for the University of London; but they refuse to accept either the Motion or the Amendment, and adopt one which practically amounts to the Previous Question. They adhere to their former practice, in order that this subject may again be dangled before the eyes of the electors when they go to a General Election; that so once more they may say, as they have already said so often, that they are willing to support this measure whenever it is brought forward by a responsible Party in the State. Sir, it is because I think that that is not the manner in which a question of this importance ought to be treated that I have no hesitation in supporting the Motion of my hon. Friend the Member for the Border Boroughs.

MR. CALLAN, amid cries of "Divide!" said, as he was the only Irish and Catholic Member who had risen to address the House that evening, he would ask a few moments in order to notice the intolerant, wanton, and grossly offensive speech delivered during the evening by the noble Lord the Member for King's Lynn. ["Order!"] He would repeat—that intolerant, gross, and wantonly offensive speech. He was not at all surprised to see the noble Lord opposed to the Reform Bill of 1866, because of a cause personal to himself. He had that evening used language of an intolerant and not very creditable nature. He had said that a people so ignorant, bigoted, and devoid of all knowledge of the commonest principles of government as the Irish Roman Catholic peasantry did not exist. In 1865 the noble Lord was elected for Londonderry; but in 1869 he was defeated by the vote of Catholics of the City, given not in favour of a Catholic candidate, but for a Presbyterian of the Presbyterians—the present Baron Dowse, who was returned by a majority of upwards of 100. He (Mr. Callan) was sorry that that defeat had so rankled in his mind as to lead him to use such gross and offensive language. ["Order!"] He would repeat, wanton, gross, and offensive. ["Order!"] ["Divide!"] He had accused the Leader of Her Majesty's Opposition of introducing coercion into Ireland. He (Mr. Callan) had always opposed these Bills; but he should say that at that time the state of Ireland was very different to what it was now. He would quote the words of the successor of the noble Lord's father in the Viceroyalty of Ireland to show that. Everyone knew in Ireland that with the departure of the Abercorn Administration in Ireland was hailed a new epoch in the political history of the country. The departure of the Abercorn Administration—["Question!"] ["Divide!"]—With the departure—["Divide!"]—The departure was signalized as the defeat of the intolerant and despicable faction. What, however, was now the condition of Ireland, which was said to be bigoted and intolerant, where murders were said to stand undetected? Her Majesty's present Representative in Ireland said the other day that 10 years ago an Act of a very extreme character was passed including a large and important district in Ireland; but the Lord Lieutenant was happy to say that within the present year he was resident in that very district, and he could only say, so far from anything approaching disloyalty, her Grace and himself had met with every mark of kindness. The noble Lord had declared that the Irish Catholics were ignorant and bigoted; but would the hon. Members for Carlow or Monaghan, or the junior Member for Cork City, or the senior Member for Tipperary County, who represented Catholic constituencies, endorse such language? Catholics would know the value of this Division, and they would recognize by their votes what they thought of the wanton and offensive language of the noble Lord the Member for King's Lynn.

Question put.

The House *divided*:—Ayes 226; Noes 291: Majority 65.

AYES.

Adam, rt. hon. W. P.
Allen, W. S.
Amory, Sir J. H.
Anderson, G.
Ashley, hon. E. M.
Backhouse, E.
Balfour, Sir G.
Barclay, A. C.
Barclay, J. W.
Barran, J.
Bass, A.
Bass, H.
Baxter, rt. hn. W. E.
Beaumont, Colonel F.
Beaumont, W. B.
Biddulph, M.
Biggar, J. G.
Blake, T.
Blennerhassett, R. P.
Brady, J.
Brassey, H. A.
Brassey, T.
Briggs, W. E.
Bright, Jacob
Bright, rt. hn. John
Bristowe, S. B.
Brogden, A.
Brooks, M.
Brown, A. H.
Brown, J. C.
Browne, G. E.
Burt, T.
Callan, P.
Cameron, C.
Campbell, Lord C.
Campbell, Sir G.
Campbell-Bannerman, H.
Carington, Col. hon. W.
Cartwright, W. C.
Cave, T.
Cavendish, Lord F. C.
Chamberlain, J.
Chambers, Sir T.
Childers, rt. hn. H. C. E.
Cholmeley, Sir H.
Clarke, J. C.
Clifford, C. C.
Cogan, rt. hn. W. H. F.
Cole, H. T.
Colebrooke, Sir T. E.
Collins, E.
Colman, J. J.
Colthurst, Colonel
Corbett, J.
Cotes, C. C.
Cowan, J.
Cowen, J.
Cowper, hon. H. F.
Cross, J. K.
Davies, D.
Davies, R.
Dease, E.
Delahunty, J.
Dillwyn, L. L.
Dodds, J.
Dodson, rt. hon. J. G.
Duff, M. E. G.
Dundas, hon. J. C.
Earp, T.
Edge, S. R.
Edwards, H.
Egerton, Admiral hn. F.
Evans, T. W.
Fawcett, H.
Ferguson, R.
Fitzmaurice, Lord E.
Fitzwilliam, hn. W. J.
Fletcher, I.
Foljambe, F. J. S.
Forster, Sir C.
Forster, rt. hon. W. E.
Fry, L.
Gladstone, rt. hn. W. E.
Gladstone, W. H.
Gordon, Sir A.
Gordon, Lord D.
Gourley, E. T.
Gower, hon. E. F. L.
Grant, A.
Grey, Earl de
Grosvenor, Lord R.
Hankey, T.
Harcourt, Sir W. V.
Harrison, C.
Harrison, J. F.
Hartington, Marq. of
Havelock, Sir H.
Hayter, Sir A. D.
Henry, M.
Herbert, H. A.
Herschell, F.
Hibbert, J. T.
Hill, T. R.
Holland, S.
Holms, J.
Holms, W.
Hopwood, C. H.
Howard, hon. C.
Howard, E. S.
Hutchinson, J. D.
Ingram, W. J.
Jackson, Sir H. M.
James, Sir H.
James, W. H.
Jenkins, D. J.
Johnstone, Sir H.
Kay - Shuttleworth, Sir U.
Kenealy, Dr.

Kensington, Lord
Kingscote, Colonel
Knatchbull-Hugessen, rt. hon. E.
Laing, S.
Lambert, N. G.
Lawson, Sir W.
Leatham, E. A.
Lefevre, G. J. S.
Leith, J. F.
Lewis, O.
Lloyd, M.
Locke, J.
Lubbock, Sir J.
Lusk, Sir A.
Macdonald, A.
Macduff, Viscount
Mackintosh, C. F.
M'Arthur, A.
M'Kenna, Sir J. N.
M'Lagan, P.
M'Laren, D.
Maitland, W. F.
Marjoribanks, Sir D. C.
Marling, S. S.
Massey, rt. hon. W. N.
Meldon, C. H.
Middleton, Sir A. E.
Milbank, F. A.
Monk, C. J.
Montagu, rt. hn. Lord R.
Morgan, G. O.
Morley, S.
Muntz, P. H.
Mure, Colonel W.
Noel, E.
Nolan, Major J. P.
Norwood, C. M.
O'Beirne, Major F.
O'Brien, Sir P.
O'Byrne, W. R.
O'Clery, K.
O'Donnell, F. H.
O'Donoghue, The
O'Gorman, P.
O'Reilly, M.
Otway, A. J.
Palmer, C. M.
Palmer, G.
Parker, C. S.
Parnell, C. S.
Pease, J. W.
Peel, A. W.
Pender, J.
Pennington, F.
Perkins, Sir F.
Philips, R. N.
Playfair, rt. hon. L.
Portman, hon. W. H. B.
Potter, T. B.
Power, J. O'C.
Price, W. E.
Ralli, P.
Ramsay, J.
Rashleigh, Sir C.
Rathbone, W.
Richard, H.
Roberts, J.
Robertson, H.
Rothschild, Sir N. M. de
Russell, Lord A.
Rylands, P.
St. Aubyn, Sir J.
Samuda, J. D'A.
Samuelson, B.
Samuelson, H.
Seely, C.
Shaw, W.
Sheil, E.
Sheridan, H. B.
Simon, Serjeant J.
Sinclair, Sir J. G. T.
Spinks, Serjeant F. L.
Stansfeld, rt. hon. J.
Stanton, A. J.
Stevenson, J. C.
Stewart, J.
Stuart, Col. J. F. D. C.
Swanston, A.
Tavistock, Marquess of
Taylor, D.
Temple, right hon. W. Cowper-
Tracy, hon. F. S. A. Hanbury-
Villiers, rt. hon. C. P.
Vivian, A. P.
Vivian, H. H.
Waddy, S. D.
Walter, J.
Waterlow, Sir S. H.
Wedderburn, Sir D.
Whitbread, S.
Whitwell, J.
Whitworth, B.
Williams, B. T.
Williams, W.
Wilson, C.
Wilson, I.
Wilson, Sir M.
Young, A. W.

TELLERS.

Dilke, Sir C. W.
Trevelyan, G. O.

NOES.

Agnew, R. V.
Allcroft, J. D.
Allen, Major
Allsopp, C.
Allsopp, H.
Arbuthnot, Lt.-Col. G.
Archdale, W. H.
Arkwright, A. P.
Arkwright, F.
Ashbury, J. L.
Assheton, R.
Astley, Sir J. D.
Bagge, Sir W.
Bailey, Sir J. R.
Balfour, A. J.
Baring, T. C.
Barne, F. St. J. N.
Barttelot, Sir W. B.
Bates, E.
Bateson, Sir T.
Beach, rt. hon. Sir M. H.
Beach, W. W. B.
Bective, Earl of
Benett-Stanford, V. F.
Bentinck, rt. hon. G. C.
Bentinck, G. W. P.
Beresford, G. De la P.
Beresford, Colonel M.
Birkbeck, E.
Birley, H.
Blackburne, Col. J. I.
Boord, T. W.
Bourke, hon. R.
Bourne, Colonel J.
Bousfield, Col. N. G. P.
Bowen, J. B.
Brise, Colonel R.
Broadley, W. H. H.
Bruce, Lord C.
Bruce, hon. T.
Bruen, H.
Brymer, W. E.
Bulwer, J. R.
Burghley, Lord
Burrell, Sir W. W.
Buxton, Sir R. J.
Cameron, D.
Campbell, C.
Cartwright, F.
Castlereagh, Viscount
Cecil, Lord E. H. B. G.
Chaine, J.
Chaplin, Colonel E.
Chaplin, H.
Clive, Col. hon. G. W.
Close, M. C.
Clowes, S. W.
Cobbold, T. C.
Cochrane, A. D. W. R. B.
Cole, Col. hon. H. A.
Coope, O. E.
Cordes, T.
Corry, hon. H. W. L.
Corry, J. P.
Cotton, W. J. R.
Crichton, Viscount
Cross, rt. hon. R. A.
Cubitt, G.
Cust, H. C.
Dalkeith, Earl of
Dalrymple, C.
Davenport, W. B.
Deedes, W.
Denison, C. B.
Denison, W. B.
Denison, W. E.
Dickson, Major A. G.
Digby, Col. hon. E.
Dyott, Colonel R.
Eaton, H. W.
Edmonstone, Admiral Sir W.
Egerton, hon. A. F.
Egerton, Sir P. G.
Egerton, hon. W.
Elcho, Lord
Elliot, Sir G.
Elliot, G. W.
Elphinstone, Sir J. D. H.
Emlyn, Viscount
Estcourt, G. S.
Ewart, W.
Ewing, A. O.
Fellowes, E.
Finch, G. H.
Floyer, J.
Forester, C. T. W.
Forsyth, W.
Foster, W. H.
Fremantle, hon. T. F.
Gardner, J. T. Agg-
Garfit, T.
Garnier, J. C.
Gathorne-Hardy, hn. S.
Gibson, rt. hon. E.
Giffard, Sir H. S.
Giles, A.
Goddard, A. L.
Goldney, G.
Gordon, W.
Gore-Langton, W. S.
Goschen, rt. hon. G. J.
Grantham, W.
Greenall, Sir G.
Gregory, G. B.
Hall, A. W.
Halsey, T. F.
Hamilton, Lord C. J.
Hamilton, I. T.
Hamilton, right hon. Lord G.
Hamilton, Marquess of
Hamond, C. F.
Hanbury, R. W.
Harcourt, E. W.
Hardcastle, E.
Harvey, Sir R. B.
Hay, rt. hn. Sir J. C. D.
Heath, R.
Helmsley, Viscount
Herbert, hon. S.
Hermon, E.
Hervey, Lord F.
Hick, J.
Hicks, E.
Hill, A. S.
Holford, J. P. G.
Holker, Sir J.
Holland, Sir H. T.
Holmesdale, Viscount
Holt, J. M.
Home, Captain D. M.
Hood, Captain hon. A. W. A. N.
Hope, A. J. B. B.
Hubbard, E.
Isaac, S.
Jervis, Col. H. J. W.
Johnson, J. G.
Johnstone, H.
Johnstone, Sir F.
Jolliffe, hon. S.
Jones, J.
Kavanagh, A. MacM.
Kennard, Col. E. H.
Kennaway, Sir J. H.
Knightley, Sir R.
Knowles, T.
Lacon, Sir E. H. K.
Lawrence, Sir T.
Learmonth, A.
Lechmere, Sir E. A. H.
Lee, Major V.
Legard, Sir C.
Legh, W. J.
Leighton, Sir B.
Leighton, S.
Lennox, Lord H. G.
Leslie, Sir J.
Lewis, C. E.

Lewisham, Viscount
Lindsay, Col. R. L.
Lindsay, Lord
Lloyd, T. E.
Lopes, Sir M.
Lowe, rt. hon. R.
Lowther, hon. W.
Lowther, rt. hon. J.
Macartney, J. W. E.
Mac Iver, D.
M'Garel-Hogg, Sir J.
Makins, Colonel W. T.
Mandeville, Viscount
Manners, rt. hn. Lord J.
March, Earl of
Marten, A. G.
Master, T. W. C.
Mellor, T. W.
Merewether, C. G.
Miles, Sir P. J. W.
Mills, A.
Mills, Sir C. H.
Monckton, F.
Montgomerie, R.
Montgomery, Sir G. G.
Moray, Colonel H. D.
Morgan, hon. F.
Mowbray, rt. hon. J. R.
Muncaster, Lord
Naghten, Lt.-Col. A. R.
Newport, Viscount
Noel, rt. hon. G. J.
North, Colonel
Northcote, rt. hon. Sir S. H.
O'Neill, hon. E.
Onslow, D.
Paget, R. H.
Palk, Sir L.
Parker, Lt.-Col. W.
Peek, Sir H.
Pell, A.
Pemberton, E. L.
Pennant, hon. G.
Peploe, Major D. P.
Percy, Earl
Phipps, P.
Plunket, hon. D. R.
Plunkett, hon. R.
Polhill - Turner, Capt. F. C.
Powell, W.
Praed, C. T.
Praed, H. B.
Puleston, J. H.
Raikes, H. C.
Read, C. S.
Rendlesham, Lord
Repton, G. W.
Ridley, E.
Ridley, Sir M. W.
Ritchie, C. T.
Rodwell, B. B. H.
Round, J.
Russell, Sir C.
Ryder, G. R.

Salt, T.
Sanderson, T. K.
Sandon, Viscount
Sclater-Booth, rt. hn. G.
Scott, Lord H.
Scott, M. D.
Selwin - Ibbetson, Sir H. J.
Severne, J. E.
Shirley, S. E.
Shute, General C. C.
Sidebottom, T. H.
Simonds, W. B.
Smith, A.
Smith, F. C.
Smith, S. G.
Smith, rt. hn. W. H.
Smollett, P. B.
Somerset, Lord H. R. C.
Stanhope, hon. E.
Stanhope, W. T. W. S.
Stanley, rt. hn. Col. F.
Starkey, L. R.
Starkie, J. P. C.
Steere, L.
Stewart, M. J.
Storer, G.
Sykes, C.
Talbot, J. G.
Taylor, rt. hon. Col.
Thornhill, T.
Thwaites, D.
Thynne, Lord H. F.
Torr, J.
Tottenham, Colonel
Tremayne, A.
Tremayne, J.
Trevor, Lord A. E. Hill-
Turnor, E.
Wait, W. K.
Walker, T. E.
Wallace, Sir R.
Walpole, rt. hon. S.
Walsh, hon. A.
Warburton, P. E.
Watney, J.
Watson, rt. hon. W.
Welby-Gregory, Sir W.
Wellesley, Colonel H.
Wells, E.
Wethered, T. O.
Wheelhouse, W. S. J.
Wilmot, Sir H.
Wilmot, Sir J. E.
Wilson, W.
Woodd, B. T.
Wroughton, P.
Wyndham, hon. P.
Wynn, C. W. W.
Yarmouth, Earl of
Yorke, J. R.

TELLERS.
Dyke, Sir W. H.
Winn, R.

Question proposed,

"That the words 'this House is of opinion that it is inexpedient to reopen the question of Parliamentary Reform at the present time,' be there added."

Mr. LOWE moved the omission of the words "at the present time."

Amendment proposed to the said proposed Amendment, to leave out the words "at the present time."—(*Mr. Lowe.*)

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER said, it did not seem to him to be worth while dividing on this Amendment.

Question, "That the words 'at the present time' stand part of the said proposed Amendment," put, and *negatived.*

Words, as amended, *added.*

Main Question, as amended, put.

Resolved, That this House is of opinion that it is inexpedient to reopen the question of Parliamentary Reform.

LIBEL.

Select Committee *appointed,* "to inquire into the Law in relation to Libels in newspapers and journals, and as to the mode of proving the publication of such Libels, and the means of rendering the proprietors and publishers of newspapers and journals responsible civilly and criminally for the Libels contained therein; with power to make any proposals for the alteration of the Law with regard to the above matters, or any of them."—(*Mr. Attorney General.*)

REGISTRATION OF BIRTHS, DEATHS, AND MARRIAGES (ARMY) BILL.

On Motion of Colonel LINDSAY, Bill to make further provision for the Registration of Deaths, Marriages, and Births occurring out of the United Kingdom among officers and soldiers of Her Majesty's Forces and their families, *ordered* to be brought in by Colonel LINDSAY, Mr. Secretary STANLEY, and Lord EUSTACE CECIL.

Bill *presented,* and read the first time. [Bill 95.]

WORMWOOD SCRUBS REGULATION BILL.

On Motion of Colonel LINDSAY, Bill to provide for the user and regulation of certain lands at Wormwood Scrubs, *ordered* to be brought in by Colonel LINDSAY, Mr. Secretary STANLEY, and Lord EUSTACE CECIL.

Bill *presented,* and read the first time. [Bill 96.]

DRAINAGE AND IMPROVEMENT OF LANDS (IRELAND) PROVISIONAL ORDER CONFIRMATION BILL.

On Motion of Sir HENRY SELWIN-IBBETSON, Bill to confirm a Provisional Order under "The Drainage and Improvement of Lands (Ireland) Act, 1863," and the Acts amending the same, *ordered* to be brought in by Sir HENRY SELWIN-IBBETSON and Mr. JAMES LOWTHER.

Bill *presented,* and read the first time. [Bill 94.]

BLIND AND DEAF-MUTE CHILDREN (EDUCATION) BILL.

On Motion of Mr. WHEELHOUSE, Bill to make better provision for the Education of Blind and Deaf-Mute Children, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. WHEELHOUSE, Sir ANDREW LUSK, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. ISAAC, and Mr. BENJAMIN WILLIAMS.

Bill *presented,* and read the first time. [Bill 93.]

House adjourned at Two o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Wednesday, 5*th March,* 1879.

MINUTES.]—SELECT COMMITTEE—Hall-Marking (Gold and Silver), *nominated.*

PUBLIC BILLS — *Second Reading* — Married Women's Property (Scotland) [1]; Consolidated Fund (No. 1) *.

ORDERS OF THE DAY.

MARRIED WOMEN'S PROPERTY (SCOTLAND) BILL.

(*Mr. Anderson, Sir Robert Anstruther, Mr. Orr Ewing, Mr. M'Laren, Mr. Lyon Playfair.*)

[BILL 1.] SECOND READING.

Order for Second Reading read.

MR. ANDERSON, in rising to move that the Bill be now read a second time, said, he thought the state of the benches that forenoon showed, in a very remarkable degree, how little hon. Members cared for parties who had no votes and no representation in the House, for he happened to be aware that the ladies who were interested in this measure had specially requested hon. Members to attend, and yet hon. Members, knowing they had nothing to fear from the votes of the ladies, had paid no heed to their request. He would endeavour to explain to the House the present position of the law in England and Scotland as regarded the property of married women. Previous to 1870, in both countries, the property of married women was alike unprotected, except as regarded the earnings of married women who happened to be deserted by their husbands; but beyond that, a woman had no right to consider her property her own except it was conveyed to her separate use by an ante-nuptial contract. If there was no such settlement she herself, and everything she possessed, went to her husband. Her husband might spend it as he pleased, he might give it away as he pleased, he might will it away as he pleased; and in some cases husbands gave, or even willed, their wives' property to their mistresses, and there was nothing to prevent it. In Scotland there was a certain check upon that, as there a woman had certain rights as a widow. If, when her husband died he left no children, she had a right to one-half of the personal property; and if he did leave children she had a right to one-third. In that respect married women were better off in Scotland than in England; but it was not as wives but as widows, the law not applying to the state of marriage, but only after the marriage ceased. The state of the law in England having remained in the condition he had described up to 1870, Mr. Russell Gurney in that year brought in a Bill to amend it, and succeeded in passing it into an Act. As the measure left that House it was in a good condition indeed; but it had got a great deal knocked about in "another place," and came back to the Commons with a good many alterations, certainly not in the way of improvements. Even in the state in which it did come back it was still something worth having. Under that Act the law in reference to the protection of married women's property in England was this—It protected the earnings, and the investment of the earnings, of married women to their separate use; it protected also their deposits in savings banks, their money in the Funds, their shares in joint-stock companies, and their interest in benefit societies, provided that these had not been acquired with the husband's money without his consent, and provided they had not been acquired with his consent in the way of defrauding his creditors. By the Act, also, a married woman was allowed to insure her own life, or her husband's life for her own benefit. The husband might insure his life for his wife's separate use, free from claims of himself and creditors, provided it could be shown that this was not done for the purpose of defrauding creditors. Again, if the wife inherited personal property by being next-of-kin to an intestate, and not by will, it went to her separate use, whatever the amount; but if she became entitled to personal property by will, and not from an intestate, it was only secured to her separate use if it was not over £200. If it was in the least degree over that amount—if it was even 200 guineas—it went to her husband. That, he thought, was absurdly anomalous. As regarded real estate, if the wife inherited it by kinship from an intestate, the rents and profits came to her separate use; if it came to her by will, her husband got these rents and profits. A married woman in England might maintain an action at law in her own name, and in respect of any part of her separate estate. The married woman's debts contracted prior to her marriage did not involve the liability of the husband except to the amount of such property as he might have received by her through marriage. This important provision was added to Mr. Gurney's Act by the hon. Member for Bristol (Mr. Morley). The separate estate of a married woman was liable to contribute to the parish for the support of her husband, and also for the support of her husband's children, failing the husband's estate. Such was the state of the law in England, with regard to the protection of married women; or, rather, the nominal state of the law—for it appeared doubtful whether if the husband chose to ignore the law altogether, and simply take property from his wife, the law would then protect the wife—there was a remarkable decision in Manchester recently. The law in that case refused to prosecute the husband criminally for going into his wife's house in her absence and taking property that legally belonged to her for her separate use. Therefore, perhaps the protection was a little more nominal than real. But the theory of the law in England, so far as it went, was better than in Scotland. The married women of England enjoyed these advantages for several years before there was any attempt to do anything of the kind for the married women of Scotland. But in 1877 he introduced a Bill, which he had hoped would pass, bringing the married women of Scotland up to the level of married women in England, and, indeed, going a little further; because he proposed to enable a married woman in Scotland to call her own her own, and to make all the property that was justly hers really hers. He endeavoured to avoid the anomalies of the English law, and the difference created by that law between testate and intestate estates. If he could have passed that Bill, it would have settled the question finally on the only footing on which it could be settled—that of absolute justice. However, he was not able to do that. The Government opposed him. The Government admitted that in Scotland they might be allowed to come up to the level of the English Act, but would not let them get one step further. They must, said the Government, adopt the English Act with all its faults and failings. The Bill was read a second time on that understanding—that it was to be amended accordingly; but before the Lord Advocate had agreed on the Amendments to be inserted the Session was well nigh over, and it was agreed between the Lord Advocate and himself that they should pass only the clause for the protection of the earnings of married women. That seemed the most clamant part of the injustice to be remedied. It was desirable to pass that clause immediately, and the Bill was passed with only two clauses — one protecting the earnings of the wife, and another protecting the husband from ante-nuptial debts of the wife, except to the value of what he had received with the wife on marriage. Thus, the interests of husband and wife were equally balanced in the measure as it passed. There was further a distinct understanding on the part of the Lord Advocate and the Home Secretary that, in a subsequent Session, he should be allowed to bring in a Bill that should put the position of the married women of Scotland on a footing with that of the wives of England by protecting their property also. With that view he introduced a Bill last Session, adopting the very clauses of the English Act, and naturally concluded—having regard to the understanding which had been come to—that he would be allowed to pass it. But, instead of that, the Lord Advocate himself put down a Notice of opposition which blocked its path, and prevented its even coming before the House during the whole of the Session. That Bill he had introduced again this year. He believed the Lord Advocate opposed it before on behalf of husbands, and in the interests of children, and because he thought it went too far. He thought the Lord Advocate was wrong, and it rested with him to show that it really was in the interests of husbands that this Bill should not be passed. At any rate, it appeared that husbands failed to see this, for last Session there were many Petitions in its favour, not only from wives, but from husbands also; and if the husbands had been opposed to the Bill, and thought their position was to be injuriously affected by it, they would surely have petitioned against it; but there was only one solitary Petition against the Bill. It had only three signatures, and it was not from husbands, but from a trade protection society. He was, therefore, entitled to infer that husbands had no particular objection to it. If it was in the interests of children that the Lord Advocate opposed the Bill, he would ask who were better able to judge what was in the interests of children than the parents themselves? If mothers and fathers petitioned in favour of the Bill, and scarcely anyone petitioned against, it was not likely that it could be a measure to harm the children. The Bill did not ask the House to go any further than the parties could go of their own accord before marriage by an ante-nuptial settlement. But the majority of women married without ante-nuptial settlements. Some were too poor to make ante-nuptial settlements—they had nothing to settle; and many who afterwards became rich, and would have made such settlements could they have foreseen that, did not think it worth while to incur the expense involved in doing by deeds and parchments what the law ought to do for them. He wanted to make the law as considerate to the property rights of the respective parties as the parties themselves would have been by getting these deeds and parchments drawn. If it were a wrong thing that a wife should have a separate estate, she ought not to be allowed to have one by ante-nuptial contract. That would be the logical position for the Lord Advocate to take in opposing the Bill. If the present state of the law was a good state of law, they should not allow people to contract themselves out of it. But rich people did contract themselves out of it. All the hon. Members of that House, in arranging marriages for themselves or their daughters, invariably contracted themselves out of the law. The Lord Advocate was bound to show how what was good for his own class was bad for any other class, and that the present state of the law in England had worked badly. That law had been in operation for eight years, and, so far as he (Mr. Anderson) knew, no complaints had been made, except as to its insufficiency—not that it had gone too far, but that it had not gone far enough. But he maintained that the present state of the law in Scotland was unjust to the husband as well as to the wife. That had been abundantly shown on the occasion of the failure of the City of Glasgow Bank. The want of a separate estate in the wife had been very grievously felt by many husbands in regard to this failure. In cases where a wife became possessed of property in the City of Glasgow Bank, her shares in the bank would, if her property had been separate estate, have remained in her own name, and only such separate estate as she otherwise happened to possess would have been liable to pay calls on those shares. But because the wife had not a separate estate, unless it had been made separate by ante-nuptial contract, the shares of the wife went to the husband's name, and every penny of his property was liable to make good the calls on the shares. So that actually this property of the wife, through its not being separate estate, brought absolute ruin upon a number of husbands. That was surely an argument that ought to have weight with the Lord Advocate, who was defending the rights of husbands so strongly. If husbands in Scotland did not petition against the Bill last year, they were certainly very unlikely to do so this year, after such a grievous lesson on the injustice of the present state of the law, and he did not think they would greatly thank the Lord Advocate if he opposed the Bill for them. The Home Secretary was as much to blame as the Lord Advocate. He was sorry they were not in their places to hear his charges against them; but they had distinctly, last Session, broken their pledges by refusing to let this Bill pass. They ought now either to let this Bill pass, or do something themselves. They ought to show in what respect this Bill went further than the English law. If they could not do that, they should say what amendment they desired, or bring in some Bill of their own which would do what they promised should be done. It was no argument at all—and he believed this was the only argument that would be used—that the widow was in a better position in Scotland than in England. What was wanted was protection for the rights of a wife during her married life. The property of widows was another question. He had not attempted to make any sensational speech by giving instances of the wrongs women suffered under the present law. He had appealed only to the justice of the case, and that was an appeal that, sooner or later, must be listened to by the House. He begged to move the second reading of the Bill.

Mr. M'LAREN: I beg to second the Motion. My hon. Friend behind me has so minutely explained the state of matters, that I really do not think it needful to say anything more. What I should say would only be repeating in another form what he has already said. Therefore, without further remark, I will just second the Motion.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."—(*Mr. Anderson.*)

Mr. M'LAGAN said, he would not oppose the Bill, because he believed it was founded on justice. The Bill did exactly what most hon. Members would themselves do if entering the state of matrimony, by an arrangement in a prenuptial contract. He, however, would like one explanation. The hon. Member for Glasgow (Mr. Anderson) stated that the Bill was opposed last year on behalf of husbands and children; but he was not sure if it was considered from the point of view of the interests of the parish: and he would like to know what would be the effect of the Bill if a husband should be reduced to circumstances in which he could not support his children—would the liability of the wife to support the children out of her separate estate be established?

Mr. ANDERSON: Yes; it is perfectly clear without the Bill that the wife will have to do so.

Mr. M'LAGAN: I am glad to hear that. It was as well to bring out that information.

Mr. SHAW LEFEVRE hoped that the absence of the Lord Advocate indicated that he no longer opposed this measure, and that the Bill would be allowed to pass its second reading. He thought the hon. Member had done wisely in limiting the scope of the Bill, and making it an exact copy of the English Act. In saying that, he did not wish it to be supposed that he and many other hon. Members on his side of the House were satisfied with the state of the law as regarded England and Ireland. He simply thought that this would not be a desirable occasion on which to raise the wider question. When that wide question was brought up at a later period by the hon. Member for Oldham (Mr. Hibbert), he would be prepared to show that the English Act of 1870 was a very insufficient measure of protection, and highly unsatisfactory in many of its clauses. The hon. Member for Glasgow had adopted the wiser course in waiting for that occasion to support this view.

Question put, and *agreed to.*

Bill read a second time, and *committed* for *Thursday* 13th March.

House adjourned at a quarter
after One o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Thursday, 6th March, 1879.

MINUTES.]—Public Bill—*Committee—Report* —Assizes * (17).

SOUTH AFRICA—SIR BARTLE FRERE AND MR. JOUBERT.—QUESTION.

OBSERVATIONS.

The Earl of CARNARVON: I beg to ask a Question of my noble Friend the Under Secretary of State for the Colonies, of which I have given him private Notice. I read in the papers this morning what purported to be Minutes of what had occurred between Sir Bartle Frere and Mr. Joubert, who formerly held the office of President in the Transvaal. I should be glad to know if these Minutes are authentic? For my own part, I should be sorry to think that they express correctly the state of feeling among the whole, or even a large portion of the Dutch population, whether it be in the Transvaal, in the neighbouring Orange Free State, or in the Cape, the most influential of all. On the contrary, I cannot help thinking that in many parts of that Continent there exists a very different feeling. I would also ask my noble Friend—though I do not anticipate that he will be able to give an official answer—Whether it is true, as I see it stated with great satisfaction in this morning's papers, that the Chief Magistrate of the Orange Free State has either proffered or undertaken to send us no less than 500 men to our support in the Zulu War? I was well acquainted with the Chief Magistrate of the Orange Free State when he was in this country two years ago, and I was very much impressed with his steadfast, truthful character; and I shall not be at all surprised to hear that he has proffered us 500 men. It will be very satisfactory to know that that is the case, not only as regards himself, but also as affording evidence of the state of feeling in the Orange Free State, and as affording evidence of the state of feeling among a most influential portion of the Dutch population.

EARL CADOGAN, in reply, said, that his right hon. Friend the Secretary of State for the Colonies had received an account of the interview between Sir Bartle Frere and Mr. Joubert similar to that which his noble Friend had mentioned as having appeared in the newspapers, but it had reached the Secretary of State unofficially. He thought his noble Friend (the Earl of Carnarvon) would agree with him that, in these circumstances, his right hon. Friend was justified in withholding that account from the Papers about to be presented to Parliament; and probably his noble Friend would be satisfied with the assurance that as soon as the official account of the interview had been received, it would be included in the Papers to be laid on the Table of their Lordships' House. He had just laid on the Table Papers relating to South Africa received up to yesterday. He might further mention that two telegrams had been that day received at the Colonial Office through the Brazilian Telegraph Company in these terms—

> "Following transports arrived St. Vincent:—5th, Olympus, 1.55 p.m.; Queen Margaret, 7.30 p.m.; 6th, City of Venice, 6 a.m.; Russia, 7.30 a.m.
>
> "Transports China and Florence arrived St. Vincent 9 a.m. 6th."

This intelligence showed that the transport service was working favourably. As to the second part of the noble Earl's Question, he was unable to give any official confirmation of the report.

THE EARL OF CARNARVON said, he did not mean in his Question official information, but any information.

EARL CADOGAN said, he was not able to give his noble Friend any further information.

EARL GRANVILLE said, he could not see what was the objection to the publication of the unofficial account of the interview between Sir Bartle Frere and Mr. Joubert, received at the Colonial Office, if, as he understood from the noble Earl, it was similar to the account which appeared in the newspapers.

RAILWAYS—CONTINUOUS BRAKES.

QUESTION. OBSERVATIONS.

THE EARL OF BELMORE rose to call attention to the present position of the subject of the use of continuous brakes upon Railways, and to ask Her Majesty's Government, Whether they propose to introduce any Bill to deal with the matter during the present Session? He would remind their Lordships that the Royal Commission on Railway Accidents, which reported about this time two years ago, paid particular attention to the matter of "continuous brakes;" and that a series of trials, at their request, was made in the year 1875, near Newark, to which the principal English Railway Companies sent trains, and at which experiments were made with different kinds of continuous brakes. The result of these inquiries was that the Commissioners in their Report recommended that Railway Companies should be required by law, under adequate penalties, to supply all trains with sufficient brake power to stop them within 500 yards under all circumstances. In making that recommendation, the Commissioners refrained advisedly from mentioning any particular kind of brake; but they suggested what at the time seemed to be a reasonable distance (500 yards) within which all trains should be stopped. To have done otherwise would have been to discourage improvements in brakes. The result had proved the wisdom of the recommendation. On page 105 of the Report would be found the result of experiments with seven different continuous brakes, using all available brake and other power, including sand. The shortest stop obtained was with a train of the Midland Company, weighing over 200 tons, and travelling 51½ miles an hour; the distance in which the train was stopped was 275 yards; the time was 18 seconds. The brake was the Westinghouse air brake. Last year a series of experiments were made on the Brighton line by Mr. Westinghouse and Captain Douglas Galton, when a stop was obtained by a train travelling 50 miles an hour in 119 yards and 10¼ seconds. An interesting account of these experiments was contained in *The Times* of August 30. As the weight of the train was not given, nor the particular kind of brake used mentioned — although he presumed it was the Westinghouse air brake—he could not make an exact comparison; but, at any rate, very considerable progress had been made in the three years, the distance within which a stop could be made being reduced more than a half. Although the Government had not acted upon the Commissioners' recommendation, yet in August, 1877, the Board of Trade called the attention of Railway Companies to the matter of continuous brakes, and to a correspondence which had lately taken place between the Board and the Railway Association relative to the use of such brakes; and in the course of this letter the Board laid down the conditions which, in their opinion, were essential to a good continuous brake. After saying that there had been apparently no attempt on the part of the Companies to agree upon the requirements of a good continuous brake, they went on to say—

> "In the opinion of the Board of Trade these conditions should be as follows:—
>
> "(*a.*) The brakes to be efficient in stopping trains, instantaneous in their action, and capable of being applied without difficulty by engine-drivers or guards.
>
> "(*b.*) In case of accident to be instantaneously self-acting.
>
> "(*c.*) The brakes to be put on and taken off (with facility) on the engine and every vehicle of a train.
>
> "(*d.*) The brakes to be regularly used in daily working.
>
> "(*e.*) The materials employed to be of a durable character, so as to be easily maintained and kept in order.
>
> "The inquiries and experiments instituted by the Royal Commission on Railway Accidents, and the recent researches into the causes of railway accidents during the last few years, appear to the Board of Trade to leave no doubt as to the importance of the above conditions, and the experience which has been obtained by the companies appears sufficient to enable them to come to some general and unanimous conclusion. There can, therefore, be no reason for further delay, and the Board of Trade feel it their duty again to urge upon the railway companies the necessity for arriving at an immediate decision and united action in the matter."

Further Returns were laid before Parliament last year, by which it appeared that no unanimous opinion had been arrived at among the Railway Companies. The Government introduced and passed an Act last Session—Continuous Brakes Act, 1878—compelling Railway Companies to make a periodical Return respecting the use of continuous brakes on their passenger trains, and it was to the first Return that he now wished to call their Lordships' attention. On page 4 of that Paper would be found an abstract showing the description of continuous brakes in use, the amount of stock fitted, and the mileage run with each description of brake. The result was that there was yet no uniformity, and there was still a great deal to be done. Only 16 per cent of the engines and 21 per cent of the carriages were fitted with these brakes at all; while only three out of a much larger number of brakes complied with the requirements of the Board of Trade Circular. If these requirements were to be carried out by legislation, surely it would be better to do so before more stock was fitted with a wrong kind of brake. He was not for undue interference with Railway Companies; but he thought that the 500 yards recommended by the Royal Commission might now be materially shortened, and that the Board of Trade conditions should be insisted on. He understood that men employed on railways regarded this question of brakes as possessing an interest only second to that of compensation for injuries they might sustain during the course of their employment—and certainly it was a question of great importance to the public. The Railway Commissioners recommended that there should be an appeal from the Board of

Trade to some other tribunal. The noble Earl at the head of the Government objected to that, and he admitted that there was force in the objection, because it was an awkward thing to have an appeal from a Department of the Government. But, on the other hand, the Railway Commissioners felt it hard on Railway Companies that, without being heard by counsel or otherwise, they should be condemned to a considerable expenditure. The difficulty might, perhaps, be met by the establishment of a tribunal before whom an officer of the Board of Trade might appear as prosecutor. One of the Commissioners thought there might be a special tribunal to act as between Railway Companies and the public. As he had already said, he entertained an objection against undue interference with Railway Companies in the management of their own concerns; but he thought the powers of the Board of Trade might be extended, so as to enable it to deal more effectually with this brake question. The year before last he moved a Standing Order on the subject; and his noble Friend the President of the Council held out the hope that the matter would be dealt with in a general measure. He did not now expect a Bill specially applicable to it, but there were rumours of a general Bill, and he hoped to hear that in its provisions would be included enactments having reference to continuous brakes.

LORD NORTON said, that as he, thinking that the subject was not yet ripe for legislation, had commenced the conference between the Board of Trade and the Railway Association, he wished to say a few words. The conference to which he referred led to the Board of Trade issuing to every Company Circulars, in August, 1877, and to the short Act of last Session for obtaining Returns, and, consequently, to the Returns now before Parliament. The subject was important, not only for the safety of the public, but also in relation to the expeditious conveyance of goods and the effectiveness of signal arrangements. The art of increasing speed had outstripped the art of stopping. The problem how best to stop 100 tons weight running 60 miles an hour was slowly working out, and nothing should be done to check experiment, but every freedom should be allowed to promote it. Parliament, therefore, had been asked by no one to interfere in the way of prescribing the best kind of brake to be adopted for railways; because to do so would be to check improvement, and to relieve the undertakers from the sense of responsibility. But Parliament could, at all events, insist upon the five essential qualities of brakes recommended in the Circular Letter of 1877—that they should be continuous, automatic, instantaneous, in constant use, and of strong material. The first requirement for expediting improvement was constant publication of what was being done, and for that the short Act of last Session, and consequent Returns, were sufficient. Uniformity of brake was most desirable—that not only the best, but the same should be used for all, both for interchange of rolling stock between one line and another, and more especially when two or more lines were continuous; but it was doubtful if uniformity was yet possible. The Returns showed as yet but slow improvement and many failures. From the last Return it appeared that there were still only 16 per cent of the engines and 21 per cent of the passenger carriages fitted with continuous brakes. The fact was there was a money interest in each invention. If it were enacted that no brake should be considered sufficient which had not the five qualities stipulated for in the Circular, the responsibility for any accident from want of brake power would fall on a Company using brakes without those qualities.

LORD HENNIKER said, their Lordships would agree with him in saying that his noble Friend had done good service in bringing this question before the House. It was one of importance; great interest was taken in it both inside and outside Parliament, and, no doubt, in this—as in all questions connected with railway working—the expression of public opinion and discussions in Parliament had a great effect upon the Railway Companies; for experience had shown that, in the end, the best system was generally adopted. Railway Companies were naturally rather slow to adopt any system which involved a large expenditure; and particularly where a change in the working arrangements would also be necessary, although the Companies were themselves equally, if not more interested than anyone in adopting the best systems of working their traffic. He did not think he need trouble their Lordships with any lengthened remarks on the present occasion, because last year, in a discussion raised by his noble Friend the noble Earl behind him (Earl De La Warr), he had gone fully into the question; but he should be glad to remind the House of the action which had been taken in the matter. For many years the Inspecting Officers of the Board of Trade had reported that more efficient brake power was necessary on passenger trains. In January, 1877, a Letter was addressed by the Board of Trade to the Railway Companies' Association. As progress in the desired direction was slow, a Circular Letter was addressed to all the Railway Companies in August of the same year. This Letter was printed in the Paper issued that morning. It spoke for itself, and showed clearly the opinion of the Department, and how strongly they had urged the Companies to adopt some good system of brakes. The replies to this Circular were printed last Session. They did not show that rapid progress was being made by the Companies; but still great progress had been made since January, 1877. The Board of Trade, however, did not then think it desirable to interfere by legislating on the subject. The difficulties were great, and must be overcome before any general system was agreed upon; for instance, the recommendation of the Royal Commission, referred to by the noble Earl—that every train should, in all circumstances, be pulled up easily in 500 yards. Would it be possible for the Board of Trade to see such a provision carried out? Again, it was undesirable to lay down that only one particular brake should be used, as this would prevent the Companies from availing themselves of any improvements which might be made. However, he stated at the time that it might be wise to pass a short Act of Parliament to require Returns to be sent in every six months to the Board of Trade by all the Railway Companies as to the progress they were making in fitting their engines and carriages with brakes. It was thought that it would be desirable to introduce such a measure by many noble Lords who took an interest in railway matters, and it was brought in and passed. The Board of Trade were encouraged in the hope that this Act would have a good effect by the result which a similar Act, relating to the block and interlocking system, passed in 1873—the Regulation of Railways Act—had had in inducing the Railway Companies to adopt that system. The Return issued to-day was the result of that Act. He was sorry to see that the amount of stock fitted with continuous brakes during the last six months to December 31, 1878, was not very large; but still some progress was being made, and he hoped the Act might prove to be as useful a one as the Act of 1873—at all events, the Return was a useful one. That Return brought the question up to the present time, as far as regarded the action of the Board of Trade. It would not be right for him to go further into the question at the present time. He had merely stated these few facts, that what had been done might be clearly before the House; and to show that the Board of Trade had been alive to the necessity of a better system of brake power, and had not been inactive in pressing the subject on the attention of the Railway Companies. His reason for not wishing to go further into details was this:—Their Lordships would recollect that on the re-assembling of Parliament it was stated that Her Majesty's Government were about to introduce a measure to deal with the Railway Commission, whose powers expired at the end of this Session of Parliament. The noble Viscount who presided over the Board of Trade (Viscount Sandon) thought, very properly, that disjointed statements made at different times and in different places as to the various subjects connected with the working of railways were inconvenient, and probably misleading. Viscount Sandon proposed before long to introduce the Bill to which he had referred in the House of Commons, and he would then take the opportunity of stating fully the opinions of the Government as to the question now before their Lordships, and several other subjects of interest and importance in railway management.

EARL DE LA WARR said, that the subject was a very important one, and he was glad to find that the Board of Trade had taken it up. The progress they had made in it was not very satisfactory, for the Returns showed that the use of continuous brake power had not been adopted as it ought to be; but it seemed that the action of the Board of Trade had stirred up the Railway Companies, and there was reason to hope that their efforts would lead to some result. It was satisfactory to know that Her Majesty's Government would use its influence in the matter; and he hoped that the Railway Companies would themselves make further experiments, and come to some agreement among themselves as to the best form of brake to be employed.

ARMY REGULATIONS — NON-COMMISSIONED OFFICERS.—QUESTION.

THE EARL OF GALLOWAY asked the Under Secretary of State for War, Whether, under existing Regulations, a non-commissioned officer in the Regular Army is liable to be called upon to perform any other duties connected with a brigade, depôt, or sub-district, than those of the Militia regiment to the permanent staff, of which he had been attached for probationary duty only during the non-training period?

VISCOUNT BURY said, in answer to his noble Friend, that Circular 101 of 1877 made no difference between the two classes of men.

House adjourned at Six o'clock, till To-morrow, half past Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Thursday, 6th March, 1879.

MINUTES.]—SUPPLY—*considered in Committee* —CIVIL SERVICE SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES, 1878-9—R.P.

PUBLIC BILLS — *Second Reading* — Exchequer Bonds (No. 1) [92]; Public Health Act (1875) Amendment * [33].

*Committee—Report—*Consolidated Fund (No. 1)*; Racecourses (Metropolis) [48].

QUESTIONS.

CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY (IRELAND) —SPEECH OF MR. W. JOHNSTON.

QUESTION.

MR. SULLIVAN asked Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, If his attention has been called to a report in the "Belfast News Letter" of the 12th instant of a party demonstration in Belfast, stated to have been presided over by Mr. W. Johnston, Orange Grand Master, who was surrounded by members wearing the insignia of the Order, and who commenced his speech by addressing his auditory as "Brother Orangemen;" whether in that speech Mr. Johnston announced his and their

> "determination to maintain to the utmost of our power the position which we now occupy as Conservatives and Orangemen in this great frontier town of Belfast,"

and thereupon proceeded to inveigh against the Catholic claim for a Catholic University, declaring that a Catholic University would "pervert moral philosophy and stifle free thought and free inquiry;" whether this gentleman is a salaried official of the Crown, as Commissioner of Irish Fisheries; and, whether such a display of feeling will be tolerated by Her Majesty's Government on the part of a salaried public functionary?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: Mr. Speaker, my attention was called to the report by the Question of the hon. and learned Gentleman, and I communicated with my right hon. Friend the Chief Secretary for Ireland on the subject. The report, as given in the Question of the hon. and learned Member, is correct. Of course, it is known to the House that Mr. Johnston is a salaried official of the Crown, and a Commissioner of Irish Fisheries. Mr. Johnston, as we all know, sat for many years in this House, and he has recently become a member of the permanent Civil Service, and is, perhaps, hardly aware as yet how very objectionable the use of such expressions must be, as placing him in an embarrassing position, and in one that is inconsistent with that of a salaried servant of the Crown. My right hon. Friend has given him a caution on the subject, and it is to be hoped that there will not be a repetition of such observations.

PUBLIC WORKS (INDIA)—CONSTRUCTION OF INDIAN RAILWAYS.

QUESTION.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE asked the Under Secretary of State for India, Whether it is true that the Indian Government have granted concessions which will enable a Railway to be made from Bellary to Marmagoa in Portuguese territory, in preference to the proposed State Railway of 1872 from Bellary to Karwar in British territory; to whom the concession has been made; and, whether the Correspondence which has passed on this subject between the Home and the Indian Governments will be laid upon the Table?

Mr. E. STANHOPE: The promise of a conditional concession has been made by the Secretary of State in Council to Mr. Frederick Campbell for the construction of a railway from Bellary to Marmagoa, but not necessarily in substitution for that from Bellary to Karwar. Some particulars will be found in the Evidence taken last year by the Select Committee on Public Works in India. I will put the Correspondence in the Library; and if, after examining it, the hon. Baronet still thinks it of sufficient public interest and will move for it, he can have it as an unopposed Return.

POOR LAW (IRELAND)—REMOVAL OF IRISH PAUPERS.—QUESTION.

Major NOLAN had a Notice on the Paper to ask the President of the Local Government Board, If it is a fact that a man named Patrick Feeny, who had been resident over twenty years in Blackburn, was removed from the Blackburn Workhouse Hospital and sent in charge of a Poor Law official to Dublin; if this official left him in Dublin with a loaf of bread and with two shillings to defray his expenses to Gort, in the county of Galway, a distance of 130 miles; if Patrick Feeny had been nine months in hospital suffering from paralysis, and if at the time he was left in Dublin he was in a state of great debility and scarcely able to crawl; and, further, was any certificate of a doctor procured before the man was thus removed, and what were the terms of the certificate, and was any promise made by any of the workhouse officials to Patrick Feeny before quitting Blackburn that he would be left in Gort?

Mr. SCLATER-BOOTH, in reply, said, the Notice had already been put on the Paper by the hon. and gallant Member, and he had assured him on a previous occasion that there was no foundation for the statement contained with reference to Feeny. He thought it rather hard on the Blackburn Union that the subject should be again brought forward without any further information being forthcoming.

ARMY—WAR OFFICE CONTRACTS. QUESTION.

Mr. MACDONALD asked the Secretary of State for War, If his attention has been directed to a correspondence in respect to a contract for locks furnished to the War Office, in which it is stated that a person furnished locks at a very large percentage above purchase price; if he has taken any steps to find if these allegations are correct; and, whether there was any particular reason why that tradesman was selected to supply the locks?

Colonel STANLEY: In answer to the hon. Gentleman, I may state that my attention has been called to the correspondence respecting the locks furnished to the War Office, or, rather, to the contractor, and I have taken steps to find out whether the allegations implied in the Question are correct; but I have not yet received all the particulars I require before I express an opinion on the subject. I only hope that the hon. Member will repeat his Question in about a week's time.

POST OFFICE—THE BOOK POST. QUESTION.

Mr. MITCHELL HENRY asked the Postmaster General, If he would explain to the House why letters and book packets between the limits of eighteen and twenty-four inches in length, and nine and twelve inches in depth, are permitted to pass through all parts of the kingdom if intended for delivery in the Colonies or abroad, and yet are absolutely prohibited from inland circulation; whether the Postmaster General is aware that a packet of that size posted in France is delivered by the Post Office in this Country notwithstanding these regulations; and, whether the Post Office could not adopt with advantage the standard rule that prevails in most Foreign Countries and in the Colonies of a maximum of twenty-four inches in length?

Lord JOHN MANNERS: Sir, bulky packets are so inconvenient to deal with, especially when the mail bags containing them are exchanged by apparatus, that it was found necessary some years ago to reduce the dimensions. Larger packets are permitted to be sent to foreign countries, and are sometimes received from foreign parts, but they are so few in number that, practically, no inconvenience is experienced from their transmission; but I am informed that it would be highly inexpedient to alter the rule of the inland post in this respect.

"GENERAL STATISTICAL ABSTRACT"—FOREIGN TARIFFS ON BRITISH PRODUCE.—QUESTION.

Mr. W. E. FORSTER asked the President of the Board of Trade, Whether he can furnish a Return of the tariff in the principal articles of British and Irish produce which was levied in the principal countries of Europe, and America, and in the Colonies, in 1859, and which is levied this year; and, whether a Return of such tariffs can be included in the General Statistical Abstract for future years?

Mr. J. G. TALBOT: In the absence of my noble Friend, who, I regret to say, is unexpectedly absent, owing to domestic affliction, I may ask leave to answer the right hon. Gentleman's Question. With regard to the first part of it, we shall be happy to give the right hon. Gentleman a Return which will probably supply him with the information he desires. With regard to the latter part, I fear that we shall not be able to include the whole information in the Statistical Abstract, as it would add very largely to the bulk of that document; but we shall be glad to consider how much it will be possible to give in that form with due regard to the public convenience.

IRELAND — ATTENDANCE OF IRISH RESIDENT MAGISTRATES AT PETTY SESSIONS.—QUESTION.

Mr. COGAN asked the Chief Secretary for Ireland, If he can state when the Returns, ordered by the House of Commons last Session, relative to the attendance of Resident Magistrates at Petty Sessions in Ireland, will be laid upon the Table of the House?

Mr. J. LOWTHER: I hope we will be able to lay them on the Table to-night.

POOR LAW GUARDIANS (IRELAND).

QUESTION.

Mr. O'CONNOR POWER asked the Chief Secretary for Ireland, Whether the provisions of the Bill, now in preparation, for the purpose of carrying out certain recommendations of the Select Committee which inquired last Session into the mode of election of Poor Law guardians are to be extended to Ireland, or whether a separate Bill for Ireland will be brought in by the Government?

Mr. J. LOWTHER: I have no knowledge of any such Bill as that to which the hon. Gentleman refers, so I conclude that it cannot in any way be intended to apply to Ireland. The Report of the Committee to which reference is made is now under the consideration of the Government, and the decision at which we arrive will in due course be communicated to the House.

TURKEY — APPOINTMENT OF A FINANCE COMMISSIONER.

QUESTION.

Mr. COGAN asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether any reply has been given with reference to the application made by the Porte for the appointment of a Financial Commissioner?

Mr. BOURKE: Yes, Sir; this subject has received the consideration of Her Majesty's Government, and we are communicating with the French Government. That is now being done.

ARMY—HALF-PAY SERVICE.

QUESTION.

Sir EARDLEY WILMOT asked the Secretary of State for War, If, when he considers the question of half-pay service, owing to sickness not being allowed to count towards voluntary retirement, he will also take into consideration the case of those officers who have been promoted to the Half-pay List, as a reward for their services, and yet are not permitted to reckon such half-pay service towards voluntary retirement?

Colonel STANLEY, in reply, said, he had no objection to refer this subject to a small Committee, which would, at the same time, inquire into the question raised by the hon. and gallant Member for Hereford (Colonel Arbuthnot).

IMPRISONMENT FOR DEBT—LEGISLATION.—QUESTION.

Mr. M. T. BASS asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether it is the intention of the Government to introduce any measure affecting the Law by which imprisonment for debt now exists?

Mr. ASSHETON CROSS: A Bill has already been introduced into the other House of Parliament by the Lord Chancellor in order to amend the Act of 1869. Necessary amendments will be made in consequence of the Bankruptcy Bill which has also been introduced in the House of Lords; and when it comes down here it will be competent for the hon. Member to raise the question, when Her Majesty's Government will be in a position to state their views upon the subject, and to see whether any alteration of the existing law in reference to it is required.

INDIA—THE NORTH-WESTERN FRONTIER—THE OCCUPATION OF QUETTAH.—QUESTION.

Mr. DILLWYN asked Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, If he will communicate to the House the "precise instructions" authorizing the occupation of Quettah which were given by Her Majesty's Government, and the reasons which induced them to authorize that measure, which, by a Despatch dated December 26, 1867, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, on the part of the Government then in power, had declared would be inexpedient both on political and military grounds?

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER: It seems to me that this is a Question of a very argumentative character. It is intended, probably, to provoke some debate. I cannot understand what is the object of the hon. Member in putting the words "precise instructions" in inverted commas. [Mr. Dillwyn: They are quoted from a despatch.] I do not know what the hon. Member refers to. There are no precise instructions authorizing the occupation of Quettah; but if he will turn to the Papers presented last Session and the Session before he will see that there is a despatch from the Government of India, dated the 23rd of March, 1877, and a despatch from the Secretary of State of the 13th of December following, which gives full information as to the reasons why the Indian Government at that time decided, upon the request of the Khan of Khelat, to send a British Force from Hindostan, and selected Quettah as the proper post.

SOUTH KENSINGTON—NATURAL HISTORY MUSEUM.—QUESTION.

Lord ARTHUR RUSSELL asked the First Commissioner of Works, What progress has been made in the Natural History Museum at South Kensington, and when the removal of the collections from the British Museum may be expected?

Mr. GERARD NOEL, in reply, said, it depended very much on the Votes of the House when that work would be completed. At the present moment very costly fittings were being made for those collections; and he hoped that in the course of the present year the botanical and mineral collections would be placed in the new buildings.

THE TREATY OF BERLIN—EASTERN ROUMELIA.—QUESTIONS.

Mr. WHITWELL asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether he can inform the House what progress the Commission appointed to "elaborate the organisation of Eastern Roumelia" has made; whether it has "determined" upon "the powers and functions of the Governor General as well as the administrative system, judicial and financial, of the province;" whether the Russian troops are expected to evacuate Eastern Roumelia at the expiration of nine months from the ratification of the Treaty of Berlin, although the Commission may not have completed its work; and, whether the troops of the Porte will enter into the province on the departure of the Russians?

Mr. BOURKE, in reply, said, that the Commission appointed to elaborate the organization of Eastern Roumelia had been engaged in drawing up a Constitution for that Province. The different chapters of the Constitution had been divided among the members of the Commission, and he thought that more than six chapters had already been completed. Among the chapters so completed were, he was informed, those relating to public rights, the powers of the Governor General, and finance. The hon. Member asked—

> "Whether the Russian troops are expected to evacuate Eastern Roumelia at the expiration of nine months from the ratification of the Treaty of Berlin, although the Commission may not have completed its work?"

His answer to that was, "Yes, certainly." With regard to the Question—

> "Whether the troops of the Porte will enter into the province on the departure of the Russians?"

he would refer the hon. Member to the Treaty, which said that the troops of the Porte shall be able to garrison the Frontier of the Province, and in the event of disorder shall have the power of entering the Province. He could not at present lay any Papers on the Table in connection with the proceedings of the Commission.

MR. E. JENKINS: With regard to the answer given to the Question of my hon. Friend the Member for Kendal, I wish to ask, Whether it is to be distinctly understood that it is in the contemplation of the Government, in the event of disorder in Eastern Roumelia, that the whole of the district shall be left to the mercy of the Turkish troops?

MR. BOURKE: In my reply to the hon. Member for Kendal I referred him to the Treaty; and I must give the same answer to the hon. Member for Dundee.

SOUTH AFRICA—THE RE-INFORCEMENTS.—QUESTION.

COLONEL MURE: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War a Question of which I have given him private Notice—namely, Whether any regiments of the Line are being completed up to their war strength in case additional re-inforcements should be required for the Army in Zululand, or in the other British Colonies of South Africa, and, if so, what regiments; and if no regiments are thus being completed, whether the right hon. and gallant Gentleman will inform the House what troops will be sent out should additional re-inforcements be required?

COLONEL STANLEY: In answer to the hon. and gallant Gentleman, I have to say that upon the regiments becoming what is called first for service on the roster they are gradually brought up to their proper strength. That is so under ordinary circumstances, as different battalions go abroad to complete their tour, whether of active or foreign service. We are not taking any unusual steps to fill up the battalions; nor, at the present time, do I apprehend that re-inforcements will be required. Perhaps I may be allowed to add that the number of battalions sent out was in excess of those demanded by the authorities on the spot. I would further state, in order to put myself technically right, that the battalions sent out to the Cape are, in round numbers, 840 strong. A battalion technically on the war strength would be over 1,000 strong. It is not intended to bring them up to that strength.

AFGHANISTAN—OPERATIONS IN KHOST VALLEY.—QUESTION.

MR. ONSLOW: I wish to ask the Under Secretary of State for India, Whether any Report has been received from Major General Roberts as to operations in the Khost Valley; and, if so, whether he has any objection to lay it on the Table of the House?

MR. E. STANHOPE: Yes, Sir; we have just received a Report from Major General Roberts as to operations in the Khost Valley; and as the attention of the House has been rather specially called to those operations, I shall be happy to lay the Report on the Table.

AFGHANISTAN—DISTURBANCES IN BURMAH.—QUESTIONS.

THE MARQUESS OF HARTINGTON: I wish to give Notice that, on Monday, I will ask the Chancellor of the Exchequer, Whether the Government intend to lay upon the Table any further Papers relating to the War in Afghanistan; and, further, with reference to what fell from the right hon. Gentleman on the re-assembling of the House, whether he intends shortly to make any Statement to the House on the subject? I would also take the opportunity of asking the Chancellor of the Exchequer a Question of which I have not been able to give him Notice, owing to the report having just reached me. I wish to ask, Whether there is any truth in the report that, in consequence of disturbances which have taken place in Burmah, a British Force has been ordered there?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: I have not heard the report alluded to by the noble Marquess, nor has my hon. Friend the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs heard anything of it. I presume, therefore, that it is not correct.

IRELAND—WATERFORD HARBOUR BOARD.—QUESTION.

Major O'GORMAN asked the Attorney General for Ireland, Whether his attention has been called to the subject of the defalcations of the secretary of the Harbour Board of Waterford; and, if so, what steps he intends to take in the matter?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL for IRELAND (Mr. Gibson): My attention has been called to the matter referred to by the hon. and gallant Member, but the proceedings do not, in my opinion, call for interference. I believe that the secretary has resigned his office.

ARMY DISCIPLINE AND REGULATION BILL—THE MUTINY BILL.

OBSERVATIONS.

Colonel STANLEY said, it might be for the convenience of the House, with reference to this Bill, which was one of the Orders of the Day, if he called attention to an Amendment which stood on the Paper in the name of an hon. and learned Member opposite (Mr. O'Shaughnessy), namely—

> "That, having regard to the intended permanent character of the provisions of this Bill, and the consequent necessity for their careful consideration, it is desirable to provide for the administration of the Law pending the passing of this Bill by renewing the existing Mutiny Acts for a period of three months."

Although every effort had been made to place the Bill in the hands of hon. Members as speedily as possible, he was unable to proceed with it that night; and, accepting the Amendment to which he had referred in the same spirit in which he presumed it was proposed—namely, as one meant for the convenience of the House—he would not offer any opposition to that Amendment on the part of the Government, on the understanding, which he took to be implied in it, that the Bill for the continuance of the Mutiny Act for three months, pending the consideration of the Army Discipline and Regulation Bill, should be a simple Continuance Bill, to be passed without Amendment. After the promise given by his noble Friend who preceded him in his present Office, he had felt bound to do all that he could to spare the House the necessity of passing the Mutiny Acts again in the existing form. But having redeemed that promise to the best of his power, he could not help feeling that it would be convenient to accept the Amendment of the hon. Member opposite, with the understanding he had mentioned. With the leave of the House, therefore—the number of men having been voted—he would on Monday next introduce a mere Continuance Bill such as he had described. He might add that there were several precedents for the passing of a mere Continuance Bill of that kind.

ORDERS OF THE DAY.

SUPPLY—COMMITTEE.

Order for Committee read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair."

KEW GARDENS.—RESOLUTION.

Sir TREVOR LAWRENCE rose to call attention to the existing Regulations for the opening of Kew Gardens to the public; and to move—

> "That, in the opinion of this House, it is desirable that the Royal Gardens at Kew should be opened to the public at 10 a.m. on week days, with such reservations as may be found expedient."

In bringing this subject before the House he disclaimed all feeling of hostility, or even of indifference, either to the interests of botanical science or of Kew Gardens. On the contrary, he had always taken great interest in botanical and horticultural pursuits, and he regarded Kew Gardens as being the most successful botanical establishment in the world. His only motive, therefore, was to further the interests of the English public in this matter. The outlay of public money on the Gardens was very large. Last year it was, in round numbers, £20,000, and this year it was somewhat over £18,000. This constituted one-sixth of the whole amount voted by Parliament for the Parks and pleasure-grounds of the United Kingdom. The number of visitors to Kew Gardens was constantly increasing. In 1877 it was 678,972, being considerably larger than the number of visitors to the British Museum, exclusive of the Reading Room. On the occasion of two Bank holidays last year close upon 60,000 visitors entered the Gardens in one day. One proof that good had been done by the movement for extending the hours during which the Gardens were open to the public was afforded by the fact that on Bank holidays the Gardens were now open at 10 o'clock, instead of 1 o'clock, as was formerly the case. That the change was appreciated was shown by the circumstance that on Easter Monday 4,000 people, and on Whit Monday 5,000 people, entered the Gardens before 1 o'clock. In another matter the movement for an earlier opening had done good—for owing to it the regulations for the admission of botanists and horticulturists, during hours when the Gardens were closed, had been put upon a regular footing, and they no longer had the scandal of such people being refused admittance. While agreeing with the Director that in all matters connected with Kew botanical science had a paramount claim, he showed by quotations from the Reports of Dr. Linley and of Sir William Hooker, that the Gardens ought to become an efficient instrument for refining the taste and for increasing the knowledge and rational pleasure of the middle and lower classes. The Gardens covered an area altogether of about 400 acres; the botanic portion consisting of 75 acres, the pleasure-grounds of 275 acres, and the Royal Reserve, which was not much used, of 40 acres. He desired that increased facilities should be given for the enjoyment of these Gardens. They were opened throughout the year at 1 o'clock, with the exception of Christmas Day, and closed at sunset. Thus in the winter season they were opened about two hours and three-quarters, and about seven hours in the summer, during the longest days. At Dublin, however, the Botanical Gardens were open from 10 to 6 all the year round. At Edinburgh the Botanical Gardens were open daily, except on Sundays, from 6 to 6; from daylight to dark in winter; and from 6 a.m. to 8 p.m. in June, July, and August. The Jardin des Plants at Paris was open daily from 8 o'clock till dark. The Botanical Gardens of Berlin were open for nine hours every day, except Saturday and Sunday; but although they were entirely closed on two days of the week, they were in the course of each year open for a longer period than Kew Gardens. At Hamburg the Botanical Gardens were open from sunrise to sunset; and at Geneva they were open every day during daylight. The Botanical Gardens at Rouen, Lyons, Caen, and other places in France were also open daily during daylight. Sir Daniel Cooper, formerly Speaker of the House at Sydney, stated that at Sydney the Botanical Gardens were open from 6 a.m. till 8 p.m. in summer, and while there was daylight in winter, adding that they were a general resort of residents of the city during all hours of the day. All these Gardens were open much more liberally to the public than those at Kew; and when it was said that it was impossible to do at Kew what was done elsewhere, he might fairly ask why it should be so? It was alleged that there was no real demand for the opening of the Gardens except a local demand. But the Vestries and local bodies of the West of London and the suburbs, almost without exception, had memorialized the House in favour of an early opening. He himself presented last year one of the largest Petitions he had seen presented since he had become a Member of the House for the early opening of the Gardens. Then, it was said that opening at 10 o'clock would interfere with the students and the workmen. As regards students, in proportion to its size, there were few at Kew compared with Edinburgh, where 389 attended lectures and botanical demonstrations in 1877. The students at Edinburgh were also able to carry on their studies without any inconvenience from the attendance of visitors, who numbered nearly 80,000. Then, as to the work of the Gardens—which consisted mainly in rolling a large extent of paths, mowing a quantity of grass, and raking and keeping the beds in order—he appealed to the common sense of any gentleman who had experience in such matters, whether the presence of people in the Gardens was likely to interfere with that? There was one respect in which he regretted very much the view taken by the Director, and that was as to the behaviour of the people. The

Director stated that on one of the Bank holidays, "no sooner were the gates opened, than a swarm of filthy children and women of the lowest class invaded the Gardens." He (Sir Trevor Lawrence) went to the Gardens in order to see the character of the visitors on this very Bank holiday, and they appeared to him a most decent, respectable, and orderly set of people. The Director also brought the serious charge against the people that they resorted to the woods for immoral purposes in great numbers. If the House considered that that was on an occasion when there were 60,000 persons in the Gardens, he would put it to them whether that was likely to be the case? He did not rely merely upon his own observation, but put himself into communication with the police on the subject; and the Inspector reported that, having made careful inquiry, all the police on duty agreed that they had witnessed no disorder or immoral conduct, nor had they heard any complaints except as to smoking and carrying baskets. He remembered himself, 25 years ago, making protestations of unalterable affection to a lady in a garden, and a more appropriate place for such declarations he could not imagine. With regard to the charges which had been made against the conduct of the people, he might fairly quote our national motto, *Honi soit qui mal y pense.* Then it was said that the expense would be very much increased—the people would want so much looking after. He did not think the people of this country required to be looked after so much. He had a report from the police authorities stating that there would be no necessity for additional men, and that all that would be required would be a refreshment allowance to the existing number of constables. The earlier opening of the Gardens would only entail an extra cost of £130 per anuum, and for that money the use of the Gardens by the public would be extended three hours a-day. It was not necessary that the whole of the Gardens should be thrown open; that might not be desirable. The botanical portion might remain closed, as now, till 1 o'clock; while the pleasure-gardens, which comprised 270 acres, were opened at 10 o'clock. It appeared to him that another reasonable compromise would be that for six or eight months in the year the Gardens should be opened at 10 a.m., instead of 1 p.m. He appealed to hon. Members from Scotland and Ireland to assist him in getting the advantages which were enjoyed in their countries. The hon. Baronet concluded by moving his Resolution.

Mr. T. CAVE seconded the Motion. He believed the great obstacle to any concession in this matter arose, not from public, but from personal reasons. Sir Joseph Hooker and his staff, whom he wished to speak of with all the respect they deserved, had been engaged in a most unpleasant correspondence with their neighbours. He was not complaining of the course they had taken; but the fact was, that they had built a very ugly wall in the face of some very pretty villas, at which the inhabitants of those villas were naturally irate. He was afraid that the language and the spirit which had been manifested on both sides were not such as to conduce to a settlement of the question. In consequence of that discussion a bitter feeling had been established between the parties; and Sir Joseph Hooker was determined to do all he could to prevent his neighbours from getting from the House the concession they desired to get. He (Mr. T. Cave) resided in that district; he had a large family and received many friends, and nothing pleased him better than to take his friends to the Kew Gardens. He was accustomed to enter them, not only from the public road, but by the entrances from the River; and he could say, without fear of contradiction, that he had never in his life seen or heard of the slightest approach to immorality. But if it was true that there was immorality, the earlier hours would rather tend to decrease than increase it; because he knew that much intemperance resulted from people going down to Kew in ignorance of this strange and arbitrary rule. People went down in large numbers, and were compelled to remain in public-houses for two or three hours before they could gain admittance. In the interests, therefore, of temperance, of science, and of morality, he cordially seconded the Motion.

Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "in the opinion of this House, it is desirable that the

Royal Gardens at Kew should be opened to the public at 10 a.m. on week-days, with such reservations as may be found expedient,"—(*Sir Trevor Lawrence,*)

—instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

MR. GERARD NOEL said, he had little to add upon this question to what he had stated when it was brought forward last year. The question had been very carefully considered by the Department, and there were two very strong reasons against the proposal. In the first place, it would very materially add to the annual expenditure; and, in the second place, it would altogether alter the character of the Gardens, and the purpose for which they were originally established. The gardeners went to work in the morning, and remained till 12 o'clock, when they went to dinner; after that they appeared in the Gardens as constables, and if the Gardens were opened at 10 an increased staff would be necessary, at an expense of from £1,500 to £2,000 a-year. Were there any sufficient grounds for this additional outlay? He was informed, on the best authority, that the majority of those who visited the Gardens did not go there till long after the time the Gardens were opened. On Bank holiday in August last year the Gardens had been opened at 10, when the number of visitors was about 58,000. Of that vast number, not more than 4,000 entered before 2 o'clock. Between 10 and 11 only about 600 were admitted; between 11 and 12, 1,200; between 12 and 2, about 2,000. This, he thought, clearly showed that the public had no particular desire to enter the Gardens before 1 o'clock. And, indeed, how was it possible for artizans and labourers to go there before that hour? Very exaggerated statements were made in the papers last August about the number of persons kept waiting at the gate; and he had, therefore, had a Return prepared on the subject. In August, 45 presented themselves before 2 o'clock; in September, 32; October, 12; November, 4; December, 3; January, (1879), 3; and February, 3; and in March, 4. He had no doubt that a number of nurserymaids would like the arboretum opened in the morning; but as it was planted with the most costly shrubs, it would be a sad thing to throw it open merely as a public park, and if it were so thrown open from 25 to 35 additional men would have to be added to the staff. With respect to other places which were public property, the time was limited during which they were open. For instance, the British Museum was open to the general public four days a-week; Windsor Castle, five days; the National Gallery, four days; Hampton Court, five days; South Kensington Museum, the most popular institution in London, was open three days free, on the other days the public had to pay; and the Tower of London, two days; while Kew Gardens were open every day of the week, Sunday included. They were open until dusk, which meant half-past 8 o'clock in summer, and they were closed only on one holiday—namely, Christmas Day. There really was no ground of complaint, for there was no other institution in the country from which the public derived so much advantage, or to which they were so freely admitted as Kew. Persons taking a special interest in botany and horticulture were admitted at 8 o'clock in the morning. The earlier opening of the Gardens to the public would involve considerable expense, and it would also alter the character of the Gardens, and deprive them of the scientific character which it was originally intended they should maintain. In 1840, a Treasury Committee was appointed to report on the condition and management of Kew Gardens in connection with the arrangements made as to the Civil List in 1838. The result was, the botanical gardens, the pleasure-grounds, and the deer park were transferred from the Lord Chamberlain's Department to the Woods and Forests, and the botanical gardens were given by the Queen to the nation for scientific purposes, for the culture of plants from all parts of the world, for the instruction of the public, for the propagation of useful plants for distribution to India and the Colonies, and for furnishing the Government with general information on such subjects. In 1841, Sir William Hooker was appointed Director, and was furnished with a copy of the Report for his guidance. The arboretum was maintained at the cost of the Civil List up to 1846, and then was given up to the public in the same way, and on the same conditions, as the botanical gardens. The Gardens were really never intended to be a recreation ground like Hyde Park. He had given his own reasons for thinking so, and he should like to quote a few words from what had been written by Sir Joseph Hooker, when asked for his opinion in reference to this Motion. He said—

> "It further follows that the opening of the Garden and grounds to the general public throughout the day would be to assimilate them to the Metropolitan Parks; it would deprive teachers, students, artists, and scientific visitors, together with the officers of the establishment, of any time for the undisturbed pursuit of their avocations. I have stated that the original objects of the institution were purely scientific, utilitarian, and instructional, and that to these has been superadded the recreation of the general public; but it must be recollected that when the arrangements for the latter were sanctioned it was under the distinct understanding that they were to be carried out only so far as this could be done without prejudice to the original objects of the institution—that is to say, without detriment to the collections, without interference with the claims and privileges of those whose pursuits would be interrupted by the admission of the general public. It would be superfluous to dwell upon the grievance which earlier opening would be to teachers, students, artists, and gardeners, and others who are now admitted in the forenoon. If public hours are extended to the forenoon, I have no hope of maintaining the collections and grounds in any but a most unsatisfactory condition. With dispirited and hampered workmen the whole will fall off, Kew will lose its character for ornament as well as for utility, and the public will be profoundly dissatisfied. The Kew Arboretum, though still in its infancy, is the finest in the world; its formation has cost a quarter of a century of assiduous labour and scientific knowledge and zeal. If the completion of this noble national project is to be carried out, those intrusted with its management must have the morning hours uninterfered with by visitors. If, on the other hand, it is thought advisable to make the arboretum available for the day's-long recreation of pleasure parties from the Metropolis, I should advise its abandonment as a scientific or utilitarian department."

These views of the Director were concurred in by a great number of hon. Gentlemen who had studied the question, and he was sure they were endorsed by almost all botanists and people who took an interest in horticulture. He had received deputations on the subject, and also memorials signed by 500 of the most eminent botanists in the country and abroad, who one and all urged the Government not to assent to this proposal. One of these Memorials, signed by Fellows of the Royal Horticultural Society, the Geographical Society, and the Royal Society, was as follows:—

> "We, the undersigned persons, who are well acquainted with the details of horticultural operations and the conditions under which large botanical establishments can be successfully managed, desire to express an opinion that the Royal Gardens of Kew could not be maintained at their present state of efficiency, which we believe to be entirely unique, if the public are allowed unrestricted access to them from early morning till dusk, and the staff have no period in the day when work can be carried on unimpeded by the presence of visitors. We further desire to express our opinion that the indiscriminate admission of the public would, by necessitating the abolition of all special privileges for the study and examination of the collections during the morning, inflict a serious injury on a large class in whose interests, as well as in those of the public at large, the Royal Gardens were made a public establishment. The presence of crowds of visitors is incompatible with the work of the scientific staff. This work is carried on from morning till noon, and it requires not only activity but organization to complete it within the time available. From the hour at which the general public is admitted serious work becomes impossible."

It had been said that at one time, under the late direction, Kew Gardens were opened at 10 o'clock; but that was when Kew Gardens consisted only of 11 instead of 300 acres, before there were railroads to Kew, and when people went in tens instead of thousands. Yet, even under these circumstances, the late Director found the practice so inconvenient, and so destructive of the objects of the institution, that he was compelled to withdraw the privilege in 1846. If it could not be continued then, how was it possible it could be granted now? No doubt, a great number of Petitions had been presented in favour of this proposal; but it was easy, with proper organization, to get signatures to such Petitions. The British public was only too glad to write its name anywhere, especially where no liability was connected with the act. The hon. Baronet spoke of a "movement" in support of his proposals. The fact was, the agitation was a purely local one, got up by the people in the neighbourhood, who had entered into building speculations, built villas and large public-houses, and they knew that if Kew Gardens were opened all day the value of their property would be immensely advanced. But what the Government had to consider was the interests, not of the builders, but of the public. There was no one who was more anxious to make Kew useful and enjoyable than Sir Joseph Hooker; but he wished, also, that it should continue to fulfil the purpose for which it was established as a scientific institution; and he was naturally anxious that, after he had laboured 25 years there, and the Gardens had earned such distinction and admiration, the labour of his life should not be thrown away. No doubt, the Motion was brought forward with the best intentions, but it would be disastrous to the best interests of the Gardens; and he therefore hoped the House would support him in opposing the Motion.

MR. MITCHELL HENRY said, he was greatly disappointed with the answer of the Chief Commissioner. It seemed trifling with the House to tell them that to allow people to walk about the arboretum before 2 o'clock would injure the trees. The Gardens might be divided into two portions, and that which was purely botanical could be closed while the rest was open, and three or four policemen would afford complete protection to the arboretum in the early part of the day. Some prejudice was introduced by speaking of this as a local agitation; he had no local interest in it, and he felt that it was no argument at all to say that local residents, who did nothing wrong by living at Kew, should be denied a privilege because it would improve the value of their property. Such a plea was equally frivolous and ungenerous. There was no case in which any injury had been done to a public institution that had been thrown open freely. His own belief was that the more recreation which was provided for the people, the less would be the pressure of that tide of democracy which some hon. Gentlemen appeared so much to fear. The argument of the Chief Commissioner of Works was inconsistent, for he said that nobody went when the Gardens had been thrown open at 10 o'clock. There was, therefore, no danger of any injury being done. He hoped the right hon. Gentleman would review his decision.

MR. ALEXANDER M'ARTHUR supported the Motion. Other gardens of a similar nature were thrown open to the public, and the same might very well be done at Kew. It was a poor compliment to the people of the Metropolis to say that they could not be trusted in these Gardens a few extra hours every day. The compromise proposed by the hon. Member might very safely be entertained.

MR. EVELYN ASHLEY also supported the Motion. He suggested that if the number of visitors prevented operations in the arboretum, the gardeners might very well begin their work earlier than 10 o'clock. London was the only great town in Europe that did not give its gardens the whole day to the public. The allegation of increased expenditure, which, it was said, would result from adopting the proposal now before the House, rested solely upon the *ipse dixit* of Sir Joseph Hooker.

MR. FAWCETT said, the subject was one of general, and not of merely local, interest. No evidence whatever had been adduced to show that scientific research would in any way be interfered with. He had carefully considered the subject, and he had come to the conclusion that if the Gardens were opened at 10 o'clock, with the reservations which his hon. Friend (Sir Trevor Lawrence) proposed, there would not be the slightest interference with scientific research or scientific pursuits. The First Commissioner of Works had spoken as if a crowd of filthy children and loose women was certain to be found at the gates at half-past 9 in the morning, waiting anxiously for 10 o'clock, in order to rush in and knock over the whole scientific collection. They were told that a Memorial against the proposal had been signed by 500 scientific men. He had great respect for the claims of science, but he could not help remembering there was such a thing as scientific enthusiasm. He had some experience of scientific Memorials, and he knew that when one or two eminent signatures were obtained it was very easy to get a number of others to follow. Experience in other places afforded them no reason to suppose that any harm would be done by admitting the public to the Gardens. The filthy children and the women of low character were simply paraded for the purpose of frightening two classes — the scientific men, and the economists who objected to increased expenditure. The First Commissioner of Works, when speaking of the great expense that would be incurred by the proposed change, almost in the same breath emphasized the fact that the early visitors would probably be very few; so, from the right hon. Gentleman's own point of view, the argument from expense was inadmissible. As for the arboretum, Sir Joseph Hooker's communication was an admirable argument for shutting it up altogether. The truth was that it was simply a question of expense; but the increased outlay would be so small as to be hardly worth the consideration of the House.

Mr. A. MILLS pointed out that it was evident, from the experiment that had been already tried on a Bank holiday, that a very small proportion of the class which it was sought to benefit were likely to avail themselves of the opportunity afforded. Of 58,000 Bank holiday visitors on a recent occasion, no fewer than 54,000 entered the Gardens after 2 o'clock. It was, therefore, a delusion to suppose that to open the Gardens early would be to confer a boon on any considerable number of persons. After all, the question was, as a matter of fact, a conflict between botanical science and the owners of villas at Kew and the neighbourhood, and the House would have to decide whether the Gardens were to be kept up in such a way as to reflect credit on the directors and on the nation.

Mr. LYON PLAYFAIR said, that when such a question as the Repeal of the Test Acts was agitated, the hon. Member for Hackney (Mr. Fawcett) presented Memorials and attached great importance to the signature of Professors, while on the present occasion he laughed at the Memorial of 500 men of science, and asked the House to give it no consideration. Now, as it was admitted on all hands that the early visitors to the Gardens would not be very numerous, the question narrowed itself to this—whether the convenience of the inhabitants of Kew outweighed the disadvantages of the proposed change? He would remind the House how high was the character of Kew Gardens, and how deserved was the great reputation of the scientific staff there employed. The Gardens were celebrated for the great amount of scientific research that had emanated from them, which scientific research had made them the admiration of the world. He believed that the volumes which had issued from the Kew Gardens considerably exceeded 100 in number. The hon. Gentleman who proposed the Motion asked the aid of Scotch and Irish Members, because their gardens were open at other hours. Had the hon. Gentleman ever been to the Botanical Gardens, Edinburgh, as he (Mr. Lyon Playfair) had been, he would find students studying there in the morning; but he would not meet any of the general public, unless accidentally one or two ladies using the Gardens for walking. The people who went there early were University students of Edinburgh, whose object was study. The supporters of the Motion had dealt somewhat unfairly with what had fallen from the First Commissioner of Works with regard to expense; for the point of the right hon. Gentleman's argument was that after the admission of the public the gardeners ceased to be gardeners and became watchmen, thus necessitating an increase of the permanent staff. They were hardly justified in making the change for the convenience of a few of the Kew residents; though he considered it might be practicable to open the Gardens at 12 instead of 1, an hour sufficiently early for visitors from London.

Mr. CUBITT thought that if the Gardens could be opened early on each Monday during the summer months, at the time the excursions trains were running, it would satisfy the desire of the working classes, and would not interfere with the work of the scientific staff. If the right hon. Gentleman could not hold out any such prospect, he should vote for the Motion.

Mr. W. E. FORSTER thought the interests of the taxpayer in this matter ought not to be overlooked. The House ought to consider what it was that the money was voted for. It was not to maintain Kew Gardens as a park; if that were so, he should be glad to give every facility to the public. The object was to maintain Kew as a scientific establishment—and men of science engaged in the administration, and other scientific men who knew what the administration ought to be, said that the scientific object would be considerably frustrated if the students did not have the Gardens to themselves for half the day. He thought they were bound to pay due deference to such an opinion. Believing that the money was not given solely that beautiful gardens might be provided for the public, he much regretted that he could not support the Amendment.

Sir HENRY PEEK said, the reason why so small a number entered the Gardens before 1 o'clock on former occasions was because it was not generally known that they were opened. He thought that if his right hon. Friend the Chief Commissioner would assent to the opening of the Gardens on Mondays as on Bank holidays, he would, to a great extent, meet the wishes of those who were in favour of the Motion.

Question put.

The House *divided* :—Ayes 196 ; Noes 94 : Majority 102.—(Div. List, No. 36.)

MERCANTILE MARINE—BREACH OF CONTRACT BY SEAMEN.—LEGISLATION.—OBSERVATIONS.

Mr. GORST, in calling attention to the present state of the Law by which seamen who have entered into a contract of service are liable before joining their ship to be arrested without warrant and imprisoned with hard labour for simple breach of such contract, and to the pledge given by Her Majesty's Government in relation thereto, said, that as the noble Lord the President of the Board of Trade had intimated his intention to introduce a Bill on the subject. he did not intend to proceed with what he had to say on it ; but he desired publicly to call the attention of Her Majesty's Government to the repeated pledges which they had given to the House and the country on this subject. In 1875, a Merchant Shipping Act Amendment Bill dealing with this question was passed through Committee, but eventually withdrawn ; while in the following year a most distinct pledge was given on the subject. When the Bill of 1875 was before the House, he moved an Amendment which found a very considerable amount of favour in the House, and which would have had the effect of remedying the evil of which he complained. He withdrew that Amendment on a distinct pledge being given by the Home Secretary that the whole subject would receive the attention of the Government in the next Session. Last year, however, at the beginning of the Session, the Bill was referred to a Select Committee. The Earl of Beaconsfield used to say that a Select Committee was an electorate piece of machinery for discovering something that everybody knew. The Select Committee of last Session fully bore out that description, and it was simply a very convenient mode of shelving the question. The noble Lord the President of the Board of Trade had stated that a Bill was now prepared which would satisfy all parties ; and his object in calling attention to the matter was to urge her Majesty's Government to introduce the Bill as early as possible, and make an effort to legislate on the subject this Session. It might be said that it was an inconvenient thing to bring the matter forward upon a Motion for going into Committee of Supply ; but this was a question of great importance to merchant seamen, who were not possessed of many electoral privileges, and whose interests, therefore, required to be brought prominently forward in order to insure attention.

Mr. BURT agreed that seamen had only a small amount of electoral power, and, unlike many other classes of working people, were so circumstanced that they had not any very powerful trade organization, and were, therefore, very much at the mercy of the Government. He trusted that their weakness would make their claim all the greater, and he earnestly hoped that the Government would speedily introduce the promised Bill.

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER said, that it was not from any want of interest in the subject that the Bill had not been introduced already. The truth was that his noble Friend (Viscount Sandon), when he went to the Board of Trade last Session, found the Bill under the consideration of the Committee. He had not previously paid any special attention to the subject, and he found it to be one of very considerable difficulty and complexity. He therefore felt it desirable to take some time to consider it, and the matter stood over for that purpose. He had now given a great deal of consideration to the subject, and was anxious to make a statement, and to bring forward a Bill. It would not be fair on the part of his noble Friend's Colleagues to forestall anything he had to say on the subject, and therefore he would confine himself to assuring his hon. and learned Friend and the hon. Gentleman opposite that he should be exceedingly glad so to arrange the Business as to give an early day for the consideration of the Bill ; but he did not know that he should be able to do so immediately, as there was a great deal of Business requiring attention. As soon as he could arrange a day, he would take care that an opportunity was afforded of introducing the Bill.

IRELAND—DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION.—OBSERVATIONS.

Mr. O'SHAUGHNESSY, who had given Notice of his intention to move—

> "That the system of limiting the number of Ministers entrusted with the direction of Irish Departments and sitting in this House to one, namely, the Chief Secretary of the Lord-Lieutenant, is productive of abuse and neglect in the Government and Administration of Ireland, and requires to be altered;"

said, that as the Rules of the House would preclude him from moving his Resolution, he should content himself with a few general observations. The subject was one which had long attracted the notice of his hon. and learned Colleague (Mr. Butt), whose absence, and the cause of it, was a source of so much regret, not only to Irish Members, but to all Parties in the House. He might first say that his Motion did not involve any personal reflection on the conduct or administration of either the present Chief Secretary or his Predecessor. It was very hard to fix on any very continuous or aggravated abuse, which, as a rule, was the fault of the system and not of the men, and it was the system which he proposed to discuss. It might be suggested that, in addition to the Chief Secretary, there were the Attorney General and the Solicitor General, but these officers had cut-and-dry functions of their own; they had really to put the Criminal Law into operation, and if other work was thrown on their shoulders it was such that in England would be placed in the hands of some Minister representing a Department. That itself was an abuse. Besides, the Office of Attorney General in Ireland at the present day was not as important as it was 20 or 30 years ago, when juries had no difficulty in bringing in a conviction in every case which came before them, and the Attorney General was a much more active official than now. In addition, the House should remember that it was not always the Attorney General or Solicitor General could get a seat in Ireland. In England they had represented, the Home Office, including all the various duties it managed; the Local Government Board was represented, with the Poor Laws, the Laws of Health, and the various other matters connected with that branch of the Administration. Then they had got the Vice President of the Council sitting in the House, responsible for the large interests coming under the head of Education; and whenever any other matter of great domestic importance arose the Chancellor of the Exchequer, and sometimes the Leader of the Government, were there to direct it, and avow themselves directly responsible over the head of the subordinate officers. In Ireland all these duties devolved on the Chief Secretary, who was responsible for the Local Government Board, for the large and complicated system of Irish Education, and assumed the proportions of Minister of War when he came to answer for that military organization which went under the name of Constabulary. But that was not all. In England there were local institutions regulating to a large extent these matters, and elected bodies exercising control over the policy of the country, while there was nothing of the kind in Ireland. For instance, the Constabulary, with its military discipline, was altogether subject to the discretion and judgment of one man in Dublin—the Chief Inspector of Constabulary. Of course, the Chief Secretary was prepared at 48 hours' notice to answer any question that was put to him with regard to that Force; but he had to telegraph over to the Sir John Wood or the Colonel Hillier of the day, and then he entered the House, and repeated his information as if he were a responsible Minister. The real dictator was a man sitting in a pleasant house in the Phœnix Park; and that was the manner in which the Irish people were supposed to be represented in the House for the administration of that Force. The result was that the Force had become more and more military, and the leading Irish papers were for six months in the year deluged with letters of complaint from discontented constables. Instead of bringing their ingenuity to bear on the catching of thieves, they were compelled to learn all sorts of books of discipline. That was not all. Within the last six months there had been four or five transactions connected with their officers which were nothing less than scandal, and which, if they had taken place in England, would have led to a summary and complete change in the system of managing the Constabulary. If a charge against the management of the Constabulary had taken place in the House the Minister would answer the question in a cut-and-dry form, for it would be impossible for him to concentrate his attention on the great matter on which he was questioned; and whether he was an active or inactive, an honest or dishonest official, he could not deal with these scandals. For many years one of those officials had been pocketing the public money—whether by intentional fraud or by mistake he would not say—but if the persons into whose hands the public money passed felt that there was a responsible Minister sitting in the House directing that large establishment, and not having his attention diffused over a thousand other things, he doubted whether it would be possible for the spirit of red tape to allow such occurrences in Ireland. In a county in the West two constables, for whom the right hon. Gentleman was directly responsible, had devoted themselves for weeks to irritating the feelings of the great majority of the people; but the matter only could become a squabble in the newspapers between the Lord Lieutenant and the Bishop of the Diocese, for there was no use in coming to the Chief Secretary about it. It was virtually by fighting out squabbles in the papers that the people of Ireland were bound to supplement this system of irresponsibility. Then turn to the Education Board. In Ireland the onus of explaining in the House the difficulties of Irish Education lay in the hands of an official, who was responsible for the Constabulary, the Poor Law Boards, and, in addition to other duties, had the responsibilities of the cesspools of the country being cleaned. He was the man that had to explain how the middle schools, which were useless to the great mass of the people, could be made useful to them. It was needless to say, under these circumstances, that the control was left in the hands of officials in Dublin, willing, no doubt, to do what they could, but utterly unable to go beyond the regulations, or to suggest any broad lines of policy for the improvement of the system which they administered. If there was a man capable of devoting his attention to the transactions of the National Board, and fully responsible for them, could it be supposed that the National teachers would so long have had to complain of their miserable pay? Then there was another tremendous Department called the Board of Works; but the abuses and mismanagements of that Board had been so threshed out, that he would only point it out as an instance of the want of direct responsibility in that House. The result of it all was that there was a nominal Parliamentary Government, but it was really administered by a bureaucracy. He might cite the case of the outrage on the people in the Phœnix Park. It was impossible to fix the charge on the officials, so many of them were mixed up in the affair. The red-tape system was so complicated that it was impossible to trace the transaction to its real source; the blame was shifted from one shoulder to another, and the wrong remained unredressed up to this very day. There was a Privy Council managing the executive of the country, and it comprised Attorney Generals and Judges, and men whose office he would not say was interfered with, but whose dignity and impartiality were put in doubt by their being compelled to descend from the Bench to take on themselves duties which ought to be discharged by Ministers in that House. The result was that in Ireland the office of Judge did not carry with it the assumed sacred belief in its impartiality which it did in England. What would be said if these were responsible Ministers in Belgium or Holland? Ireland was the only nation in which the sham of Parliamentary government, leaving the entire responsibility in the hands of one man, was carried out. O'Connell had an expression, which he applied indiscriminately to Chief Secretaries for Ireland. He called them "shave-beggars." He meant, that in the same way as barbers were accustomed to employ untried apprentices to shave poor people for nothing in order to get their hands in, gentlemen were sent over to Ireland who had no experience, but who showed signs of smartness, and who were in all respects apprentices, to operate on the Irish people for £4,000 a-year until they showed themselves fitted for better purposes. If the Chief Secretary showed that he was able to do the work and to be of great service to the country he was, as a rule, removed to another and more important Office. If, on the other hand, he proved incompetent and left everything to his subordinates, he was allowed to retain his Office. He wished the House to understand clearly that in saying this he was in no way referring personally to the present holder of the Office. The only personal matter to which he should allude was the vast amount of relief which was felt by the official classes in Ireland when the last Chief Secretary (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) was removed. Among other good qualities, that right hon. Gentleman had a keen eye for sloth and jobbery and arrogance among officials, and, to use a familiar phrase, he "bowled them over" whenever and wherever discovered. He only mentioned this to show what was the state of things to which those gentlemen were accustomed. It would take a Hercules of labour and ingenuity to cleanse this Augean stable, and perhaps only one man in a thousand would attempt to cope with the difficulties which presented themselves. The real cause of all the existing abuse was that the Government were trying to do in that House a thing which was utterly impossible—namely, to carry on in that Assembly two perfectly different systems of administration. In England public opinion interfered to prevent abuses; but in Ireland, under the present system of managing things by correspondence with officials over in Dublin, there was no public opinion to rectify these matters. Public opinion would not arise and make itself felt unless there was something to be got by its activity, and the present system of Parliamentary government for Ireland prevented the exercise there of public opinion on the administration of the country. The ultimate remedy would be to hand over to an Irish Assembly the management of purely Irish affairs—a proposal which was not so revolutionary as some appeared to think. This would not be done at once, but it was daily becoming more and more apparent to the English people that the claims of Ireland to wise and prudent management should be granted, and he hoped the fact would soon be accepted by the House. In the meantime it was the duty of Irish Members to diminish as much as possible the abuses which prevailed under the present system in the administration of the country. They would fail to-night, as they had failed many times before, but they would at least show the people of England the necessity of a change in the administration. The only duty they could discharge was to awaken English public opinion to the extraordinary and unconstitutional principles on which Irish affairs were managed, and they felt that transcended any duty to the Empire which could possibly be open to them. He saw that nothing could be carried by assault in that House; but they meant to surround the Irish Administration and the system of Irish government by an effective blockade, and when they met with any abuse would make prisoner of the offender and try him by court martial in that House. As long as the affairs of Ireland were governed by the English House of Commons, they would do their best to put an end to the fiction of Parliamentary government which at present ruled over Ireland.

Mr. J. LOWTHER said, that the hon. and learned Gentleman had called the attention of the House to what he considered to be grievances in Ireland, and he had stated what he thought would be remedies for them; but he (Mr. J. Lowther) would not follow him through all his suggestions, some of which would no doubt have an opportunity of being discussed upon some occasion when they could be more legitimately considered than would be the case at that moment; and he, therefore, would confine himself to the specific point which was contained in the Motion of which the hon. and learned Gentleman had given Notice. The hon. and learned Gentleman had referred to the fact that the holder of the Office which he (Mr. J. Lowther) had the honour to fill was the solitary Representative of the Irish Government in that House, and he had expressed an opinion that there ought to be a Minister of Irish Education, a President of the Irish Local Government Board, and an Irish Home Secretary, and that various other officials should be appointed.

Mr. O'SHAUGHNESSY explained that he meant that the Chief Secretary could discharge the duties of Home Secretary for Ireland.

Mr. J. LOWTHER: Well, that was a matter of detail. What was meant was that, in the event of questions arising which called for the attention of Parliament, it should be within the power of the Minister in charge of the Department more rapidly to master the subject and to give information to the House in regard to it. The reasons which the hon. and learned Member adduced must, he thought, have struck the House as telling heavily against his argument. The hon. and learned Gentleman said that under the present system everything was left to bureaucracy, and he complained that there was great inconvenience in not having some person responsible in connection with any subject on which an inquiry might be necessary; but anyone occupying the position which he (Mr. J. Lowther) had the honour to fill, was responsible to the House of Commons for all the Departments under his charge. Under the system which the hon. and learned Gentleman proposed, there would be an inevitable increase of circumlocution which must aggravate instead of diminish the evils complained of. The hon. and learned Gentleman went on to say that the difficulty which the Chief Secretary had in making himself acquainted with the details of his Department consisted in the fact that, whereas the English Minister had his office in Whitehall, and could easily refer to his subordinate officials, the Chief Secretary had to have recourse to the telegraph, or obtain his information by letter, which might cause a delay of some days. But he would like to know how, by a multiplication of official Representatives in that House of the Irish Government, the difficulties of time and space could be remedied. The hon. and learned Gentleman also said that not only was it necessary that the office of each of these numerous Irish Ministers should be at Whitehall, but that it was necessary that an intelligent public opinion should be formed and cultivated in Ireland. He did not undertake to say what great prodigies might not be achieved by a multiplication of half-a-dozen editions of himself; but the formation of an intelligent public opinion was a feat which, he feared, would require a great many persons of far greater intelligence and ability than any to which he could presume to aspire. The hon. and learned Member held out may temptations to others to share in the duties of the Irish Government, and he spoke of a blockade with a view to waylay every Representative of the Government of Ireland. [Mr. O'Shaughnessy: No; to catch every abuse, and bring it before the House of Commons.] He thought the blockade was to be of a more practical character. The hon. and learned Member had, he thought, failed to show that mere multiplication of Representatives of the Irish Government would achieve the results of which he spoke. There was one part of the hon. and learned Gentleman's speech, however, which he confessed he viewed with different feelings from the rest, and that was the part in which he drew a distinction between the Department of Finance and the other Departments of the Irish Government. He thought there was a great deal to be said upon that head, as he had felt it himself by no means an agreeable task to be called upon to explain or defend a policy for which he was not responsible. For all the other Departments the Chief Secretary was responsible, but as to financial matters, those were under the control of the Treasury in London, and for them he was not responsible; and therefore he was disposed to agree that it might be considered how far an official Representative of the Irish Department of the Treasury should sit upon the Government Bench, and be charged with the duty of explaining and defending financial matters. He could promise that that was a subject to which attention should be given. With regard to the other Departments, he could only say that so long as he had to discharge the duties of the Irish Government he would endeavour to discharge those savoury and agreeable duties of cleansing the Augean stables to the best of his power. He knew that his right hon. Friend who preceded him (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) had endeavoured to check abuses, although he probably had, like himself, heard that night for the first time of the supposed individual shortcomings to which reference had been made, and, without holding out a hope of anything heroic as the result of his own exertions, he could assure the hon. and learned Gentleman that it would be his endeavour to eliminate from the Public Service any abuses which might be proved to exist.

Mr. O'CONNOR POWER said, he must thank his hon. and learned Friend

(Mr. O'Shaughnessy) for the very able address which he had delivered. The review which had been given of Irish administration and Irish government was highly valuable. Irish Members often found that when Select Committees made recommendations which related to England and Ireland, the latter country was sure to be last thought of by the Government. That was shown by the Question which he had put to the Chief Secretary that evening in reference to the administration of the Poor Law. Only last year a Committee made certain recommendations as to the election of Poor Law Guardians in England and Ireland, and while the President of the Local Government Board was preparing a Bill to carry out the recommendations made in this country, they could not even obtain a promise from the Chief Secretary that a similar Bill would be applied to Ireland. It was clear that the Chief Secretary had at present too much work to do to do it well, and the experience of the right hon Gentleman, and of his Predecessor, could not but point in this direction — that there must be some division of labour.

Mr. MELDON said, they did not at all find fault with the present Chief Secretary for want of ability or of anxiety to show that ability; but they did blame him for neglecting the work which had been begun by his Predecessor. He could only come to the conclusion that the Government had recently come to the deliberately-formed intention of changing their policy with regard to Ireland. Nobody could doubt that the present Chief Secretary was a man not only of great ability but of great industry, and yet the work of his Predecessor had not been carried on. The right hon. Baronet the late Chief Secretary had worked hard in respect of matters as to which reform was needed. He had devoted much attention to the amendment of the Poor Law, and also to the subject of Intermediate Education. The Bill in reference to that important subject, which was conceived in a spirit of conciliation towards the Irish people, was carried after the right hon. Baronet had been appointed to his present Office, but to him the credit attaching to it was due. He challenged the present Chief Secretary to point to a single attempt which had since been made to remedy the grievances of which the Irish people complained. The Cabinet had suddenly changed from a conciliatory to an exasperating policy towards Ireland; and the result was that, during the last 12 months, nothing had been done to redress a number of grievances which had been brought under the notice of the Government. A deputation had asked the Chief Secretary to consider the state of Dublin, but he said that he could not give any special attention to the matter. The position of the Board of Works and the National teachers had not been improved, though as to the latter, moneys had been voted by Parliament for the purpose. There must have been incapacity or negligence in those officials who ought to have carried out the wishes of Parliament. Certain inquiries had been promised in regard to the Irish Local Government Board and the election of Poor Law Guardians, but nothing had been done. Surely Ireland demanded some attention to her affairs. And not only were Irish affairs in the hands of a Minister who dealt with them in a light and airy manner, and who was either unable or unwilling to communicate any real information to the House, or to say anything substantial, but speeches had been made by the supporters of the Cabinet with regard to Irish matters which were exceedingly irritating, and which would never have have been delivered if they had not had the sanction of the Government. Those speeches had never been repudiated from the Treasury Bench ; on the contrary, some of the occupants of that Bench had gone out of their way to compliment the authors of that class of addresses to which he alluded. The fact was that, for some reason or other, the Government appeared to be determined to go back to the old policy of governing Ireland by underlings and officials who were not responsible in any way to the House of Commons. The last Chief Secretary (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach), who was now Secretary of State for the Colonies, had not only encroached upon, but almost put an end to, that pernicious system. Whether the right hon. Baronet had been promoted on account of the representations of certain officials in Ireland, or whether the Government here thought his policy of conciliation unwise, he was not prepared to say; but the change which had marked his retirement from the Office of Chief Secretary made some explanation desirable.

MAJOR NOLAN said, he agreed generally with the observations of the hon. and learned Member for Kildare (Mr. Meldon). He (Major Nolan) did not complain of the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary, who was not a responsible officer, for not bringing in and carrying Bills for the benefit of Ireland, but he could raise objections and disagreeable obstacles, or smooth them away. The present Chief Secretary had not done anything of that kind to prevent Irish Members from bringing forward Business. He had no fault to find with the right hon. Gentleman in that respect, nor did he suppose that he was hostile in any way to the Irish Representatives in that House. But he certainly thought that the Cabinet had shown itself, during the last month or five weeks, hostile to Ireland by the change of policy that had taken place. Why there should have been such a sudden display of hostility to Ireland he was at a loss to conceive. He could only suppose that they had renounced the idea of earning Irish gratitude by granting to Ireland the modicum of justice which they but lately seemed to contemplate, and that they did not now think it worth while to take any trouble to please Ireland.

MR. PARNELL said, he regretted that the Rules of the House would prevent the Motion of his hon. and learned Friend (Mr. O'Shaughnessy) from being put at the present time. His hon. and learned Friend had not brought it forward as a specific for remedying Irish grievances and for the removal of those radical evils which existed, but to represent to the House those inequalities which were to be found in Ireland; and so far he was willing to support him. There was an undoubted neglect of Ireland on the part of the Government, and one of the causes of that neglect must be that those who were responsible for Irish affairs had not urged with sufficient weight and influence the necessity of attending to those questions. If, besides the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary, there were several Ministers responsible for, and thoroughly acquainted with the different Irish Departments, and acquainted with them to an extent which the right hon. Gentleman could not be, hon. Members might hope to find those Ministers pressing upon the Cabinet and upon the Leader of the House the necessity of doing something in the direction of remedying Irish grievances. At the present time there was only one responsible Minister, who could not be expected to be thoroughly conversant with all those matters; and Irish Members were treated as if their grievances, as if, indeed, their country itself, had no existence. If for only one reason, he would like this Motion to pass, and that was that among the half-dozen Irish officials then having seats in the House, there might have been one amongst the number who might have some sense of the responsibility of his position, and the magnitude of the issues with which he had to deal. It had made a painful impression upon him, and, no doubt, an equally painful impression upon everybody who wished to see the relations between this country and Ireland improved, to see the attitude and bearing of the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary for Ireland when he got up to answer this Motion. It appeared to him that the right hon. Gentleman had no sense of the responsibility of his position, or of the serious importance of the Motion which had been presented with so much ability. He did not wish to charge the right hon. Gentleman with any levity of behaviour in the House or out of it; but he could not help contrasting his attitude and bearing and the tone of his speech with the attitude and bearing which they might have expected under similar circumstances from a former Chief Secretary for Ireland. That right hon. Baronet had now the affairs of the Colonies in his hands. When that right hon. Gentleman was Chief Secretary, he (Mr. Parnell) did not hesitate to criticize his conduct severely whenever he thought it necessary to do so; but, at the same time, Irish Members always received from him the attention and painstaking interest which sometimes convinced opponents that they were trying to meet them, although they might fail to convince them that they were wrong; but the way in which Irish questions had been treated since the advent of the right hon. Gentleman was almost enough to make Irish Members despair of doing any good by the ordinary operations of Parliamentary action. He did not think the hon. and learned Member for Limerick intended to say that public opinion in Ireland was dead, but rather public opinion in Ireland despaired of having the effect which it had in every other country where there was a Constitutional Government. When public opinion was evidenced in the ordinary ways—through the Press, public meetings, Petitions to Parliament, and even by the return of a majority of Members to the House, pledged to a given line of action—these indications of public opinion were entirely disregarded by the ruling powers; and, consequently, people in Ireland said — "What is the use of adopting the ordinary Constitutional methods open to us of explaining our grievances, and bringing them before the authorities, when all our exertions, no matter how persistent or energetic, are entirely thrown away?" Therefore, he maintained that, although public opinion in Ireland was not non-existent, it was undoubtedly dormant and despairing of good effect. He thought it would be a most desirable thing if this House were to show that it was not insensible to the public opinion of Ireland—if they showed that they valued Irish public opinion in the same way that they showed they valued English public opinion. He believed that the change would be a most beneficial one, and they would have that public opinion exercised and made use of in a Constitutional way, and a way that would be of advantage to the mutual relations of both countries. But, as things at present stood, there was no inducement to anybody in Ireland to approach this House with any idea that they were going to derive any benefit from any trouble they might take in making themselves heard and felt in the Constitutional way. They had a great number of boards in Ireland. It had been a favourite saying in this House that Ireland was the most "be-boarded" country in existence. For every Department there was a board, and every Bill that was brought in constituted a fresh board. The Intermediate Education Bill of last year established a fresh board. In England they had a Minister responsible for Education; but that was not so in Ireland, and the only chance there was that the intention of Parliament would not be perverted depended upon the operation of its instructions. They had a Board of Works which fulfilled its functions most imperfectly. The Report of the Royal Commission, on which the hon. and gallant Member for Galway had a seat, distinctly condemned the Board as an obstructive institution. The character of the Board was condemned as having obstructed Public Works in Ireland, and the Commissioners said that all great questions of benefit and improvement in Ireland had been entirely neglected, mentioning particularly the drainage of the Shannon, the important artery through the country; and they found that a whole Session had passed, and the Government had deliberated for a whole year, and the Irish Minister, the Chief Secretary, made no move and took no steps to carry out the recommendations of the Commission. An example came under his notice recently in his own immediate neighbourhood, and in which he felt a special interest. A harbour, which had been visited by the Lord Lieutenant, was very much in need of improvement, and where the expenditure of very little money would produce most important results; but all improvement had been obstructed by the Board. When the Chief Secretary was applied to, he said he knew nothing about it—that it was in the Department of the Treasury; and when the Treasury officers were applied to, they referred the matter back to the Board of Works. So the thing was tossed from one to another, and there was a regular species of political battledore and shuttlecock. In the meantime, the fishermen's families were starving, and every now and then a horrible wreck occurred through boats crossing the bar in the attempts of the fishermen to earn a livelihood. Then, as to the Constabulary. If they had a Minister responsible for that body, they would soon succeed in abolishing both the Minister and the Constabulary. Everybody must condemn the maintenance of an armed Force, armed with weapons of precision—breech-loaders; he was not sure whether they had yet got so far as to the Martini-Henry, but with sword bayonets and all equipments necessary to take the field, except heavy artillery, which he had no doubt they could borrow if necessary. Such a Force was a contravention of the Mutiny Act, and against all Constitutional precedent, and yet money was voted for it by this House year after year, under the pretext that the people of Ireland were disorderly—that they required 15,000 armed and drilled soldiers to keep them in order. If the House would only reflect for a moment on the position of Irish Members, they would see that they came over to England, many of them at great personal inconvenience, neglecting their own private interests, and leaving their homes, their friends, and incurring considerable expense, and they felt it to be a great hardship when they saw so fair a case as had been presented by the hon. and learned Member to-night met in the light and disdainful way in which the right hon. Gentleman the Irish Secretary had met it. It made them feel almost exasperated with the conduct of the Government. Irish Members could not but feel exasperated at the way in which such questions were treated, and he really did not know what they should do in future. At the next General Election they would be obliged to admit to their constituents that they were entirely useless, and that they might as well not send any Representatives. But, however that might be, in the interval that remained between this and the General Election, he thought, perhaps, it was their duty to persevere in the discouraging work they had undertaken—to do what they could to incline the ear of the House to a consideration of the justice of their demands. He admitted that prospect was not a bright one. Unless public opinion in this country were acted upon in some very special and unforeseen way—in some way which was not at all likely to occur—they could not hope for any change in the minds of the Government. They were told that the Boers of the Transvaal were seeking their independence, because the British power was menaced in that country, and were about to convene their own Assembly, and take advantage of the feature in England's government of her Dependencies, which had always been manifested since the declaration of Irish Independence in 1782—that the difficulty of England was the opportunity of the Dependency; and the Boers were pressing upon England the necessity of returning to them the independence of which they were deprived by England some years ago. He did not suppose that any such course would help them in Ireland. He did not hope it should so help them, because he supposed it would not be right for him to have any such hope. But, looking to the condition of the country, and the power of England, he did not see any fear of England being mixed up at home as she was with the Zulus in South Africa. He, therefore, did not see any chance of directing the attention of the governing classes to the redressing of grievances in the same way as the Boers were directing the attention of the Government to the necessity of doing them justice. However, he believed they ought to do all they could in pressing that question on the Ministers of the day, and on the necessity of doing something. At all events, they were calling attention to the Irish grievances that existed in a way that was not unconstitutional, and could not be found fault with, and in doing that they were doing all they could.

MR. SULLIVAN said, the Chief Secretary had treated this subject as pleasantly and amiably as he usually treated most subjects that were brought before him. They did not complain of his good humour, his personal amiability, or his courtesy; but of the inactivity, lethargy, and fatal torpor which, in obedience to some word of command, had recently come over the Government policy in Ireland. But they would not allow the good humour of the Chief Secretary to banter away the seriousness of the question which had been raised. He had no doubt whatever that the Chief Secretary would at once bring to bear on Irish affairs enough power if there were not behind him in the mysterious recesses of the Government policy some controlling influence which had told him that nothing further was to be done for Ireland in this Session of Parliament. The Chief Secretary tried to make a pleasant joke of it, and he wondered what prodigies would ensue if there were five or six editions of himself. It was related that the Duke of Wellington was once talking to the King about a new pair of boots, and His Majesty asked—"What are they called?" "They are called Wellingtons," was the answer; and the story went on to say that the Sovereign exclaimed, —"Impossible! there could not be a pair of Wellingtons." And Nature could not possibly produce two Chief Secretaries like the right hon. Gentleman. It simply came to this—Who was the responsible Governor of Ireland? Did they think the

Lord Lieutenant? Not a bit of it. Nominally and on the floor of this House there was one Minister who was the real Governor of the country—the Chief Secretary for the time being. The Chief Secretary for Ireland governed that whole country; he was the Minister of Commerce, the Minister of Education, the Minister of Justice, the Head of the Board of Works, the Head of the Poor Law system. Now, he would ask the House, given a Kingdom of 5,000,000 or 6,000,000 inhabitants in any part of Europe, how many responsible Ministers would an honest Government consider necessary for the public life of that country? If the Emperor of Russia proposed that there should be only one Minister of Bulgaria, would he not be denounced for having made representative government a farce? Yet, while this country was holding out the pretence of Constitutional government to Ireland, she gave her just one responsible Minister. Did they think the Irish people were going to be always content with a system which mocked, derided, tortured them with the semblance of Constitutional government, while in reality denying it? When their Representatives complained of that state of things, they were told to practise self-reliance; and when they asked for the mechanism appropriate to self-reliance, the answer given them was that they must depend upon England, who would manage their affairs for them better than they could do themselves. This was the question they were raising to-night. They maintained—and it was not a matter for mirth—that they had only one responsible Minister in this House. He happened to be in the Court of Queen's Bench, Dublin, when the Irish Board of Works, through its Head, was brought into the witness box, and they saw what came of having no responsible Minister but one. Each Department had about one-twentieth share of that Minister. They found what a myth, what a sham, what a mere delusion, this Board was. The Head of the Board was in the box, and was being examined about the sittings of the Board, and counsel called for the Minute Book; and it turned out that not a single entry had been made in that book for years and years. And how did the Board transact its business. It consisted of two Members who hardly ever met, but who, in fact, attended on and off. Some one of them strolled into the office, read the morning papers, saw the latest news from the club, smoked a cigar, gave orders, wrote a few letters, and went out—and that was a Board meeting. It was probably not known to the Irish Secretary, and yet the Irish Secretary was the only Minister they had in the House.

Mr. J. LOWTHER: I said the Board of Works was not in the Department of the Chief Secretary.

Mr. SULLIVAN: I am sure it is not; but he is the only Minister responsible.

Mr. J. LOWTHER: No, Sir, he is not; the Board of Works is under the Treasury, and not in any way connected with the Chief Secretary's Department.

Mr. SULLIVAN: That only made the matter still worse. He had thought that the right hon. Gentleman gave at least one-twentieth part of his time and attention to the Board of Works, but now it seemed that he gave it none at all, and yet Irish Members were taunted with occupying the House with sentimental grievances. It was most important to the Irish people that that Department should be properly managed, because its functions concerned the development of the material resources of their country. Yet in the whole of Ireland there was no Department that had been so completely "a mockery, a delusion, and a snare" as the Board of Works. But the whole system was so bad, so vicious, so rotten, that the late Government sent over a roving Commission to pry into all those Departments, and a precious discovery they made. It would go down from generation to generation in the hereditary officialism of Ireland how Mr. Herbert Murray was an enemy and a terror to the officials, and was rooting out and disturbing the cobwebs of the Departments. The whole system would not endure 24 hours' genuine daylight if they had a responsible Minister in the House. They were not a Party who were clamouring for the creation of official places, because they were not in favour of buying public men by elevating them to place. They saw on the Government Bench at least one Irish Gentleman (the Attorney General for Ireland) appointed to a Public Office in Ireland, and never was one appointed to a Public Office who commanded more widely the confidence of the Irish public than the Attorney General for Ireland. They were not raising this question for the benefit of individuals, but for the benefit of the country. Another thing they had to complain of was the frequency of removal of Irish Secretaries. After the Chief Secretary had been a little while with them and was beginning to have sympathies with the people and the country and to perceive what a noble field there was before him for the exercise of his abilities and his ambition—just as, in fact, he might feel inspired to play in Ireland the part Lord Dufferin had played in Canada, he was removed from his Office and a fresh man was put in his place who had to learn everything from the beginning, and who naturally fell entirely into the hands of his subordinates. That system must be changed if they wished to make Parliamentary and good government a reality in Ireland. At all events, Irish Members had done their duty by calling attention to the subject.

Main Question, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair," put, and *agreed to.*

SUPPLY—CIVIL SERVICE SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES, 1878-9.

Supply—*considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Class I.—Public Works and Buildings.

(1.) £3,771, Houses of Parliament.

(2.) £8,417, Public Buildings.

Mr. DILLWYN observed, that some explanation ought to be given with regard to this Vote. They were told that the sum of £5,542 was required to defray the expense of repairs on certain public buildings, including works carried out at the official residence of the First Lord of the Treasury. Surely it could be foreseen, when the original Estimates were prepared, that those works would be required, and their cost could have been included. The Committee ought to know what change had taken place to render the expenditure necessary. The footnote in the Estimates stated that the money was required for ordinary work and repairs; but why should the cost of that work be greater than usual? Labour and materials were both cheaper, and the cost of the work should, therefore, have been less.

Mr. GERARD NOEL said, that some works had been executed which were not anticipated when the Estimate was framed. In August or September last the First Lord of the Treasury notified his intention to take up his residence at the official mansion in Downing Street, and it was necessary to put it into proper repair. Only a small proportion of the sum of £5,542 was spent upon the residence of the First Lord. In consequence of a fire taking place some repairs were suddenly required at the Colonial Office, and some work was also done at the Home Office. About £400 was spent on the Prisons Department, and £700 had to be laid out at the offices of the Local Government Board.

Mr. DILLWYN observed, that his point had not been answered—namely, that the work ought to have been cheaper, as labour and materials had fallen in value.

Mr. GERARD NOEL said, that no doubt the cost of the work was less in consequence.

Mr. RYLANDS said, that the Vote included a sum of £1,196 on account of Broadmoor Criminal Lunatic Asylum. The buildings at Broadmoor were very unsatisfactory, and occasioned very considerable expenditure from year to year. There was an expectation held out that some change might be made which would relieve the country from the maintenance of those buildings. He would like to ask the First Commissioner of Works if he knew whether any place had been taken in substitution of Broadmoor Criminal Lunatic Asylum, or whether anything had been done which would relieve the country from the continually recurring expense on the buildings of that Asylum?

Mr. GERARD NOEL said, that a Committee had sat with regard to the question; but, so far as he was aware, no resolution had yet been arrived at. The sum of £1,196 had been required to supply the immediate need for some large tanks in the buildings, and for increasing the supply of gas. The "maintenance" for Broadmoor was only £2,000 per annum. This was found to be insufficient.

Mr. BRISTOWE thought that these heads of the Supplementary Estimates had been rendered necessary by reason of a proper survey not having been made. He should have supposed those whose duty it was to survey buildings of this important character would have been able to foresee what would be required in the year. It must be an unsatisfactory kind of survey which could lead to Supplementary Estimates of this amount. It was the duty of the surveyor to examine all the public buildings; and though he knew sufficient of the subject to be aware that accidental circumstances might occasion unforeseen repairs, yet he should like to be satisfied that a sufficient survey was made.

Mr. DILLWYN inquired why the purchase of 20, Great George Street had been brought into the Supplementary Estimates?

Mr. GERARD NOEL explained that the purchase was not completed during the financial year.

Mr. WHITWELL disagreed with the criticisms on the expenditure at Broadmoor Criminal Lunatic Asylum. The arrangement of the buildings was bad—nothing could be worse—but the management, and the results of the Asylum, were not unfortunate, but, on the whole, very satisfactory.

Vote *agreed to.*

(3.) £400, Furniture of Public Offices.

(4.) £724, New Home and Colonial Offices, &c.

Mr. DILLWYN asked whether any further sums would be required in connection with these Offices?

Mr. GERARD NOEL said, that this was the last charge.

Mr. ADAM observed, that the building did not seem to be finished, as two towers were still incomplete.

Mr. GERARD NOEL remarked that several plans had been considered, but were not approved of. At present it was not intended to add the cupolas to the building.

Vote *agreed to.*

(5.) £650, British Museum Buildings.

Mr. WHITWELL wished to be informed whether the experiments in electric lighting at the Library of the British Museum were being made at the expense of the country or of the contractors, and whether the experiments were being conducted with a view to the adoption of the system of electric lighting there?

Mr. Bristowe

Mr. GERARD NOEL said, he could not answer the question. The matter was entirely in the hands of the Trustees of the British Museum.

Mr. PARNELL observed, that part of the Vote was required to defray expenditure in consequence of defective drainage. He would like to know whether steps had been taken to remedy those defects, for, otherwise, the charge might be an annual one?

Mr. GERARD NOEL said, that in consequence of the outbreak of typhoid fever in the British Museum the drains were examined and put into proper repair.

Vote *agreed to.*

(6.) £12,800, Natural History Museum.

Mr. BRISTOWE supposed that this additional Estimate was necessary by reason of the works at the Natural History Museum having made more rapid progress than was anticipated. He would, however, like to be assured that that was the case, for if more rapid progress had been made nothing could be more satisfactory; but if the additional Estimate was requisite only because the work had been more expensive, the matter required some explanation.

Mr. GERARD NOEL was happy to say that the increased Vote had been taken simply because the progress of the work had been much quicker than was expected. So far as he was aware, the original Estimate had not been exceeded, and he hoped the buildings would be completed in May.

Vote *agreed to.*

(7.) £1,900, Harbours, &c., under the Board of Trade.

Mr. PARNELL said, that this Vote included a charge for Holyhead Harbour. That harbour was one of those gigantic engineering blunders which had entailed almost endless cost upon those who had been led into sanctioning it. Of the Supplementary Estimate of £1,900, £1,641 had been laid out on Holyhead Harbour. They were informed by a foot-note that the cost of repairing the damage done by a severe gale was £1,100, while the cost of covering the stone angle of the jetty with timber had been £537. It was a matter of common knowledge that Holyhead Harbour was constructed in such a way that it was almost certain to be carried away permanently some day or other, and all the expenditure upon it would be rendered useless. The harbour was built in such a manner that the sea beat into an angle, where it must infallibly make a breach in the harbour walls. He wished to know what prospect there was of a cessation in this annual expenditure, or how much more money was intended to be spent on this costly and useless work?

MR. J. G. TALBOT declined to enter into a discussion of the merits or demerits of Holyhead Harbour, on which he thought the House had already made up its mind. With regard to this particular Vote, unfortunately, last autumn, there was a very severe gale, and a great breach was made by the sea in the wall of the harbour. The Board of Trade consulted Sir John Hawkshaw, whose name was, doubtless, familiar to many hon. Members. It was found that it would be necessary to make a considerable expenditure at once in repairing the breach which the sea had already made in the breakwater. Accordingly, in the present financial year, the expense mentioned in the Estimate—£1,100—was incurred. He would be deceiving the Committee if he led them to believe that that was all that would be required. Sir John Hawkshaw had stated that some additional works would be necessary, and the expenditure on them would appear in the Estimates of the ensuing year. With regard to covering the stone jetty with timber, that was done in order to make it secure. The cost of the work appeared in the Supplementary Estimates, because it was necessary to do it for the winter service. As hon. Members were aware, the force of the sea at Holyhead was very great, more particularly during the winter months.

Vote *agreed to.*

CLASS II.—SALARIES AND EXPENSES OF PUBLIC DEPARTMENTS.

(8.) £3,500, Treasury.

MR. BRISTOWE observed, that he could not understand the item. He should have thought that the Government would have known perfectly well the measures it intended to introduce, and would be able to estimate the cost of drafting such Bills. He admitted that Bills ought to be drafted in a proper manner; but he could not understand how it was the Government, knowing what Bills it intended to bring forward, should make an original Estimate of £1,700, and a Supplementary Estimate of £3,500, as the cost of drafting such Bills. Why should a Supplementary Estimate of double the original Estimate be necessary? It was a most extraordinary state of things; and though it might possibly be accounted for, it seemed to him that the Estimates must be framed in a somewhat careless manner. He believed that there were few things which required more carefully examining than the Civil Service Estimates; and with regard to this particular Vote, he thought the Committee was entitled to have a full explanation.

SIR HENRY SELWIN-IBBETSON agreed that this Vote was a legitimate subject of criticism; but he was bound to point out to the Committee that the amount originally estimated was estimated under the idea of the cost that would be entailed by the employment of the ordinary staff in preparing Bills. But there had been many occasions on which, from peculiar circumstances, it was thought advisable, with the consent of the Treasury, to employ outside legal advice in the preparation of particular Bills. In the last Session of Parliament there were three or four Bills of a very important character, in the preparation of which it was considered necessary to employ outside legal advice. One of those Bills was the Criminal Code Bill, and in the preparation of that Sir James Fitzjames Stephen was employed, and his charges were included with the amount now under discussion. Mr. Reilly, another eminent draftsman, was also employed, and his bill was likewise included. Outside legal assistance was also obtained in the cases of the Contagious Diseases (Animals) Bill, and the Bankruptcy Bill. The amount spent on legal advice, outside the ordinary staff, was last year in excess of the ordinary sum; and perhaps that accounted for the expenditure not being included in the general Estimate. He might further mention that every one of the Bills which had to be intrusted to outside legal advisers were only so intrusted after consultation with, and by consent of, the Treasury, and on the evidence of the Heads of Departments, showing the necessity of the Bills being so drafted.

MR. RYLANDS said, that the explanation given of this Vote was, no doubt, very accurate; but it did not meet the remarks of his hon. and learned Friend. He must draw attention to the fact that the Estimates of the year provided for the payment of £2,500 a-year, increasing to £3,000, to a leading counsel, and £1,200 to an assistant counsel; there was also a staff of clerks, making the entire original Estimate for the ordinary counsel to the Treasury amount to £5,660. In addition to that, the Treasury laid upon the Table of the House an Estimate for fees to Parliamentary counsel outside those employed permanently, in respect of special and additional services. The reason alleged for this extraordinary charge was that they anticipated extra labour would be required in drafting Bills, and they estimated the amount at £1,700. The fact was that the £3,500 shown in the present Vote was in addito the £1,700, which itself was in addition to the ordinary expenditure on Parliamentary counsel. It was a most remarkable circumstance, that while the ordinary expenditure amounted to £5,600, the extraordinary expenditure incurred by the employment of learned gentlemen outside the Department came to no less a sum than £5,200, or nearly as much again as the original Estimate. He was entirely at a loss to explain this remarkable charge. When the matter was before the Committee last year, a noble Lord on the Ministerial side of the House thought the Supplementary Estimates then presented indefensible; but they were really not so utterly without justification as those which the Committee was now called upon to vote. He thought if greater pressure was put upon the permanent officials a great deal of good might be done. The fact was, these fees for drafting Bills were, no doubt, found to be a very nice thing to be given to learned gentlemen. There was a suggestion of jobbery in these matters which he did not believe existed however. Still, it was an expenditure of public money; and he could not understand, if his hon. Friend was anxious to put down unnecessary expenses of this kind, why he did not abolish these.

SIR HENRY SELWIN-IBBETSON said, he could assure the hon. Member that the Secretary to the Treasury was the last person not to agree with his remarks as to expenses of this kind, which were, practically, very often forced upon him. The point which the hon. Member had brought to the notice of the Committee was that already £1,700 was taken for the additional assistance which was found now every year to be required in the Parliamentary Draftsmen's Office. Whether it arose from the immense energy of Members, or their desire for legislation, the result was that more Bills were required to be brought in, and carefully drafted; and there was no doubt that, notwithstanding the services of the learned draftsman and his assistants, a very great deal of outside aid had to be asked. The explanation of the excessive amount this year would be found in the fact that they had had two exceptionally heavy Bills, one especially so—namely, the Criminal Code Bill, which required special treatment, and certainly had been dealt with in a manner which had given great satisfaction. When he stated that £1,575 of the amount was expended in this way, and £1,135 in another Bill, he thought it would show that, although they had estimated in the ordinary way what the expenditure in this Department would be, the Supplementary Vote was justified. It was very difficult to resist the employment of a person so eminently qualified as Sir James Stephen was to conduct the drafting of the Criminal Code Bill; and he thought the Treasury were justified in consenting that the Bill should be drawn by Sir James Stephen, instead of being introduced in the ordinary way through the official Department. The items were, therefore, practically forced upon them by the nature of the Bills introduced; and that amount, though excessive, could hardly be avoided.

MR. DILLWYN observed, that the Government were aware of their intention to bring in these Bills; and therefore he saw no reason why the extra cost should be met by a Supplementary Estimate. The question was, why were they not brought in amongst the ordinary Estimates?

SIR HENRY SELWIN-IBBETSON said, the Government had to decide the ordinary Estimates on Bills that were absolutely before Parliament. The Estimates were framed in December, and many of the Bills included in the Supplementary Estimates were not practically decided upon until after the ordinary Estimates were in preparation. If they knew exactly the Bills they were bringing in, or intending to bring in, the suggestion of the hon. Member could be adopted; but the Estimates were framed on the average cost in the previous year, and occasionally there were instances where a Bill was decided upon later in the year, which cost a much larger sum than was anticipated.

MR. DILLWYN said, he could understand that being so in the case of a small discrepancy; but in this instance the Supplementary Vote nearly covered the original sum.

MR. GREGORY said, the excess did not principally arise in the preparation of the Bill, for upon that something like an average Estimate could be formed, but was caused by the alterations which were afterwards found to be required in it, and which might be considerable. This was especially the case as regarded the Criminal Code Bill, which was one of a wholly exceptional character, and as to which it was almost impossible to enter into any calculation of the charges involved in the preparation of the measure. He thought the Committee should bear in mind that the Estimate was, practically, not only for the past, but for the present year, as the Bill was about to be re-introduced and, he hoped, passed in the present Session.

MAJOR NOLAN thought the Committee, and particularly Irish Members, ought to express their displeasure at the inefficiency of the Drafting Department, by moving the rejection of the Vote. Irish Members had particular reason in the present Session to be annoyed at the inefficiency of that Department. It was largely due to the conduct of the Drafting Department that there was no Bill this year on the subject of University Education in Ireland. If the Department had done its duty, some sort of Bill, to give equal advantages in regard to University Education to the Catholics of Ireland, would have been brought in this year. He was aware that the Committee would think this statement on this point grossly improbable; and if it rested on his own unsupported assertion, he would not expect the Committee for one moment to believe him. But, unfortunately for them—the Irish Members—they had the statement of the Chancellor of the Exchequer that it was largely owing to the Drafting Department that they had no Bill this year for a Catholic University. He (Major Nolan) thought that the Drafting Department, having behaved so badly, the case was one in which they should enter a protest by dividing against the Vote.

SIR HENRY SELWIN-IBBETSON pointed out to the hon. and gallant Member that whatever might be alleged against the Drafting Department during the present year, the Supplementary Estimate before the House was one for last year, when the Intermediate Education Act for Ireland was passed.

MR. PARNELL said, he was afraid that the anticipation of the hon. Member (Mr. Gregory) that the Criminal Code Bill would be passed this Session, would not be realized; and, in this respect, he must refer to the habit of the Government of preparing a lot of Bills which they had no immediate intention of bringing in. It would be in the recollection of the Committee that when the present Government came into Office they announced that it was their intention to withdraw themselves from the exciting and sensational topics which had occupied the attention of the preceding Government, and confine themselves to domestic legislation. Well, they had not fulfilled that pledge in the slightest degree; but they had kept up an appearance of fulfilling it, and mainly by the introduction of Bills upon every conceivable topic of domestic legislation at the beginning of the Session, involving very considerable expense, and without the slightest intention of carrying these Bills through their various stages. He believed that the Criminal Code Amendment Bill, if they could get it, would be an exceedingly valuable Bill. It would be worth far more than the £325 paid to Sir James Stephen for drafting it, because he had no doubt his labours were worth the money. But, at the same time, as the Bill was drafted last year, why was it not passed last year? He did not see the slightest chance of its being passed this year; and, in all probability, this Parliament would not see it carried into law. Therefore, though the Bill might, to some extent, be valuable for public reference and discussion, the expenditure of this amount was practically a waste of money, as far as the country was concerned. He would now come to the question which had been raised by his hon. and gallant Friend the Member for Galway (Major Nolan). He had pointed out that they ought to show their feeling as to the conduct of the Drafting Department by taking a Division against this Vote. He (Mr. Parnell) should be very unwilling to take a Division against that portion of the Vote which referred to the fees of counsel for drafting the Criminal Code Amendment Bill; and he would, therefore, suggest to his hon. and gallant Friend that it would be better to wait until the Vote for the current year came on for discussion, when they could mark their sense of the conduct of the Drafting Department by taking a Division against it. It might seem invidious to attack Sir James Stephen's fees, on account of the conduct of the officials of that Department. Sir James Stephen was not an official of the Department. He was simply an outsider, who had been called on to perform a very important and heavy work.

Sir HENRY SELWIN-IBBETSON said, there would be no fresh drafting of the Bill, unless further changes were necessary.

Vote *agreed to.*

(9.) £2,300, Home Office.

Mr. MACDONALD said, he did not object to the amount of £1,700 paid as fees to counsel engaged at inquests arising from explosions in mines, on behalf of Her Majesty. He should be glad if the right hon. Gentleman could show that the money was spent properly, and where; but he objected to the cases being grouped together, and the sum spent on each inquiry not stated. He knew very well that the attendance of counsel at these inquests had been productive of good; but he was also well aware that the common phrase used by the population in the immediate neighbourhood of mines was, that the person sent down was frequently not "worthy of their salt." He thought they ought to know what these inquiries were, and where they took place. Indeed, he felt that he should be obliged to move that the Vote be deferred, unless it was stated what were the inquiries which were instituted by Her Majesty, and who were the persons who conducted those inquiries. In some instances, the Representatives of Her Majesty were looked upon with perfect indifference; but if the names of the gentlemen to be sent down were made known, he had no doubt that the right hon. Gentleman the Home Secretary would frequently have, on certain names being given out, remonstrances against the appointment. If these inquiries were to be efficient, and to produce any result worth anything at all, the persons appointed to attend them ought to have the full confidence of the friends of those who were lost, and the sufferers generally. It appeared to him that the sum was enormous; and he should be glad to know whether the expenditure had occurred at or since the time when these Estimates were brought forward? He was not aware whether they also included a sum of £50 for an Inspector attending the Tynewydd Inquiry, and doing nothing more than his duty. He repeated, that he felt bound to move that the Vote be deferred without this information. [Mr. Assheton Cross dissented.] The right hon. Gentleman the Home Secretary shook his head; but he thought he had the liberty of protesting and dividing the Committee on the subject, which was all he could do. What he wanted to know was, where these inquires took place? He believed they had done much good, and he had nothing to say against them, or as to the inquiries into the competency of managers; but there was a sum of £1,700 spent in this way, and he thought they ought to know where it had been spent, and if the counsel engaged were, in public opinion, competent to do the work.

Mr. ASSHETON CROSS said, he was bound to say, in reply to the hon. Member, that there had never been a colliery explosion during the last few years but the hon. Member had impressed upon him the necessity of sending counsel down to the inquest, and he had stated that it had always been his practice to send the best man down. [Mr. Macdonald: I beg——] He (Mr. Assheton Cross) would remind the hon. Member that he was in possession of the House, and that after he had concluded the hon. Member would have an opportunity to make an additional statement. All these Reports on the questions referred to by the hon. Member had necessarily been placed on the Table of the House; and that being so, the names of the persons who assisted at the inquiries would be found there. The Papers were at the service of the hon. Member in the Library. The hon. Member asked where these inquiries were held; but he had only to read the Blue Books, which had been laid on the Table of the House, to find them; and he did not know that the hon. Member required further information. The hon. Member had also given Notice of his intention to ask, from time to time, whether counsel would attend at such and such an inquiry, at this or that place? but he did not know that much would be gained by asking those Questions. The hon. Member knew that in the case of anything like a serious inquest, one of the most able counsel would go down as a matter of course; therefore, he could not see that any special good could arise from the Question.

MR. MACDONALD said, the right hon. Gentleman had either misunderstood his remarks, or he had been misinformed since he entered the House. He stated most distinctly that he did not find fault with these inquiries—the very reverse was the case, for he believed them to be beneficial and of great service to the mining population, whether as regarded the attendance of counsel on behalf of Her Majesty at inquests, or the examination as to the competency of managers. What he did object to was the lumping together of this information by the Government without telling them where the inquiries were held—and he objected still. The right hon. Gentleman asked him to go to the Library, with only the expenditure of £1,700 in his hands, there to rake up the Blue Books for the last year, where he might find the information asked. He felt bound to tell the right hon. Gentleman that there was not within the walls of the Library a document that showed the amount of the expenses laid out on each individual inquiry; and, further, that notwithstanding the large amount of legal acumen that he possessed, he would not ferret out anything that would give the information that he said could be found there. He might find certain expenses charged for attending certain inquests, and a certain number of certificates of competence issued; but what was there in that which would lead him to see the expenditure at special inquiries—£500, for instance, at Abercarne, £400 at another, and so on? What he wanted was to know where the money had been spent.

MR. PARNELL thought the request of the hon. Member a very reasonable one, although he did not suppose the right hon. Gentleman would be able to comply with it at the moment. He could not see, however, why the right hon. Gentleman should not give the required information hereafter. If they had no means of ascertaining how much was spent on each inquiry, they had no means of gauging whether the money had been properly applied; because it was perfectly manifest to all that some of these inquiries were very much more important than others, in proportion to their different character. He could quite understand that the hon. Member for Stafford might desire information as to some particular inquiry in which he was interested; and, therefore, he might very fairly take exception to this Vote, and move the reduction of this item. He certainly thought that the hon. Member was entitled to the information for which he asked; and he should suggest that instead of the Vote being postponed the information should be given hereafter. There had been an interesting discussion last year to which the hon. Member had made most able contributions, and at that time they were all very much impressed with the desire of the Home Secretary to deal with these terrible calamities in mines which, so far from decreasing, seemed to be getting worse and worse. He had seen that lime had been used for blasting purposes in America, where it was found that the explosion of this substance, when inclosed in a cartridge and rammed into a hole, and then put through a slackening process, was sufficient for blasting, and had precisely the same effect as gunpowder in breaking down the coal, without, of course, its dangers. He asked, whether the attention of the Home Secretary had been directed to that process, and whether any inquiries had been made with reference thereto?

MR. ASSHETON CROSS: Sir, my attention has been directed to the process of using lime for blasting purposes, as described by the hon. Member for

Meath. It is, besides, my own opinion that there is much scientific knowledge possessed by us at the present time which might really conduce to the reduction of the loss of life if it could be practically applied. I have also been much struck by another question, and that is the lighting of mines, which would appear to be capable of very large improvement by means of electricity. No doubt, the electric light may be introduced and applied in various ways, so as to avoid all danger from the carrying of lamps or naked lights. I am glad that attention has been further directed to this subject by the hon. Member, so that nothing may be overlooked which may tend to mitigate the terrible loss of life which occurs; but I am bound to say that if hon. Members will compare the number of persons employed in mines and the amount of coal got up, they will see that the loss of life has been materially reduced since the Mines Regulation Act has been in force. On the other hand, I may add that we shall do all we possibly can to reduce still further this terrible, although I am bound to say, not growing, evil. With this view, I thought it right, not many months ago, to put myself in communication with the Royal Society, laying the case before them and asking if they could advise any means by which the desired result could be brought about. They received my application with that frankness and cordiality which might have been expected from the Royal Society, and discussed it, over and over again, at several meetings. Eventually they wrote me a letter informing me of their willingness to assist. The result was that I came to the conclusion that it would be wise for the Government to appoint a Royal Commission to inquire into the whole subject, and I communicated that decision to the Royal Society. I placed at their disposal four seats on the Committee, which they at once accepted, on condition that the remainder should be filled by practical men. A Royal Commission was, consequently, appointed, among the Members of which are the hon. Member for Durham (Sir George Elliot), and the hon. Member for Morpeth (Mr. Burt), besides two of the most experienced mining engineers whom I could find. They have decided to go into the question of lighting, and that of blasting by gunpowder and lime, respectively, as well as the best means that can be produced for otherwise mitigating this loss of life. They must, of course, take some time in reaching a conclusion; but their sittings have already commenced, and I do hope that their labours will meet with success. With regard to the special point raised by the hon. Member for Stafford (Mr. Macdonald) as to the inquiries which have been held concerning colliery explosions, I am sure he would not wish to reduce this Vote by a single farthing. The expenses of the different persons who have gone down to attend these investigations being always paid according to the regular Treasury scale of so much per day, which is less than they could earn elsewhere. I assure the hon. Member that not one single farthing has been paid to anyone beyond the actual necessary expense of attendance. I think I may say also that £500 of the amount in question is for expenses attendant upon some of the inquiries held last year; and the accounts for these not having been sent in, that sum does not appear in the former Estimates, so that the real expense under this head for the present year is only £1,200. I hope the hon. Member will allow the Vote to pass.

Mr. J. COWEN, replying to the question raised by the hon. Member for Meath (Mr. Parnell), said, that lime had been successfully used for blasting purposes in Germany; but that its effect depended upon the description of the coal to be blasted, as well as upon the quality of the lime employed. He had himself seen the electric light applied in the North of England to the lighting of mines; but the objection there taken to it was that it did not throw light into the corners and crevices, while the cost of its application was immense. For these reasons he very much doubted whether it would ever be used in this country. As to the point before the Committee, he thought that neither the hon. Members for Morpeth (Mr. Burt) and Stafford (Mr. Macdonald), nor any persons interested in mining operations, had any blame to cast upon the mining administration of the right hon. Gentleman. On the contrary, they had nothing but encomiums to pass upon the way in which the Mines Regulation Act had been worked under his directions. Its application in special instances might have caused differences of opinion; but he believed that to be the general feeling of all persons interested in the mining districts. As to the expenses of attending inquests, it was impossible, in a statement upon Estimates, to give all the details. They could not have every item of expenditure stated, or if they did, the Estimates, instead of being comprised in the tolerably large book now presented, would require a volume four or five times as large. He therefore thought the hon. Member should be satisfied with the reply of the Home Secretary, that the sum of £1,700 had been expended on these inquiries, all of which, he thought, were inquiries that should have been held, and with the information which the right hon. Gentleman proposed to place at his disposal. If the hon. Member would permit the Vote to pass, he would have an opportunity of making any objection which he might entertain to particular items upon the Report.

MR. BURT said, it was clear that all the hon. Member for Stafford wanted was to know where the money went, and in that he was quite right; while, with regard to the inquiries themselves, he had expressed nothing but approval. These inquiries had, no doubt, done a great deal of good. The Home Secretary had already, in his reply, given considerably more detailed information than was apparent on the face of the Estimates, and had pointed out that £500 of the amount was for fees and expenses incurred during the previous year. The item was, of course, a considerable portion of the £1,700, concerning which his hon. Friend (Mr. Macdonald) wanted an explanation. He entirely agreed with the hon. Member for Meath (Mr. Parnell) in advising that the question should be allowed to rest for the present; and, perhaps, at a future time, some more detailed information would be forthcoming.

MR. MACDONALD pointed out that lime could never be used for blasting purposes unless the coal was holed underneath, which resulted in deterioration and waste. It could not burst coal or iron or stone out of the solid—there must be a weakness somewhere before lime could do any work. He felt bound to tell the hon. Member for Meath and the hon. Member for Newcastle, and the House, that slaked lime had been known to those engaged in mining operations for more than a century. He desired to obtain full information as to the cost of some of the inquiries that had been held which he thought he was entitled to have from the right hon. Gentleman, who had, however, referred him to the printed Reports in the Library of the House. But it was a fact that those Reports did not contain the desired information. He trusted that fuller information would be given, in order to satisfy a feeling which existed among the public that some of the inquiries cost a great deal too much. No one entertained more respect than he did for the services of the right hon. Gentleman in connection with the Home Office, especially those which related to mining operations. Since the death of Sir George Lewis, no one had attempted more or done so much as the present Home Secretary in that Department.

Vote *agreed to.*

(10.) £3,350, Foreign Office.

MR. PARNELL remarked that this Vote contained an item for the travelling expenses of a messenger on continuous journeys to Berlin during the sitting of the Congress, and thought that the present was a good opportunity for Her Majesty's Opposition to take a Division upon the cost of this running backwards and forwards between Berlin and London, rendered necessary by the excitement got up last year by the Earl of Beaconsfield. He thought the Opposition Leaders would show their sense by dividing the Committee.

Vote *agreed to.*

(11.) £925, Colonial Office.

(12.) £327, Lunacy Commission, England.

(13.) Motion made, and Question proposed,

> "That a Supplementary sum, not exceeding £33,000, be granted to Her Majesty, to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1879, for Stationery, Printing, Binding, and Printed Books for the several Departments of Government in England, Scotland, and Ireland, and some Dependencies, and for Stationery, Binding, Printing, and Paper for the two Houses of Parliament, including the Salaries and Expenses of the Stationery Office."

Mr. MUNTZ could not understand how such an enormous amount could be spent upon stationery. The sum was continually on the increase, and, to his own knowledge, it had reached more than double what it was not very long ago.

Sir HENRY SELWIN-IBBETSON replied, that a large proportion of the addition to this item arose from the altered method of arranging the accounts in the Stationery Office, which it was believed, on the part of the Treasury, would render them more satisfactory in the future. The practice of the Stationery Office used to be to charge, or rather to estimate, for what they supplied to the printing offices, and this the Treasury conceived to be rather a vicious system of keeping the accounts. The consequence was a change, by which, for some few months past, only the actual amounts paid were allowed to be included? That change accounted for a very large portion of the total of this £33,000 which had been reached by the unexpected addition of several other items—namely, for printing the index for the Registrar General in Ireland, which cost £1,500 more than was anticipated. Again, the printing for the prisons in England was only roughly estimated last year, from want of knowledge at that time as to the amount that would really be wanted. Then there was nearly £2,000, that was not foreseen, for binding and stationery for the use of the Inland Revenue Office, estimated at £17,000, in the hope that this sum would cover the cost of their requirements, but which had actually amounted to £19,000. The real excess was £17,000, a large portion of which was due to the fact that there were certain contracts that should have been paid for out of the money voted last year, which money, as they were not sent in during the last financial year, was paid into the Exchequer, and had again to be provided. From this, it would be seen that the £33,000 now asked was really due to the adjustment of accounts, which would, in future, be placed on a far more satisfactory basis; and that the differences referred to were not the result of any miscalculation in the cost of stationery, wherein he begged to point out to the Committee a considerable saving had been effected.

Mr. DILLWYN said, this sum of £17,000 was a very large one to be attributed to unforeseen and exceptional work, and would like to receive a little further explanation.

Sir HENRY SELWIN-IBBETSON replied, that it had been the habit to allow a number of arrears to run on from year to year; that was not a satisfactory way of dealing with accounts; and the arrears, which had now been paid up, were included in the £17,000 referred to by the hon. Member for Swansea (Mr. Dillwyn).

Mr. BRISTOWE said, that now they were upon the subject, he would call the attention of the Committee to another item that had not been touched upon. There was actually the sum of £5,500 additional for binding alone. In his opinion, the quantity of binding required would be pretty much the same for one year as for another. He could not understand that excessive increase of charge. At all events, he considered that those who had control of the Estimates should be able to frame them less wide of the mark.

Sir HENRY SELWIN-IBBETSON said, the explanation was that out of the sum of £5,500 referred to by the hon. Member, £3,300 was for a contract that had been outstanding during last year; and the money having been paid into the Exchequer had, therefore, to be again provided. The remaining £1,200 was for binding at the new prisons, concerning which, as was stated in the Vote last year, no papers were in the hands of the Department, and the amount of binding requisite was, therefore, unknown.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN remarked that he should vote this money with greater satisfaction if he could feel that more use was being made of the Papers and documents printed by order of the House. He thought many valuable Papers, which now went to the tallow-chandler and the butterman might, with great advantage, be sent to the Free Libraries throughout the country. He felt that something should be done by the Departments to assist these institutions with some of the documents which were printed by order of the House; and he was quite convinced that anyone who had practical knowledge on the subject would agree that no extra expense would be involved, as only about

100 extra copies would be required. He hoped the Secretary to the Treasury would give this matter his careful attention.

MR. HERMON said, what he objected to about Parliamentary Papers was that they very often did not get them until after they were of use. There were certain Members who did not care for the Blue Books, and he must say that many of them were a great nuisance to himself; but there were many cases in which really important Papers did not come to hand till long after they were of use. He thought if competition was sought for the Parliamentary printing, they would get Papers with very much more expedition than now, and at less cost.

SIR HENRY SELWIN-IBBETSON said, there was a separate Department for the printing of Papers for the House of Commons, and over that Department the Stationery Department had no control. The question, however, had been under the notice of Mr. Speaker during last Session; and he confessed, for his own part, that he should be glad to fall in with the views of many hon. Members, and that an endeavour should be made to see if some fresh arrangement could not be come to in regard to the printing. It had often occurred to him that the Papers should only be sent to those Members who wished for them, and that they should be had on application; or that Members should have the power of directing them to be sent to some institutions at the end of the Session to meet the point which had been raised by the hon. Member for Birmingham (Mr. Chamberlain).

MR. O'SHAUGHNESSY asked whether the printing of books under the National Education Board in Ireland was included in this Vote? He assumed that it was, and he wanted to complain of the monopoly enjoyed by the booksellers of the Board in the sale of school books to be used in the National schools. These books had the reputation of being Government books, and there was a certain unpopularity attaching to them, as representing particular views; but, from a practical and business point of view, the inconvenience was also very great. All the teachers were allowed to sell only these books, and as a consequence, all competition was shut out. Although the children did get the books at a reduced price, yet the difference between that price and the trade price came out of the pockets of the ratepayers. The system also was unfair, because it prevented the booksellers of Ireland from competing for the sale of these school books, while, on the other hand, the taxpayers were obliged to pay more than was fair for the work done.

MR. WHEELHOUSE knew, from his own experience, that great benefit resulted from sending Blue Books to people in the country; and, therefore, he did hope that the Government would do something to carry out the suggestion that had been made. He had long been in the habit of sending those of his Papers which he thought would interest them to some of his constituents. They had in Leeds a magnificent Free Library, to which he sent his copy of the Report on the Blantyre Explosion. That was a book which was so much in request that sometimes there were between 40 or 50 names down for it.

MR. RYLANDS said, it had been suggested that the printing expenses of that House should be cut down. He was entirely opposed to narrow economy in matters of this kind; for it must be remembered that these Papers not only educated the country and furnished information to the nation, but they also were the means of educating Members of the House, and of furnishing them with facts on subjects in which they were interested.

MR. J. G. HUBBARD did not think it should be suggested that there were any Members who did not use their Blue Books. Of course, they could not read all the Papers that were sent them; but some would read those that bore on the subject especially interesting to them, and others would study others. It must be remembered, also, that if these Papers were sold their diffusion all over the country did a great deal of good.

MR. WHITWELL said, it was clear that if the objections to the new management were founded on economy, then the Supplementary Estimates justified such objections. The re-Vote of £10,000 had arisen from the changes made in the Department, and, therefore, did not really signify. As he understood the practice, they used to charge each Department with the stationery served out each day, and credit it to the Department when paid for. There might, however, be this difference in the ultimate result—that under this Vote they did not get all the money which certain Departments were formerly charged with; they only got a portion of it. This was not an improvement. Then, again, some of the accounts due were not estimated for until after the time for payment was passed. That was not the way in which the accounts of a Public Department should be kept. It was not right that £10,000 due to a man should not be paid because he had omitted to send in his account on a particular day. Again, great objection must be taken to a Department which permitted accounts to go into arrears of such long standing as these were. How could the public accounts be properly kept if now only the Committee was asked to vote the payment of an account which ought to have been paid two or three years ago? Amongst the Votes that evening several related to arrears of claims not paid in proper time. He did hope that the Stationery Department would be more thoroughly looked after than it was at present. He would mention one other item which seemed extraordinary in this account. £1,700 was originally estimated for the cost of the publication of a particular volume, and after it was published a Supplementary Estimate of £2,000 was made. Many details in this account required proper investigation, and he believed the cost of the publication of some of the Blue Books could be reduced by one-third.

Mr. PELL observed, that there was one thing of extreme importance with respect to the Parliamentary Papers which he should like to mention to the Committee. He thought it desirable to bring the subject forward, in order that those in whose charge the matter lay might be able to ascertain the cause of the evil. The Report of the Education Department—a very important document, which every Member of the House who cared for the public interests desired to see—was not delivered till the 8th of November. But 10 days before its delivery a review of the book appeared in the public papers. That was not the way in which Members should be treated. He was given to understand that there was a reason for this; but whatever reason there might be, the practice should be put an end to without delay. If the market were supplied first, including newspapers, libraries, and persons who were allowed to pay for the Papers, the first batch was thus taken off, and hon. Members were left to get theirs at a later period. No Paper was more important than the Report of the Education Department, and it was manifestly wrong that that document should have been kept back until the 8th of November. When he saw the review of the Report in *The Times* he came to the House for his Blue Book, and was told that he could not have it until the next batch was printed, which would not be until a day or two later. He hoped that attention would be called to this proceeding, and that for the future it would be stopped.

Mr. MACDONALD observed, that the hon. Member for Preston (Mr. Hermon) had touched upon the subject of economy in printing. It so happened that when the Blue Book in question was on his table a printer, whom he knew, came to see him. He asked what would be the cost of printing a book like that? The answer was, that he could get it up for 4*s*., which was 2*s*. 10*d*. less than the Government price. Two-and-tenpence was a considerable addition to make in the cost of printing by a Public Department; and he believed that if the printing of the country, instead of being always centred in the same hands, were thrown open, in accordance with the usual practice of buying in the cheapest market and selling in the dearest, then it would be found that the cost price of the printing of the country would be much reduced. He agreed with the hon. Member for Preston in thinking that until there was a public competition for the whole of the printing of the country it would not be done so cheaply as it ought to be. The right hon. Member for the City of London (Mr. J. G. Hubbard) seemed to think that the printing was now very cheap. So the printing might be, if judged by the standard of the Bond Street bookseller. The Government Papers might be very cheap at the rates that such a bookseller would charge for them. But the fact still remained, that they were not done so cheaply as the public could get them done. The observations of the hon. Member for Birmingham (Mr. Chamberlain) were, in his opinion, perfectly true. In the town he had the honour to represent (Stafford) there was a working man's club, and he was in the habit of sending off nearly the whole of his books to that club, and he found that the workmen read these books with avidity. But could it be expected that a workman in the town of Stafford could pay 6*s.* 10*d.* for the Civil Service Estimates for the purpose of his private reading? It was impossible for workmen to do that out of their wages at the present moment; and until these Estimates were diffused among the working men of this country, and until the working people understood the amount of money which was thrown away by these Votes, they could never appreciate the working of this House. It would be highly desirable that the whole of these Estimates should be read by the working classes of this country, and to enable them to do that they should be sold for 6*d.* He believed that, if the Estimates were sold for 6*d.*, more caution would be exercised in Public Expenditure, and a great deal less would be spent in the frivolous manner in which it was now done. Were the great body of the taxpayers to know that millions of money was voted here by half-a-dozen of persons, as it often was done, he believed that hon. Gentlemen who left this work to the few would very quickly have to fill the House, and what was more, exhibit greater interest in the whole question of voting Supply than they did now.

Mr. J. COWEN thought that the hon. Member for Stafford (Mr. Macdonald) was under some misapprehension. No doubt the cost of one copy of the Civil Service Estimates was 6*s.* 10*d.*; but when the number of copies was multiplied the cost became less. The whole subject had repeatedly been brought before the notice of the House of Commons. In a former Session a Committee was appointed, of which his hon. Friend the Member for Swansea (Mr. Dillwyn) was a Member, to consider the subject. The printing of the House of Commons was one of the points which engaged their attention, as well as the expenses of the stationery in different Departments. He did not think that economy should be begun by reducing the sums spent on diffusing information for the benefit of the country; but he agreed with the hon. Member for Birmingham (Mr. Chamberlain) that it would be desirable if that information could be more extensively scattered over the country. He would draw the attention of the noble Lord the Postmaster General to the question of devising some means by which these Papers might be cheaply distributed. There was scarcely any Constitutional country he knew of where facilities were not given for the distribution of information published by Parliament. The Congress of America published and distributed to Members a much larger amount of information than was the case in this country; and it not only did that, but it afforded free opportunities of sending the publications to the constituencies represented by the Members. In France, also, this was the case; and even in Germany, where, under the present *régime*, there was not thought to be any special desire to diffuse knowledge, better facilities existed for the transmission of official publications than in this country. If any means could be devised by which Members could be allowed to send official publications carriage free to public libraries, the boon would be highly appreciated, and it would relieve hon. Members of a considerable amount of inconvenience. With respect to getting the publications at an early date, he presumed that that matter could be remedied by the Secretary to the Treasury. He assumed, also, that the printing and stationery of the Public Departments was done under estimate; for he did not suppose the Government would allow themselves to be charged with the highest price. The Government ought not to pay more than a fair price for the printing and stationery. It should also be remembered that the cost of printing these publications ought to be cheaper than formerly, because there had been a considerable reduction in the price of paper. Therefore, without special information, he assumed that if the Government got their work done by estimate they had it done in the cheapest and most efficient manner.

Sir GEORGE CAMPBELL thought that it was very desirable to diffuse information throughout the country by means of Blue Books. They were not printed to sell; the cost of setting them up in type was incurred for the information of the House and for official purposes; the expense of printing additional copies to sell involved only the cost of the paper on which they were printed, for the cost of striking off additional copies was very trifling. Therefore, if the cost of paper and the expense of striking off additional copies of official Papers were alone taken into consideration, they could be sold at a very cheap price, and ought to be so sold. The present mode of charging for the transmission of Blue Books and Parliamentary Papers was very unsatisfactory, for by the book-post rate almost as much was charged for a pound of printed matter as for a pound of letters. He thought the Government might have additional copies printed as he had suggested, and have them sold at cost price, and circulated in the country at cost price—for there was no justification for making a profit out of these books, nor was there any reason why any profit should be made out of their transmission.

Mr. DILLWYN said, it was a common mistake, which could not be too often mentioned, that it was the printing of the Blue Books and Returns which constituted the greater part of this vast Estimate for printing and stationery. The fact was that these matters formed but a very small part of the expenses. With regard to the suggestion that those Members who did not want their Parliamentary Papers might have them sent to institutions in their constituencies, he did not think that that suggestion was of much value, because there were very few Members who did not want the books. For his own part, he wanted the most important Blue Books, and kept them for reference from one Session to another; and it would probably happen that one which he did not require his constituents would not also care for, so that the plan was not likely to answer.

Major NOLAN wished to draw attention to what had happened to him once or twice during the present Session—namely, that a document was to be found in the newspapers some two or three days before it was placed in the hands of hon. Members. The plan had caused him great confusion, for seeing the review of a Blue Book he had thought he had omitted to notice it, and had looked amongst his Papers for it, and had subsequently found that it was issued to him two or three days afterwards. He thought that this was a grievance which ought to be rectified by the persons in charge of the Stationery Department. Moreover, the grievance did not stop there, for all the newspapers did not get these publications, and there was a good deal of jealousy amongst the Press in consequence of some newspapers getting copies in advance of others. He thought that some measure should be taken to prevent these publications from getting into the hands of the newspapers before they were issued to Members, for Members were placed at a disadvantage when information appeared in the papers and the public knew of it before it came to their knowledge.

Mr. MELDON hoped that there would be some reduction made in this Vote, in accordance with the hopes which the Secretary to the Treasury had held out. He begged to call attention to the matter in order that it might be remedied before the Estimates for the next year came under consideration. With regard to the distribution of Parliamentary Papers, it had been suggested that there should be a larger distribution throughout the country; but attention had not been called to the fact that during the Parliamentary Recess Papers only reached hon. Members if they chanced to be in London. During the Vacation the most important Papers were delivered, and Members had no means of getting them unless they made arrangements to have them forwarded to them. He believed that in Dublin and Edinburgh there were offices where the Papers were issued to Members without expense. On former occasions he had been told that this matter would be looked to, but up to the present time nothing whatever had been done. As regarded the expense of printing, there was one point to which he was surprised attention had not been called, and that was that a report had been generally circulated that an eminent printer had guaranteed to do the printing of the House of Commons for one-half of the amount now paid. That was an important fact; and he thought there ought to be some inquiry into the subject, with a view of seeing whether there were not printers in London who would undertake the work at half the expense now incurred. It was a monstrous thing, if that were the case, that the country should now be paying the large sums it was. Hon. Members had not ever been told whether, at the present time, the printing of the House was done by contract. He believed that if it were put up to contract, the amount now expended would be considerably reduced. Some reference had been made by the hon. and learned Member for Limerick (Mr O'Shaughnessy) to the Report on National Education. The books used by the National teachers of Ireland, under the present system, must be printed by the Government, and the teachers were not allowed to sell any but Government books. Formerly the teachers had a small commission on the Government sales; but recently, notwithstanding the fact that the small salaries of those teachers had been a matter of strong comment, this commission had been taken from them. He believed that the books in question could be more cheaply printed by private printers, and could be sold for a less price than they now were. When the small commission for the sale of these books was withdrawn from the teachers they were given nothing in its place. He hoped that before the Estimates came up next Session this matter would receive the attention it deserved.

Mr. J. COWEN wished to make an explanation with regard to the statement of the hon. and gallant Member for Galway (Major Nolan). It was a fact that anyone who paid 16 guineas a-year was supplied with all the Blue Books and official Papers. He believed that those who paid that sum were entitled to receive the Books earlier than Members, and it was from that circumstance the newspapers obtained the Reports referred to.

Major NOLAN thought that that explanation made the matter much worse. Hon. Members were sent there by their constituents to look after their interests, and yet they were not treated so well by the country as persons that paid 16 guineas a-year.

Mr. DILLWYN asked whether the Papers were printed by contract or not?

Sir HENRY SELWIN-IBBETSON said, that the printing of the House of Commons was not under the control of the Stationery Department.

Mr. MITCHELL HENRY suggested that a Committee should be appointed to investigate into the whole subject of the printing of the House. With reference to the Supplementary Estimate of £17,000, he thought it was a very large sum, especially so when hon. Members remembered the boast which had been made that a considerable saving would be effected by the new appointment to which reference had been made. With regard to the distribution of the Parliamentary Papers, he was entirely of opinion that it failed to meet the requirements of Members; and he thought that they should have this information on the Supplementary Estimates in time for the coming Estimates.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN said, he did not wish to delay the taking of this Vote, but he certainly wanted a little further information with reference to the question he had raised. It was one of the greatest importance, and excited in the country an amount of interest which could hardly be appreciated by those who were resident in London. What he had suggested was that the Government should use its influence in order to secure the distribution of the more important Bills and Reports of Committees amongst a certain number of public institutions in the Provinces to the extent of not more than 100. The Secretary to the Treasury had told him that the Stationery Department had very little to do with this matter—that it was not responsible; but it appeared to him that the Stationery Department found the paper for printing and the binding, and he did not know any other Vote upon which to raise this subject. The Secretary to the Treasury sympathized with the object he had in view; but he did not think the proposition of the hon. Gentleman at all satisfactory. He suggested that a great many Members did not want their Papers, and therefore these could be utilized as he had suggested. He pointed out that those who did not want their Papers would not be connected with large towns, but they who were connected with those towns found that they did want their Papers, and that they could not spare them, even for the purpose for which he now asked them from the Government. Those Members complained of the large sums of money taken from the Metropolitan towns in England and Scotland for the maintenance of public libraries—the British Museum, and similar institutions in London—and they asked that some corresponding advantage should be made to libraries in the leading towns in the Provinces. He did not suppose that that was exactly the time to press upon the Government any immediate expenditure; but he calculated that his proposal would involve no increased outlay. He assumed that the number of documents printed varied in accordance with the importance of the subject; and he undertook to say that the printing of 100 additional copies would not be appreciable. The type being set up, the cost involved would only amount to the value of the paper. His own opinion was that the 100 copies might be taken from the stock which went into the cellar of the House, and was never seen afterwards. There was not a public library in the North or South of America which did not have every public document supplied free by the Government; and what he proposed was that in the case of really important public documents, issued at the instance of and by the authority of the Government, and all Reports of Committees, one copy of each of these documents should be sent to the great public institutions—such as public reference libraries in great towns.

Sir HENRY SELWIN-IBBETSON said, he thought the hon. Gentleman misunderstood what he had said. It was, that hon. Members were always ready to condemn the growing expenditure of the country, and one of the expenses complained of was the large amount annually spent for the printing of the Blue Books of the House of Commons. The printing of the Bills, and of the different Books and Papers, was managed in this way—Copies of all the different Books were printed, and were divided by order of Mr. Speaker into a double list. On one list a certain number of Books and Papers were entered, and those were left in the House of Commons, where Members could put their names down for a copy, while the others were sent to each Member. His suggestion was that as there were numerous instances in which Members took so little interest in their Papers as not to require them, that those Papers might be utilized for the purpose suggested by the hon. Member, while, at the same time, avoiding any increase of expenditure. It would, however, be inconsistent to create the right of every hon. Member to a second copy—such a course would double the number issued.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN said, the Secretary to the Treasury had a little misunderstood his suggestion. What he had suggested was that certain public institutions, not exceeding 100, should have the right to take a copy of these Bills and Reports; and he believed that the cost of printing 100 copies extra, even if that were necessary, would but amount to a fractional increase of expenditure.

Mr. SHAW LEFEVRE said, he was of opinion that the number of copies printed was in excess of the number required, and he quite agreed with the hon. Member for Birmingham that his suggestion might be carried out with a very little extra cost. He was strongly in favour of the point raised by the hon. Member.

Mr. PARNELL thought the Secretary to the Treasury was a little "penny-wise." He told them that they must all be very economical. He thought the reason why the Government opposed the proposition was because they were determined it should not be complied with. He believed the Government dared not allow the Papers published by Parliament a large circulation in the country. If they did, the public would understand questions in a manner not at all pleasant to the occupants of the Treasury Bench at the present time. He asked the hon. Baronet to elevate himself, to take a high standard, and to approach this subject with some sense of the grave considerations it involved. Was it a proper way to answer the hon. Member for Birmingham to suggest that those Members who took so little interest in the proceedings of Parliament and their duties to their constituencies as never to call for their Papers, who did not even care whether they saw them or not from one Session to another, should be invited to give directions that those Papers should be placed at the disposal of the Government for the purpose of circulating them amongst the public institutions of the country? It was idle to suppose that a Member who thought so little of his duties would go out of his way to sign an order, or give directions that his Papers should be forwarded to a public institution.

Sir HENRY SELWIN-IBBETSON said, he never suggested anything of the kind. What he said was that there were two sets of documents, one circulated amongst Members, and the others not; that as a great many Members never required the second copy they might be induced to give instructions that the copy at their disposal might be forwarded to the public libraries.

MR. PARNELL said, that was at least a complicated way in which to arrive at the simple conclusion he had drawn. They paid £484,000 for printing and stationery; and supposing they had 100 more copies of the public Papers printed, how much more would the cost be? Perhaps a quarter per cent; but, in all probability, £1,000 would suffice. He hoped it would go forth as the opinion of the front Treasury Bench that, although Parliament might provide copies for itself at the expense of £484,000 a-year, the Government was not of opinion that it was desirable to provide the large towns with 100 extra copies.

MR. RITCHIE hoped the Government would consent to no such proposition as this. The hon. Member for Birmingham (Mr. Chamberlain) had said that not more than 100 copies would be required; but he had no doubt that if that number were granted others would be demanded. What Member was there in the House who had not a high opinion of the merits and claims of some club or library in his constituency, and who would not think it an unequal rule if he did not get a copy? So far as his experience went, there was not the slightest difficulty in obtaining copies of those documents. He remembered a special case two years ago in which a friend of his wanted a special Blue Book for his constituents who were greatly interested in it. By simply asking Members of the House he got no less than 15 copies of that Blue Book to send to his constituents. Hon. Members opposite were particularly careful, when addressing their constituents, to point out any increase in the expenses of Government Departments, and to find fault with such increase, however small it might be. It was those hon. Members who were now asking the Government to increase the already heavy expenses in a manner which he thought altogether unnecessary.

MR. BARRAN thought the hon. Member for the Tower Hamlets (Mr. Ritchie) could not have had much experience in connection with public libraries, and he probably fairly represented a district which had no public libraries. If the hon. Member had had some of the experiences of Members of that House he would not have used the arguments he had put forward. He supported the proposal, because he knew the desire there was amongst the people to possess these Reports, and to use them as a means of acquainting themselves with the affairs of the nation. He thought public institutions ought to be supplied direct from that House with the Reports suggested by the hon. Member for Birmingham, and that public libraries ought to be encouraged. Those who were connected with public libraries felt that the more they could store the mind of the public with the legislation for the people—pecuniary or otherwise—and the more they could stimulate the desire for this knowledge on the part of the people, the better they would be fitted to discharge their duties towards their country. They were told, from time to time, that the people were not sufficiently informed to give opinions on matters coming before the House; and he thought the easiest way to make them so was to give them the information which would be conveyed to them through the adoption of the proposition of the hon. Member.

MR. CHAMBERLAIN said, he must say that the hon. Member for the Tower Hamlets (Mr. Ritchie) did not show much magnanimity to his proposition. The hon. Member represented a Metropolitan constituency—the Tower Hamlets—which took part in the advantage of free libraries, free picture galleries, and museums, which were provided at the expense of the nation, and towards which they in the country had to contribute; and, therefore, when they asked that a few pounds should be spent in order that the country people might have the advantage of these Books, in a fit of unwonted economy the hon. Member got up and offered his opposition. He ventured to suggest to the hon. Member that he should wait until the Vote was abused before suggesting the possibility of it. His proposition was that these books should be provided to 100 free libraries—maintained out of the rates and managed under local municipal control—and he begged to give Notice on going into Committee on the Civil Service Estimates of a Resolution.

Mr. MUNTZ thought it was absurd to send round to Members Blue Books and Papers which, perhaps, no one ever took any interest in. He thought Members should have on their tables instead a list of Sessional Papers, and those who desired might apply for them. He was perfectly certain £100,000 a-year was thrown away in Blue Books, &c. Those who wanted special copies had found great difficulty in getting them. He hoped the hon. Member for the Tower Hamlets (Mr. Ritchie) would follow his example, and send his books to a library. He had forwarded his to the Birmingham Free Library; but, unfortunately, they had all been destroyed in the late fire.

Mr. DILLWYN said, he had been unable to obtain copies for a library in his own town.

Mr. ANDERSON said, that probably the hon. Member for Birmingham, like a good many other Representatives of large constituencies, had plenty of other work, without running about asking Members for their spare Blue Books. If the hon. Baronet the Secretary to the Treasury thought the proposition such a good one, could he not go a little further and say that it would be agreed to?

Mr. BIGGAR said, it appeared to him to be a great mistake that newspapers were supplied with copies in advance of Members. The result was that the Members saw summaries of their contents in the newspapers before having the official document itself. With regard to the printing, the hon. Baronet did not seem to know the way in which it was done. He wished he would explain the system of giving the contracts, and the way in which the printing was carried out. They had been told that the printing could be done at half the present cost to the Government. If that were anything like truth, it appeared that the business of the Government was carried on in a very unprincipled manner. He begged to move that the Vote be reduced by the sum of £10,000.

Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That a Supplementary sum, not exceeding £23,000, be granted to Her Majesty, to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1879, for Stationery, Printing, Binding, and Printed Books for the several Departments of Government in England, Scotland, and Ireland, and some Dependencies, and for Stationery, Binding, Printing, and Paper for the two Houses of Parliament, including the Salaries and Expenses of the Stationery Office."—(*Mr. Biggar.*)

Mr. MORGAN LLOYD inquired whether it was a fact that one or two newspapers received information in advance of the others? because, if that was so, it appeared to him to be a proceeding that did not recommend itself to the Members of that House. The rule should be either to send copies of Parliamentary Papers to all the newspapers, at all events to those published in London, no matter what their political opinions were—or to none.

Mr. BIGGAR said, the hon. Baronet had not replied to his inquiry whether or not he would do so as he had asked him?

Sir HENRY SELWIN-IBBETSON assured the hon. Gentleman that no discourtesy had been intended. He had already stated to the House that neither he nor the Government knew of any such priority as that referred to in the delivery of Parliamentary Papers. He understood that it was suggested by the hon. Member that some such preference had been shown, and he would endeavour to ascertain the facts before Report. He could not promise to do what had been asked by the hon. and gallant Member for Galway (Major Nolan), because the Government had no power in that matter, which was entirely under the control of Mr. Speaker. The House of Commons used its official authority in regulating the printing of all books, and the stationery in stock, whilst the Stationery Office simply found the material.

Mr. W. H. JAMES inquired whether the hon. Baronet would ask Mr. Speaker to give his consent to the documents in question being presented to the public libraries? He also desired to know what became of the surplus documents now? There was, undoubtedly, a limited number of persons who had time to investigate questions which appeared in the Blue Books; and he asked the hon. Baronet what there was to prevent those documents, printed in excess of the required number, being sent, as suggested, to the public libraries?

Sir HENRY SELWIN-IBBETSON said, that was exactly his original proposal — that the surplus documents should be utilized in the way suggested by the hon. Member. The suggestion had been under the consideration of Mr. Speaker during the last Session—indeed, the whole subject of printing for the House of Commons was being considered with a view to its revision. The subject should again be brought under the notice of Mr. Speaker, and it was to be hoped that an arrangement, satisfactory to hon. Members, would be arrived at.

MR. PARNELL thought that the hon. Gentleman had forgotten what he had stated to the Committee some time ago, that there was a surplus of books down in the cellar, which he proposed should be distributed amongst the public libraries. It would be very interesting if it could be ascertained what became of all those books that were sent down to the cellar and not used, over and above the number issued to private Members.

MR. W. H. JAMES pointed out to the hon. Baronet that he had not answered his question as to whether the Government would use its influence with Mr. Speaker with reference to those documents?

MR. CHAMBERLAIN was very anxious to save the time of the Committee, and therefore hoped the hon. Baronet would answer the question. He (Mr. Chamberlain) had given Notice that the question would be raised by him at another time; but this would not be necessary if the question of the hon. Member for Gateshead (Mr. James) were replied to. Again, if Mr. Speaker consented, would the Government do what laid in their power to forward the proposal?

MR. BIGGAR said, he had moved the reduction of this Vote because he had not received a satisfactory reply to his question; but an explanation, which was satisfactory to him, having been given, he asked leave to withdraw his Motion.

Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

SIR HENRY SELWIN-IBBETSON could not pledge himself beforehand. He had said that the subject should be again brought under the notice of Mr. Speaker, with whom the Treasury were in communication, with the view of reconsidering the whole of the printing of the House of Commons.

MR. PARNELL had omitted to make some remarks upon a very important question. It would be remembered that a Division had been taken last Session against a portion of the Vote for the Stationery Department, on the ground that £271 of the money asked had been expended in stationery for the Queen's University in Ireland. It was the intention of the Irish Members to use their best exertions to prevent the Queen's University getting any money, directly or indirectly, from the House of Commons. He perceived that the present Vote was for a Supplemental Estimate of the amount required for the expense of stationery, printing, and books for several Departments in England, Ireland, and Scotland. Assuming that the Queen's University in Ireland was one of those Departments, he objected to the Vote.

Original Question put, and *agreed to.*

(14.) Motion made, and Question proposed,

> "That a Supplementary sum, not exceeding £206, be granted to Her Majesty, to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1879, for the Salaries of the Officers and Attendants of the Household of the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland and other Expenses."

MR. PARNELL said, he was very unwilling to introduce a personal question into the discussion of that Vote, and that which he was about to raise was more of a public than a personal character. He had no fault to find with the salaries paid to the officers of the Household; but there was an item of £150 per annum, appearing as an allowance to the Chaplain for an official residence. That allowance had very much the appearance of a job; and he rather fancied that it was but an increase to the Chaplain's salary, to enable him to pay an assistant. He merely wished for an explanation from the Chief Secretary for Ireland, as to whether the Chaplain of the Castle in Dublin ever did occupy any other than his own private house; and whether, in fact, it was not an addition to his salary, pure and simple, under the guise of supplying him with an official residence, of which he never made any use? They could understand that the Chaplain of the Castle did not desire to reside in his official residence, and that he might prefer to live in his own house; but what was the reason for granting him £150 a-year for the loss of a thing for which he cared nothing? He would be glad to find that his idea was incorrect. As to the incidental expenses, it was his intention to take a Division against the whole Vote for the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland when it came on, because he thought that if Ireland was to be governed as a portion of England the Lord Lieutenancy ought to be abolished. He did not understand the principle that Ireland was to be governed as a portion of the United Kingdom, and still have the Lord Lieutenant as Representative of the Queen conducting the ceremonies of a mock Court. For his part, there was nobody who would be more rejoiced, if they had their own Parliament in Ireland, to see the Lord Lieutenant again carrying out his functions as Representative of Royalty; but so long as the badge of provincialism was affixed to Ireland, he thought it was only right to hold the English Government to its bargain. It had been a matter of regret, and considered as a remarkable fact, that no Representative of the Viceroy had waited upon Her Majesty, the Empress of Austria, when she honoured Ireland by landing on her shores, and this duty was left to be performed, as well as it might be, by the Lord Mayor of Dublin. He moved the reduction of the Vote by the sum of £191.

Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That a Supplementary sum, not exceeding £15, be granted to Her Majesty, to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1879, for the Salaries of the Officers and Attendants of the Household of the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland and other Expenses."—(*Mr. Parnell.*)

Mr. J. LOWTHER said, he must remind the hon. Member that the Empress of Austria, on the occasion referred to, came to Ireland as a private person, which was the reason that no Representative of Her Majesty had waited upon her. With regard to the Chaplain of the Castle, the sum of £150 was paid by arrangement during the time his official residence was under repair.

Mr. PARNELL said, of course the reply of the right hon. Gentleman (Mr. J. Lowther) was to be taken as conclusive. It was, however, just what he had expected. Government were going to make an addition to the salary of the Chaplain of £150 a-year, because it was found that the official residence had fallen out of repair from not being used.

Sir HENRY SELWIN-IBBETSON said, the real explanation was that there had been several cases of typhoid fever in the house, and the Chaplain had left in consequence. An inquiry had been held by the Board of Works, and they reported against the house being retained as an official residence, at the same time recommending an allowance to the Chaplain during the time that it was undergoing repairs.

Mr. PARNELL inquired if the Chaplain had been in the habit of residing in the house before that circumstance occurred?

Sir HENRY SELWIN-IBBETSON replied, that the Chaplain had resided in the house before the cases of fever had occurred.

Mr. M. BROOKS knew the Chaplain of the Castle to be one of those people who had taken a great interest in the condition of the public health in Ireland, and who would never shrink from any duty that properly fell upon him. He would certainly not leave his residence without a sufficient reason. He. (Mr. Brooks) appealed to his hon. Friend not to press his Amendment.

Major NOLAN wished to know whether the Chaplain was of the same religion as the Viceroy?

Mr. J. LOWTHER said, the Chaplain was of the same religion as the Viceroy. He had not been appointed by the Lord Lieutenant, but had held his office previously.

Mr. BIGGAR wished to know whether, although the Church of Ireland had been disestablished and disendowed, the Dean was dependent upon the public funds?

Mr. PARNELL had no personal feeling in the matter, but remarked that the item in question looked rather suspicious; and certainly the explanation of the right hon. Gentleman (Mr. J. Lowther) was neither happy nor fortunate. He was ready to withdraw his Motion for the reduction of the Vote; but, at the same time, he thought it would have been a better course for the Government to adopt, if they had put the Dean's house into a proper sanitary condition. That could have been done, probably, at very much less cost than the capital sum given by way of allowance, and would not have had the effect of increasing his salary by a side wind.

MR. MELDON said, the amount of disease about the Castle was scandalous to the country, and was the source of disease to those who were compelled to live in its precincts.

Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Original Question put, and *agreed to.*

(15.) £390, Chief Secretary for Ireland, Offices.

MR. PARNELL said, he should oppose this Vote, although he should not put the Committee to the trouble of a Division, and he would not trouble the Committee either with a long speech. His reason for opposing the Vote was that, in his opinion, Irish Members would get on better without a Chief Secretary for their country.

Vote *agreed to.*

(16.) £560, Public Works Office, Ireland.

MR. MITCHELL HENRY asked what the Government intended to do in regard to the Board of Works?

SIR HENRY SELWIN-IBBETSON said, this matter had been for some time under the serious consideration of the Government. After the receipt of the Report of the Committee which inquired into this matter they came to the conclusion that the Board of Works was undermanned, and that it would be desirable to increase the number of Commissioners to that originally intended. The Government also intended to bring in and pass, if possible, this Session, an Act to consolidate the whole of the Acts dealing with the duties and operations of the Board of Works. They proposed to amend certain of the functions of the Board, in accordance with the recommendations of the Committee, and they intended to nominate a Member of the Government, a Member also of the Treasury, as an *ex-officio* member of the Board of Works, so that the Board might be represented directly in the House of Commons. He would sit as a member of the Board, and would, therefore, be aware of the action of the Board, and, at the same time, be a Representative of the Treasury. This was roughly the outline of the scheme which it was the intention of the Government to propose with the view of carrying out some of the recommendations of the Committee. It might take some little time to put the scheme into definite shape; but he trusted that when it was finished and formulated a real amendment of the Board of Works would take place.

MR. MITCHELL HENRY said, this was so important a matter that he thought there ought to be a distinct and definite statement made by the Government going into the whole matter. Was the Government going to intrust to a Member of the Government the official representation of the Board of Works in that House, or were they going to recommend that there should be a responsible Minister, as had been recommended? If they did not state more clearly what they intended to do, he should be driven into entering on a discussion on this subject, though he did not wish to take that course. He was exceedingly anxious that nothing should be said that would be painful to the feelings of any member of the Board; but unless the Government took up this matter in a really serious way, and were prepared to investigate and deal with the Report of the Committee in a reasonable manner, he would be obliged to initiate a discussion which would be extremely painful to members of the Board. That Board had been responsible for a great deal of the feeling of dissatisfaction which at present existed in Ireland towards the English Government; and the Treasury ought, therefore, to be glad of the opportunity given them by the Report for showing that the good intentions of the English Government had been defeated only by the performance of the functions of this Board in Ireland.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER could assure the hon. Gentleman that the Report and proceedings of the Committee had received the serious consideration of the Government. The Vote at present before the Committee was merely a Supplemental one for the works of last year; but he trusted that before the regular Vote came on for discussion in the ordinary course, the Government would be in a position to give a full explanation as to what would be done. The real cause of the weakness of the Board was that its duties had been increased, while its strength had been reduced. At the proper time he should be prepared to state the proposals of the Government; but he thought it better not to enter into details of an arrangement which as yet was not quite complete.

Mr. PARNELL considered that the Irish Members had grave grounds for complaint. The Committee reported a year ago. ["No, no!"] Well, nearly 10 months ago, and yet the Government proposals were still immature. They were now invited by the Government to defer the discussion of this question till the Irish Votes came on; but they knew very well that those Votes were never taken till August, when everybody was tired out. Therefore, he thought that Irish Members were wise to seize this—which was practically their only opportunity. If the Chief Secretary had only paid attention to this matter during the winter, as he ought to have done, he would have been prepared to state the Government proposals by this time.

Mr. J. LOWTHER begged to remind the hon. Member that this matter belonged to the Treasury. He was not responsible for the Department of Works, and had nothing to do with it.

Major NOLAN asked whether, in the course of the re-organization of the Department intended by the Government, any additional facilities would be afforded for giving effect to the Bright clauses of the Irish Land Act?

Sir HENRY SELWIN-IBBETSON, in reply, admitted the importance of the question put by the hon. and gallant Gentleman, and the matter was at present under the consideration of the Government. He was not, however, at liberty to state at present what course would be taken with regard to it.

Mr. M. BROOKS hoped the opposition to this Supplementary Vote would not be pressed. It was not only in Dublin that the Board of Works was under-manned and underpaid. This Vote intended, in some respects, to remedy the evil, and, if passed, was calculated to have a salutary effect.

Mr. CALLAN said, the officials of the Board were overpaid, and he denied that they were overworked. He knew that of some of them; and though he would not go into the matter unless he were pressed, he would tell any hon. Member who chose to ask him. There was one man—Colonel M'Kerlie—who was notoriously unfit for his post.

Sir HENRY SELWIN-IBBETSON said, he could not allow such a statement to pass unchallenged. Colonel M'Kerlie was a very valuable public servant; and, so far from being underworked, it was excess of zeal and the desire to do more than he was able which broke him down.

Mr. CALLAN said, as he had been challenged to prove what he had said, he must do so. He would, therefore, give the Committee an instance of Colonel M'Kerlie's conduct. In 1870 an officer passed an examination for the inspection of the Boyne county. He passed the examination most creditably, and after calling on Colonel M'Kerlie, was asked to go into his room. He did not wish to make this personal statement, but for the wanton challenge of the Secretary to the Treasury. Colonel M'Kerlie asked him where he had been in the last year, and he said in Wexford. Colonel M'Kerlie said—"Well, and what have you been doing there?" Mr. Dodd said he had been with the Christian Brothers. Colonel M'Kerlie then said—"Oh! Are you a Roman Catholic?" To which Mr. Dodd replied "Yes." Within a week the appointment was cancelled. Mr. Chichester Fortescue was Chief Secretary at the time, and the case was represented to him, and he brought a Motion forward —which he did not persist in, however, for he was asked not to do so. The reason was that he got the appointment of the Christian Brother in another Department. He, however, had watched Colonel M'Kerlie's proceedings since; and he could say that, so far as the Irish Catholics were concerned, they looked upon Colonel M'Kerlie's conduct in regard to the Board of Works as bigoted in the extreme, and he had surrounded himself with a bigoted party. He must say, however, that he did not join in the dispraise of the present Chief Secretary for Ireland. Whenever he had gone to him on business, he had found civility, cordiality, and willingness to oblige. He wished there were more officials of the same kind. At the same time, he was very sorry that he had not more influence over the Irish Board of Works. Would the new official have such control, or would he be a mere ornamental feature?

Major O'GORMAN said, in consequence of what he had observed, he would be an ungrateful person if he did not publicly acknowledge the great kindness and politeness with which he had been treated by the hon. Baronet the Secretary to the Treasury—he did not know whether he was a right hon. or not. He went to his office one day, accompanied by the noble Lord the Member for the County of Waterford (Lord Charles Beresford) and by his hon. Colleague the Member for the City of Waterford (Mr. R. Power). He happened to be the first to enter the room, and he asked the hon. Baronet for £40,000 for creating a dry dock for Waterford, and within three days the hon. Baronet gave him the £40,000. Now, that was a positive fact, and a somewhat remarkable fact. That was to say, they had not actually got the £40,000. It was certain the board could draw upon it whenever they liked; but his friends in Waterford had not yet drawn a single shilling of it, although it was advanced on the 31st of July, 1878. Now, that was not the fault of the hon. Baronet, and it was not his (Major O'Gorman's) fault; because he remembered he was hurried to the Treasury on a hot July day in the most dreadful manner; but at that moment not one single shilling, so graciously vouchsafed to them in the most handsome manner by the hon. Baronet—whom he begged leave distinctly at that moment, if he had not done so before, as he believed he had, to thank most sincerely—had been spent upon the dry dock at Waterford. He was ashamed to say that he rather thought that the hon. Baronet might call upon him to restore the money which had not been spent. He might ask—"What are you about? Why don't you go on with your dry dock at Waterford?" And he could not give them an answer to that question. He could not, indeed. They had a Harbour Board at Waterford, and a very handsome board. He never saw anything so remarkably handsome as the room in which they sat—it could not have been better if the £40,000 had been spent upon it; but they had not done a single thing towards the dry dock—even through the winter, when work was wanted in Waterford—although the money was granted to them in July, 1878, by the generosity of the hon. Baronet.

MAJOR NOLAN asked if the general constitution of the Board would be submitted to the House, and whether they would have an opportunity of voting on the new salaries?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER said, a statement would be made to the House when the arrangements were made; and whenever the Estimates were brought forward, there would be an opportunity of challenging any salaries that might be proposed.

MR. SHAW LEFEVRE would like to know whether the new officer would be under the Treasury or under the Chief Secretary?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER replied that the new officer would be attached to the Treasury, and would have special charge of the business connected with the Board of Works.

Vote *agreed to.*

Resolutions to be reported.

CLASS III.—LAW AND JUSTICE.

Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That a Supplementary sum, not exceeding £6,200, be granted to Her Majesty, to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1879, for the Salaries of the Law Officers; the Salaries and Expenses of the Department of the Solicitor for the Affairs of Her Majesty's Treasury, and of the Department of the Queen's Proctor for Divorce Interventions; the Costs of Prosecutions, including those relating to the Coin, and to Bankruptcy, and of other Legal Proceedings conducted by those Departments; and various other Legal Expenses, including Statute Law Revision, and Parliamentary Agency."

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Chairman do report Progress, and ask leave to sit again."—(*Mr. Dillwyn.*)

Motion *agreed to.*

Resolutions to be reported *To-morrow;*

Committee also report Progress; to sit again *To-morrow.*

EXCHEQUER BONDS (No. 1) BILL.

(*Mr. Raikes, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson.*)

[BILL 92.] SECOND READING.

Order for Second Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."—(*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer.*)

Mr. WHITWELL said, that before they passed that Bill for second reading, he hoped the Chancellor of the Exchequer would explain that he was intending to make provision for a portion of this money, so that they might not go on from year to year borrowing on renewed Bills of this kind. Under this Bill, if the Chancellor of the Exchequer chose —which he did not believe he wished to—he could, before the expiration of another 12 months, bring in another Bill of this kind, thus carrying on this heavy debt another year. He did not ask the right hon. Gentleman to disclose his Budget, though the country was anxiously awaiting it; but he did ask for some intimation that steps would be taken to provide for it. He was quite aware that the right hon. Gentleman had great difficulties to meet as to the loans to be made up, on account of the demands upon him for South Africa. He remembered that last Session the right hon. Gentleman had promised a statement as to how the expenses for South African affairs would be met; but they had never obtained any statement of the kind. He was good enough to say, early in the year, that it would be a question of distribution between the Imperial Government and the Cape Government, but was not then able to say in what proportion. He afterwards stated, however, that the money would first be supplied by England. The House would be glad to know what proportion the Cape Government would bear in the expenditure?

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER said, this subject was a very important one. He had not the matter in his hands at the moment which would enable him to give the hon. Member the full statement, and he would prefer not to give him a mutilated one. In bringing in the Budget he would be prepared to make a complete statement. As to the provision to be made for these Bonds, what was now proposed by the Bill was simply to enable them to meet Exchequer Bonds immediately falling due, which, of course, could not be dishonoured. He proposed to renew those Bonds for a period of 12 months; but, further, he could not at that time indicate what his other proposals would be. At the usual time, however, it would, of course, be entirely in the hands of the House to assent or not.

Mr. RYLANDS said, the fact remained that they were giving the Government power to issue Exchequer Bonds running to the end of the year.

Motion *agreed to.*

Bill read a second time, and *committed* for *To-morrow.*

RACECOURSES (METROPOLIS) BILL.

(*Mr. Anderson, Sir Thomas Chambers, Sir James Lawrence.*)

[BILL 48.] COMMITTEE.

[*Progress Clause* 1, 17*th February.*]

Order for Committee read.

Notice taken, that 40 Members were not present; House counted, and 40 Members being found present,

Bill *considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Clause 1 (Definitions) *agreed to.*

Clause 2 (Horse-races unlawful within 10 miles of London unless licensed).

Mr. CALLAN begged to report Progress. He did not think that at 10 minutes past 1 such a Bill should be rushed through the House, and that further time should be given for consideration. He had no doubt that the Bill would meet with the support of the Scotch Presbyterians; but he (Mr. Callan) belonged to a religion which did not exact such sacrifices, and contributed to the amusement of the people. He regarded the Bill as an act of barbarism, inasmuch as it limited their enjoyments. He trusted it would never pass into law.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Chairman do report Progress, and ask leave to sit again."—(*Mr. Callan.*)

Mr. ASSHETON CROSS hoped the House would be allowed to go on with the Bill, which had been before it a very long time, although it had come forward very late in the evening. He was quite as strongly in favour of retaining all the rational amusements of the people as the hon. Member for Dundalk (Mr. Callan), and as long as he had any power would do all he could to promote them. He only spoke in the interest of public order, when he said that had not people seen that these races were conducted in an improper manner the hon. Member for Glasgow (Mr. Anderson) would not have brought forward the Bill. But the races in question had not been conducted with proper decency.

MR. GOSCHEN suggested that the House should finish the Bill, and was glad that the Home Secretary had opposed the Motion of the hon. Member, because he had thereby removed the impression of some hon. Members on his side of the House, who thought they observed other Members leaving and contributing to the risk of a "Count-out."

MR. CALLAN did not think that the sensibility of the right hon. Gentleman should be so marked; for although he had been an official of the Government for the last 10 years, he (Mr. Callan) had never found him lend his assistance to the proprieties of life by putting down Cremorne or the Argyll Rooms.

MAJOR O'GORMAN was quite astonished at the wonderful virtue which was assumed by the right hon. Gentleman the Home Secretary on that occasion. Of course, he freely granted him the possession of the utmost virtue; but when he told them that all the virtue of racing in England was concentrated by the abolition of racing at two or three wretched meetings in the immediate vicinity of London, all he could say was that he did not agree with the proposition. If the right hon. Gentleman wished the country to become perfectly virtuous, he ought to put down all racing. He (Major O'Gorman) was inclined to the belief that the Bill ought to take a larger scope. The Derby ought to be put down—there was no doubt about that. Every vice that could be imagined had full scope at the Derby; and, doubtless, every vice had full scope at those two or three Metropolitan races. Why should they have been singled out for prohibition? What was the reason that their legislation did not go further and higher, and in a more virtuous direction?

Question put.

The Committee *divided:*—Ayes 2; Noes 63: Majority 61.—(Div. List, No. 37.)

Clause *agreed to.*

Clause 3 (Power to justices to license at Michaelmas Quarter Sessions) *agreed to.*

Clause 4 (Mode of making application for licence) *agreed to.*

Clause 5 (Penalty on persons taking part in unlicensed horse-races) *agreed to.*

Clause 6 (Penalty on owners and occupiers of ground where unlicensed horse-races take place) *agreed to.*

Clause 7 (Unlicensed horse-races to be deemed a nuisance, and liable accordingly) *agreed to.*

Clause 8 (Exemption in favour of long existing horse-race meetings).

MR. ASSHETON CROSS: I am bound to say that I do not like this clause, and think it ought to be altered. I move that this clause be struck out.

MR. ANDERSON had no objection to the striking out of the clause.

Clause *struck out.*

Clause 9 (Short title) *agreed to.*

Bill *reported;* as amended, to be considered upon *Tuesday* next.

MR. ONSLOW gave Notice that on the Report he should move that the Bill be considered that day six months.

MOTION.

COMMONS.

NOMINATION OF SELECT COMMITTEE.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Stephen Cave be a Member of the Select Committee on Commons."—(*Sir Matthew Ridley.*)

Notice taken, that 40 Members were not present; House counted, and 40 Members not being present,

House adjourned at half after One o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Friday, 7th March, 1879.

MINUTES.]—PUBLIC BILLS—*First Reading*—Rivers Conservancy (20).
Third Reading—Assizes* (17), and *passed.*

BRITISH BURMAH.—QUESTION.

Earl GRANVILLE: I beg to ask the noble Viscount the Secretary of State for India, Whether he has any information with regard to regiments said to have been sent to Burmah?

Viscount CRANBROOK: My Lords, yesterday I received a telegram from the Viceroy, stating that troops had been despatched to British Burmah—not in consequence of anything that had happened at Burmah, but merely as a precautionary measure recommended by the Resident. I will read the telegram to your Lordships—

> "In compliance with a strong recommendation of the Chief Comissioner of Rangoon and the Resident at Mandalay, measures have been taken to reinforce the garrison of British Burmah by three regiments—namely, two of Native infantry and one of British."

That is all the information I have received; but I have telegraphed for further information.

STREET ACCIDENTS.

ADDRESS FOR A RETURN.

Viscount TEMPLETOWN moved—

> "That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty for a Tabular statement by months of the accidents which have occurred in the streets of the Metropolis and its suburbs referable to the passage of vehicles, bicycles, or horsemen from 1st January 1878 to 31st January 1879, showing the circumstances under which each accident has occurred, its issues, and results."

Earl BEAUCHAMP said, no one would question the importance of doing all that was possible for the preservation of life in the streets of the Metropolis; but most of the information which was asked for by the noble Viscount was already contained substantially in the Reports of the Commissioners of Police. The Report for the year ending December 31 had not yet been presented. He had no objection that the Report should show month by month the accidents that had occurred. He was afraid it was impossible to give more information about the issue and results of accidents than was already contained in the Reports.

Motion *agreed to.*

RIVERS CONSERVANCY BILL.

BILL PRESENTED. FIRST READING.

The Duke of RICHMOND and GORDON: My Lords, I rise for the purpose of presenting a Bill to make provision for the Conservancy of Rivers. But before I enter in detail upon the provisions of the measure, I think it may be useful if I glance shortly at previous legislation on the subject. I find legislation on this subject dates as far back as the reign of Henry III., when the matter was under the consideration of the Legislature, and again in the reigns of Henry IV., Henry V., and Edward IV.; and that during that time and the reign of Henry VIII. inclusive, there were several Acts relating to it. The most important of those Acts was the Statute of Sewers, passed in the reign of Henry VIII. The Statute set forth that, in consequence of the damage done by floods, Commissioners ought to be appointed; and accordingly certain Commissioners, entitled Commissioners of Sewers, were appointed by the Lord Chancellor, the Lord Treasurer, and two Chief Justices. These Commissioners had powers of a most extensive character—they could take timber and other materials they required at their own price, they could impress into their service men and horses, they could fix whatever assessments they pleased—and also—a power which, in these days at least, would be liable to very considerable abuse—they audited their own accounts. They could, moreover, make their own regulations, and inflict punishment for their infraction. That Statute is still in force, and under it, I believe, some 30 Commissions are in existence at the present time. It is not uninteresting to observe that so long ago as 300 years it was found necessary to deal with this subject by a large and comprehensive measure, and that a similar mode is found to be equally expedient now. The Act of Henry VIII. has been amended by Acts passed in the reigns of Queen Anne, William IV., and Her present Majesty—Acts which in some respects augmented rather than restricted the powers of the Commissioners, though in other respects those powers have been restricted to a certain extent. For example, ornamental lands were not to be taken; and no new works were to be undertaken by the Commissioners without the consent of the owners of three-fourths in value of the land to be dealt with. In 1861 the Land Drainage Act was passed. This Act placed positive restrictions on the dealings of the Commissioners, for it made their acts subject to the Inclosure Commission, and provided that no works exceeding £1,000 in value should be undertaken without the consent of the owners of half the area to be dealt with. Where property rights were interfered with, the Act gave the parties the power of appeal. These Public Acts of which I have spoken have been supplemented by 2,000 or 3,000 Local Acts, dealing with canals and other matters affecting inland navigation. These Local Acts have interfered very materially with the action of the Commissioners under the Act of Henry VIII. The Commissioners have no sufficient control over the riparian proprietors in respect of the duties devolving upon them; and the existence in many cases of two different Commissions dealing with parts of the same river has been a source of much difficulty. There are also some 300 Private Acts in existence dealing with varied interests. In these circumstances, it is not surprising to find the channels of rivers obstructed and blocked up, and low lands liable to frequent inundations. Such was the state of things up to 1867. Your Lordships will recollect that in the autumn of 1876 there were extensive floods in various parts of the country. I have heard of one farmer who lost sight of his land for several months. In 1877, at the instance of Her Majesty's Government, a Select Committee of your Lordships' House was appointed to inquire into—

> "The operation of existing Statutes in regard to the formation of and proceedings by Commissioners of Sewers, and Conservancy, Drainage, and Navigation Boards; to consider by what means such bodies may be more conveniently and inexpensively constituted, their procedure improved, and their powers enlarged, so as to provide more efficiently for storage of water, the prevention of floods, and the discharge of other functions appertaining to such boards."

The Committee sat and took a great deal of evidence given by witnesses from all parts of the country. I will venture to quote from the evidence of Mr. Abernethy, a civil engineer of great experience, who was formerly one of the Commissioners for the regulation of the Danube. He said—

> "The cause of the recent floods in the Ouse in the first place is the defective state of the outlets—that is, the Hundred Foot River and the old Bedford River, and what is termed the wash-lands lying between these two rivers, originally designed as a spillwater or flood-channel; the general deterioration of the river-bed above Earith, which has been obstructed by numerous shoals and an enormous growth of weeds which impede the current, and the utter want of proper subsidiary channels for carrying off the flood-waters."

To the same effect is the evidence of other witnesses; and it was established to the satisfaction of the Committee that—

> "If the channels and outfalls of rivers be properly cared for, any water flowing into these rivers from the catchment basins of which they are the outlets may reasonably be expected to be discharged by them in sufficient time to render unlikely any serious damage to agricultural lands by floods."

For the purpose of remedying the anomalies and defects referred to, and providing an available system for the conservancy of rivers in future, the Committee, after careful consideration of the whole subject, made various recommendations, of which the following are the chief:—

> "1, That the catchment area of each river should, as far as practicable, be placed under a single body of conservators; 2, that, although means should be taken to insure the appointment of a Conservancy Board for each catchment basin, it should, in the first instance, result from the application of persons interested in the district; 3, that the Conservators should be enabled to remove obstructions and to improve outfalls; to deepen and dredge the beds of rivers, with power to deal with banks and bridges, and to acquire lands compulsorily for that purpose when necessary; 4, that they should also be empowered to enforce the provisions of the Rivers Pollution Prevention Act; 5, with respect to the mode of raising funds for executing the powers conferred upon the Conservators, the Committee recommended that a rate should be levied over the whole watershed, flood-lands being rated at a higher amount than up-lands, and other graduations of exceptions being made to meet particular cases."

The Committee were strongly of opinion also that towns and houses should contribute to the rates in question. The rating question was a very difficult one, and with respect to the mode of setting up Conservancy Boards it must be borne in mind that the circumstances of no two watersheds are alike. Of the 210 rivers in England and Wales, there are—having catchment basins of 1,000 square miles and upwards, 11; having catchment basins of 500 to 1,000 square miles, 14; having catchment basins of 100 to 500 square miles, 59; having catchment basins of 50 to 100 square miles, 24; having catchment basins of 10 to 50 square miles, 102; total, 210. The length of these rivers, including tributaries, varies from 688 miles to two miles. The inconvenience of the present system was so great that Her Majesty's Government have thought it necessary to propose legislation; and with that view we have prepared the Bill which I am now about to lay before your Lordships. The Bill contains four points to which I wish to call attention. In the first place, it provides for the establishment of Conservancy Boards; in the next place, it provides for their constitution; in the third place, it defines the duties of those Boards; and, in the fourth, it meets the greatest difficulty of the whole subject—namely, the raising of money to defray the expenses of the operations of the Boards. As to the constitution of the Boards, it is proposed to give power to 10 or more of the landowners of any district, to any existing Conservancy Board or any Sanitary Authority, to apply to the Local Government Board for powers to set up a Conservancy Board in the district. The Local Government Board, having been put in motion, will direct a local inquiry to be made, and thus everything will be conducted in the most public manner possible. Notice will have to be given to the people of the district in order that any of them may appear and make objection if they think it right to do so. If the Local Government Board are satisfied that a case has been made out for such a proceeding, it may issue a Provisional Order to set up a Conservancy Board; and, for the purpose of meeting the expense which will have to be incurred in case the Provisional Order is opposed in Parliament, the Local Government Board will be entitled to take from the promoters of the scheme an undertaking that they will appear to sustain the Order. The number of the Board will be defined in the Provisional Order. The Board will be constituted of two descriptions of members—first, of life members; and, secondly, of elected members. The former, who are to be landowners of the district, are to number one-third of the Board, and vacancies among them, by resignation or death, are to be filled up by the Board itself. The second class of members will be elected by the Sanitary Authorities for a period of three years. If there is to be only one elected member, he must be a landowner; if there are more than one member, then one-half the elected members must be landowners. The duties of the Board so constituted will be to cleanse, widen, and deepen, and otherwise improve the channels and outfalls of rivers; the Boards will have power to remove all obstructions and to enforce the liabilities of riparian owners; they will have power to frame bye-laws, to have periodical surveys made of the catchment basins under their supervision, and to carry out the provisions of the Pollution of Rivers Prevention Act. With regard to the difficult question of rating, I propose to give a Conservancy Board power to levy a general rate, and with that view it is proposed to divide the lands into the uplands, the intermediate lands, and the lowlands. It is proposed that the rates on the uplands shall in no case exceed one-fourth the whole rate. Tenants are to be entitled to deduct from their rents one-half the rate paid by them. Powers are taken for the exemption of certain lands from the rate if they are injured; and, on the other hand, where lands are benefited so that they may be considered as improved by what had been done, they may be rated accordingly. Power of appeal to the Local Government Board is reserved to owners. When the whole district is benefited in a sanitary point of view, it must all contribute to the expenses. It is also provided that two or more Boards may combine for the purposes of the Act. These are the main provisions of the Bill, which I hope will not only remedy the evils complained of, but meet the justice of the case. I believe that the object is one of national importance, and therefore commends itself to the consideration of your Lordships.

Bill to make provision for the Conservancy of Rivers—*Presented* (The Lord President).

On Motion, That the Bill be now read 1ª.

THE MARQUESS OF RIPON said, he could not allow the speech of the noble Duke to pass without thanking him and the Government for proposing to deal with the question. His noble Friend knew his views upon this subject so well that it would not be necessary for him to detain their Lordships long upon it. He was glad to find that the Government had taken the recommendations of the Select Committee, which sat some time since to consider the whole question of floods, as the basis of their legislation. He was certain that they were right in separating this subject from the question of County Boards, and in constituting a distinct Conservancy Board for each separate catchment basin, having as its special duty the conservancy of the rivers of its own district. It was unfair to enter upon the criticism of the Bill until they had seen its provisions. Considering, however, the statement which had been made by his noble Friend, he (the Marquess of Ripon) at that moment thought that a more simple arrangement with respect to the constitution of the Board might be devised, and one which would work better than the complicated system shadowed forth by the Lord President; but when the Bill was printed they would be able to consider more fully what the arrangements were. The opinion of the House of Lords' Committee was unanimous in favour of applying any measure to the whole of the area of each catchment basin, and he was glad that that had been followed. There was one point which his noble Friend had not explained, and that was what he proposed to make the basis of rating for the purpose of carrying out the operations of the Bill. He (the Marquess of Ripon) supposed that both houses and lands would be affected by the rating clauses. He had not risen for the purpose of offering any opposition to the principle of the measure; on the contrary, he felt sure that their Lordships would give the Bill a very careful and fair consideration.

THE DUKE OF SOMERSET said, he understood from the statement of the noble Duke that there was to be one Conservancy Board for each watershed. He asked how that was to be applied to the River Thames, where there were at present different Conservancy Boards and several authorities extending from Oxford to Sheerness? And, moreover, there were certain rights appertaining to the Admiralty Board and to the City of London, which would be interfered with if one Conservancy Board were to be established governing the whole river. Was the Board to be instituted by the Bill to extinguish all other Boards and authorities? He saw nothing of it in the Report of the Committee, and perhaps the noble Duke would state shortly what the views of the Government were upon that point?

THE DUKE OF RICHMOND AND GORDON, in reply, said, that the Thames was omitted from the Bill; but in cases where two or more Conservancy Boards had rights over any portion of a river, they might be joined to the general Conservancy Board under the present Bill.

Motion *agreed to;* Bill read 1ª; to be *printed;* and to be read 2ª on *Monday* the 17*th instant.* (No. 20.)

RAILWAYS (IRELAND).

QUESTION.

VISCOUNT LIFFORD asked Her Majesty's Government, Whether they will lay on the Table of the House a Letter respecting narrow gauge railways in Ireland from the Board of Trade to the Chairman of Committees?

LORD HENNIKER, in reply, said, there would be no objection to lay the Letter upon the Table of the House, if the noble Viscount would move for its production.

Then—

Copy of Letter respecting narrow gauge railways in Ireland from the Board of Trade to the Chairman of Committees: Ordered to be laid before the House.

House adjourned at a quarter past
Six o'clock, to Monday next,
Eleven o'clock.

in mind that the circumstances of no two watersheds are alike. Of the 210 rivers in England and Wales, there are—having catchment basins of 1,000 square miles and upwards, 11; having catchment basins of 500 to 1,000 square miles, 14; having catchment basins of 100 to 500 square miles, 59; having catchment basins of 50 to 100 square miles, 24; having catchment basins of 10 to 50 square miles, 102; total, 210. The length of these rivers, including tributaries, varies from 688 miles to two miles. The inconvenience of the present system was so great that Her Majesty's Government have thought it necessary to propose legislation; and with that view we have prepared the Bill which I am now about to lay before your Lordships. The Bill contains four points to which I wish to call attention. In the first place, it provides for the establishment of Conservancy Boards; in the next place, it provides for their constitution; in the third place, it defines the duties of those Boards; and, in the fourth, it meets the greatest difficulty of the whole subject—namely, the raising of money to defray the expenses of the operations of the Boards. As to the constitution of the Boards, it is proposed to give power to 10 or more of the landowners of any district, to any existing Conservancy Board or any Sanitary Authority, to apply to the Local Government Board for powers to set up a Conservancy Board in the district. The Local Government Board, having been put in motion, will direct a local inquiry to be made, and thus everything will be conducted in the most public manner possible. Notice will have to be given to the people of the district in order that any of them may appear and make objection if they think it right to do so. If the Local Government Board are satisfied that a case has been made out for such a proceeding, it may issue a Provisional Order to set up a Conservancy Board; and, for the purpose of meeting the expense which will have to be incurred in case the Provisional Order is opposed in Parliament, the Local Government Board will be entitled to take from the promoters of the scheme an undertaking that they will appear to sustain the Order. The number of the Board will be defined in the Provisional Order. The Board will be constituted of two descriptions of members—first, of life members; and, secondly, of elected members. The former, who are to be landowners of the district, are to number one-third of the Board, and vacancies among them, by resignation or death, are to be filled up by the Board itself. The second class of members will be elected by the Sanitary Authorities for a period of three years. If there is to be only one elected member, he must be a landowner; if there are more than one member, then one-half the elected members must be landowners. The duties of the Board so constituted will be to cleanse, widen, and deepen, and otherwise improve the channels and outfalls of rivers; the Boards will have power to remove all obstructions and to enforce the liabilities of riparian owners; they will have power to frame bye-laws, to have periodical surveys made of the catchment basins under their supervision, and to carry out the provisions of the Pollution of Rivers Prevention Act. With regard to the difficult question of rating, I propose to give a Conservancy Board power to levy a general rate, and with that view it is proposed to divide the lands into the uplands, the intermediate lands, and the lowlands. It is proposed that the rates on the uplands shall in no case exceed one-fourth the whole rate. Tenants are to be entitled to deduct from their rents one-half the rate paid by them. Powers are taken for the exemption of certain lands from the rate if they are injured; and, on the other hand, where lands are benefited so that they may be considered as improved by what had been done, they may be rated accordingly. Power of appeal to the Local Government Board is reserved to owners. When the whole district is benefited in a sanitary point of view, it must all contribute to the expenses. It is also provided that two or more Boards may combine for the purposes of the Act. These are the main provisions of the Bill, which I hope will not only remedy the evils complained of, but meet the justice of the case. I believe that the object is one of national importance, and therefore commends itself to the consideration of your Lordships.

Bill to make provision for the Conservancy of Rivers—*Presented* (The Lord President).

On Motion, That the Bill be now read 1ª.

THE MARQUESS OF RIPON said, he could not allow the speech of the noble Duke to pass without thanking him and the Government for proposing to deal with the question. His noble Friend knew his views upon this subject so well that it would not be necessary for him to detain their Lordships long upon it. He was glad to find that the Government had taken the recommendations of the Select Committee, which sat some time since to consider the whole question of floods, as the basis of their legislation. He was certain that they were right in separating this subject from the question of County Boards, and in constituting a distinct Conservancy Board for each separate catchment basin, having as its special duty the conservancy of the rivers of its own district. It was unfair to enter upon the criticism of the Bill until they had seen its provisions. Considering, however, the statement which had been made by his noble Friend, he (the Marquess of Ripon) at that moment thought that a more simple arrangement with respect to the constitution of the Board might be devised, and one which would work better than the complicated system shadowed forth by the Lord President; but when the Bill was printed they would be able to consider more fully what the arrangements were. The opinion of the House of Lords' Committee was unanimous in favour of applying any measure to the whole of the area of each catchment basin, and he was glad that that had been followed. There was one point which his noble Friend had not explained, and that was what he proposed to make the basis of rating for the purpose of carrying out the operations of the Bill. He (the Marquess of Ripon) supposed that both houses and lands would be affected by the rating clauses. He had not risen for the purpose of offering any opposition to the principle of the measure; on the contrary, he felt sure that their Lordships would give the Bill a very careful and fair consideration.

THE DUKE OF SOMERSET said, he understood from the statement of the noble Duke that there was to be one Conservancy Board for each watershed. He asked how that was to be applied to the River Thames, where there were at present different Conservancy Boards and several authorities extending from Oxford to Sheerness? And, moreover, there were certain rights appertaining to the Admiralty Board and to the City of London, which would be interfered with if one Conservancy Board were to be established governing the whole river. Was the Board to be instituted by the Bill to extinguish all other Boards and authorities? He saw nothing of it in the Report of the Committee, and perhaps the noble Duke would state shortly what the views of the Government were upon that point?

THE DUKE OF RICHMOND AND GORDON, in reply, said, that the Thames was omitted from the Bill; but in cases where two or more Conservancy Boards had rights over any portion of a river, they might be joined to the general Conservancy Board under the present Bill.

Motion *agreed to;* Bill read 1ª; to be *printed;* and to be read 2ª on *Monday* the 17*th instant.* (No. 20.)

RAILWAYS (IRELAND).

QUESTION.

VISCOUNT LIFFORD asked Her Majesty's Government, Whether they will lay on the Table of the House a Letter respecting narrow gauge railways in Ireland from the Board of Trade to the Chairman of Committees?

LORD HENNIKER, in reply, said, there would be no objection to lay the Letter upon the Table of the House, if the noble Viscount would move for its production.

Then—

Copy of Letter respecting narrow gauge railways in Ireland from the Board of Trade to the Chairman of Committees: Ordered to be laid before the House.

House adjourned at a quarter past
Six o'clock, to Monday next,
Eleven o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Friday, 7th March, 1879.

MINUTES.]—Select Committee—Poor Removal, *appointed.*

Supply—*considered in Committee—Resolutions* [March 6] *reported.*

Private Bill (*by Order*)—*Second Reading*—Lower Thames Valley Main Sewerage Board, *put off.*

Public Bills—*Ordered—First Reading*—Parliamentary Burghs (Scotland) * [97].

Committee—Report—Exchequer Bonds (No. 1) * [92].

Considered as amended—Bankers' Books (Evidence) * [65].

Third Reading—Consolidated Fund (No. 1) *, and *passed.*

PRIVATE BUSINESS.

LOWER THAMES VALLEY MAIN SEWERAGE BOARD BILL (*by Order*).

SECOND READING.

Order for Second Reading read.

Mr. GORST said, he rose to move the second reading of this Bill, which was promoted by a public body in the interests of the ratepayers, who, in consequence of the legislation of 1867, had been formed into a board consisting of 33 members elected by the ratepayers of the districts they represented. They had been brought into existence by an Act of Parliament, and had been created for a very urgent purpose—namely, the purpose of making a satisfactory disposition of the sewage to a large extent of the suburban districts and the western parts of the Metropolis. The necessity for the existence of this public body had become very urgent in consequence of the legislation of Parliament 12 years ago. All the parishes between Staines and the limits of the Metropolis were, previous to that Act, allowed to discharge their sewage into the River Thames. The Act of 1867 prohibited this; and as they were now cut off from the power of discharging their sewage into the River Thames, these various parishes had become involved in greater and graver difficulties; indeed, they had had proceedings taken against them to such an extent that in the parish of Chiswick they had incurred fines and penalties, in consequence of being unable to dispose of the sewage, which amounted to £98,000. Parliament was, therefore, applied to on behalf of all the parishes between the western limits of the Metropolis and Hampton Court. They thereupon formed into one sewerage district, presided over by a board consisting of 33 members, and comprising justices of the peace and persons of position connected with the district. This board was intrusted with the duty of providing satisfactorily for the disposal of the sewage of the district within three years. So urgent was the necessity of the case that Parliament only gave this body that limited period to make provision for the disposal of the sewage. Perhaps he ought to say that Parliament, although it had created this body, had subjected it to two very important restrictions, to which he should like to call the attention of the House. In the first place, this public body were not to create a nuisance in disposing of the sewage. They could not do anything that would cause a nuisance to the public at large or to any private person. In the second place, they were not allowed to pollute the River Thames. They could not discharge into the river any matter that would pollute the Thames. In their desire to carry out the duties intrusted to them, the board had obtained 23 competing schemes from different engineers, and out of them they had selected the proposal embodied in the Bill which he had the honour to move at the present moment; and all he asked was that the body created as he had described should now be allowed to submit this scheme they had selected to Parliament, and that it should go before a Select Committee, before whom the promoters were prepared to produce evidence to show that it was a scheme calculated to dispose, satisfactorily, of the sewage with which they were bound to deal. They would further be able to show a Select Committee that the adoption of this scheme would enable them to carry out the work without creating a nuisance or polluting the River Thames. The board were careful in the Bill to preserve the restrictions imposed upon them by Parliament with regard to the exercise of the powers intrusted to them. These restrictions were maintained in the Bill, and they did not seek for any power to do anything that would create a nuisance or enable them to pollute the River Thames. That was the scheme they wished to carry out. He dared say the House would be astonished that he wished to say so much in introducing the Bill to the consideration of the House, because if ever a scheme were submitted that ought to pass a second reading and go before a Select Committee, by whom its merits would be properly considered, it was the one which he was describing. But unfortunately this scheme was opposed by a very influential opposition. Who were the opponents? The opponents of the scheme were the constituents of the body who were promoting the Bill. Certain disaffected and disappointed constituents who were in a minority on the board itself, and who came to the House to ask it to reject the scheme. These opponents he was bound to say were animated by personal and selfish motives. They did not like the personal superintendence of the board over the locality. They had circulated among hon. Members all sorts of statements, which had even found their way into the newspapers. Some of those were very deliberate statements upon facts which ought to be determined by a Committee upstairs. He could not ask the House to listen to evidence which applied to the merits of the scheme, and he was satisfied that if he proposed to lay that evidence before them now they would decline to listen to him. It was impossible in the House to discuss or examine the facts and motives which had induced the promoters to bring forward their scheme. Therefore, in moving the second reading of the Bill, he at least would have so much regard to the Rules and regulations of the House, that he would not attempt to say one word in praise or blame of the scheme itself. He wished, however, to refer to some of the statements which had been circulated, and especially to one without a name, which had been sent broad-cast among hon. Members of the House, and a copy of which he now held in his hand. It contained no name, and it appeared, as far as he could judge from the plan that accompanied it, to have been circulated by persons who were interested in Sandown Racecourse, and by a Mr. Pugh, who lived on the Sandown Park estate. This circular contained a number of statements which he was in a position to contradict as being without foundation in fact; and he hoped that no hon. Member would allow himself to be misled by statements every one of which was the direct reverse of the true facts of the case. The question was in reality a ratepayer's question, and the opponents of the Bill talked as if the promoters themselves had created this sewage, and as if they were the persons who had made the enormous amount of sewage which had now to be disposed of. They had done no such thing. The sewage was created by the inhabitants of the district, and the unfortunate promoters of the present Bill were charged by Parliament with the unpleasant duty of, somehow or other, disposing of it. The question was one of great urgency. Parliament two years ago only gave three years in which the work was to be done. The health of the district was at present seriously compromised by the imperfect drainage, and yet Parliament was now asked not to pass this Bill, or to allow the scheme to be considered on its merits, when there was only one year left in which the work could be done. He asked hon. Members, who were generally somewhat tender of the rights of the ratepayers, to consider the expense with which they would saddle the ratepayers of this important district if they rejected this Bill and no provision was made for disposing of the sewage. If the sewage was not disposed of, the district would come under the rule of his right hon. Friend the President of the Local Government Board, and the ratepayers would be liable to have all sorts of works executed by the Local Government Board at their expense, and moreover they would be liable to the infliction of heavy fines from the Thames Conservancy Board and other public bodies for discharging the sewage into the river; and all this time the ratepayers and their representatives would have been doing their best to carry out the wishes of Parliament. Parliament themselves had created this body to deal especially with the drainage and sewage of the district, and it would be an unheard-of thing, two years afterwards, to refuse to refer their scheme to a Select Committee. He confidently appealed to hon. Members for their votes in favour of the second reading of the Bill. It was a Bill brought forward in the interests of the ratepayers of the district; and the interests of the ratepayers, both financially and in a sanitary point of view, demanded that the scheme should at least be examined by Parliament. He begged to move the second reading of the Bill.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."—(*Mr. Gorst.*)

MR. ISAAC, in moving that the Bill be read a second time that day six months, said, he felt the very great responsibility which he had taken on his shoulders, and more particularly because he had to follow his hon. and learned Friend (Mr. Gorst) who sat in front of him. He was afraid he could not use the power of special pleading like his hon. and learned Friend; but he should endeavour to show to the House that he did not represent a body of disaffected and disappointed constituents of the board named by his hon. and learned Friend. He should endeavour to show that the board had opportunities for carrying out the works that were necessary under the powers already conferred upon them by Parliament, by applying to the proper tribunal—namely, the Local Government Board — instead of introducing a Bill into the House. He felt an equal regard for the value of an investigation by a Committee upstairs, as that which his hon. and learned Friend professed to have; but he thought that his hon. and learned Friend had dealt very hardly with one of the papers which had been circulated against the Bill, when he attributed interested motives to a gentleman named Pugh, and also suggested to the House, with a view of damaging the case of one of the opponents, that he might be the proprietor of the Sandown Racecourse. His hon. and learned Friend was perfectly aware that, at the present moment, the racecourses in the neighbourhood of the Metropolis were regarded as very objectionable, and probably that was the reason which induced him to make that a particular statement in his argument. He admitted that, as a general rule, it was imperative that they should studiously avoid refusing these Private Bills a second reading. There was a great deal to be said in favour of referring them to a Select Committee; but Parliament, as well as its Committees, had duties to perform, and they had privileges, also, which they must uphold; and this was one of those cases in which, in his opinion, the duties of Parliament and the Privileges of the House should be upheld on the responsibility of hon. Members. He did not intend to ground his opposition to the Bill upon the principles and ideas suggested by his hon. and learned Friend. On the contrary, he opposed it on public grounds, although he admitted that there were also private and financial grounds upon which he should oppose it. He should not go into the history of the formation of this board. There might, he had no doubt, be a necessity for some scheme or another; and he was ready to admit that the board was constituted for the purpose of carrying out a scheme agreed to by Parliament. Under the scheme, a very large area was covered, extending from Barnes to Molesey, and including an area of 30 or 40 square miles. Within the boundary there were a very large number of parishes and several incorporated bodies. Each of these bodies was capable of dealing with the sewage question by themselves; but if each had set themselves to deal with the matter, there would, no doubt, have been many bad schemes introduced which would have involved very expensive methods of carrying out a perfect sewage scheme. He was further ready to admit that it was possible that some of them had already failed in attempting to undertake the work. Having regard to this state of circumstances, it was, no doubt, found necessary to apply to the Local Government Board in order that there might be some combination. He was told that it was generally intended to have a combination of a small number of the parishes, something like six or eight in number; but eventually that number was increased to something like 22 within the Thames district. Application having been made to the Local Government Board, Colonel Cox was sent down, at the instance of the Local Government Board, to hold an inquiry at Kingston for the formation of a district. Under these circumstances, it was necessary for him to point out to the House the grounds upon which he now moved the rejection of this Bill.

There was a distinct promise and a pledge given to the occupiers as to the mode in which the sewage question was to be dealt with by the board. Colonel Cox, at the time the inquiry was held, refused to consider any question of dealing with the sewage, and confined the inquiry entirely to what places should be included in, or excluded from, the district which it was proposed to form. But Colonel Cox further stated that opportunities would be given to the ratepayers of the district to raise any question with regard to the action of the board when the question arose of dealing with the sewage. It was quite evident that Colonel Cox favoured the idea that the Local Government Board was to deal with the question not by a Bill brought directly before the House, but by a Provisional Order of the Local Government Board. He would ask whether this had been done, or whether it had been attempted?—and, answering his own question, he might say that it had not. There was a Bill introduced which went to the House of Lords, who took evidence before a Select Committee, and after reading the evidence taken before that Committee, he believed the House would be of opinion that the ground of opposition now made was a perfectly valid and fair one. The present board were represented before that Committee, and they stated, in answer to questions put to them, that they would be unable to get the money without a Provisional Order and a local public inquiry. He would ask the House if that inquiry had been held?—and, again answering his own question, he might say that it had not. No application had been made to the Local Government Board for a Provisional Order, and if the House passed the second reading of this Bill, that inquiry would never be held, and they would shut out entirely from the Committee all the views of those who were opposed to the carrying out of these expensive operations. He contended that the Bill entirely ignored public opinion, the public themselves, and, above all, the Local Government Board. He would read to the House what was said by the counsel representing the gentlemen who were promoting this scheme when they were before the Committee of the House of Lords. In answer to a question put to him, Sir Edmund Beckett said—"We cannot get the money without a Provisional Order or a local inquiry," showing quite plainly that a Provisional Order and a public inquiry were necessary in his opinion. Sir Joseph Bazalgette was called by the promoters, and gave evidence before the Committee. His evidence, from beginning to end, was an utter condemnation of any scheme involving sewage works either within or in the neighbourhood of the combined district, and in favour of the sewage being sent into the sea. Mr. H. Law, another engineer, also called by the promoters, was asked in Question 357—

> "Now, first of all, will you state upon what grounds you come to the conclusion that it would be impossible that each individual district could deal with its drainage separately?"

He said—

> "The first fact that was patent to everybody was the difficulty that was encountered by an authority when they attempted any scheme. We have ourselves brought forward two, and have had very heavy fights upon them, and we have seen that all our neighbours, in any attempts that they made, either to acquire lands in their own district or in districts outside of them, were always met with the greatest possible opposition, an opposition, in fact, that was successful; and it was not to be wondered at when it was considered that the Thames Valley, from its proximity to London, and from its character, is especially suited for residential purposes, and, therefore, for that reason alone, irrespective of any engineering reason, it was felt that it was not the right place to establish sewage works, which must be a nuisance in themselves, however carefully carried out."

Then, in the following Question, 358, he stated—"We felt that it was only by combination that the expense could be borne." That was the statement made to the House of Lords, on behalf of the promoters, by their own engineer. In Question 362 the witness was asked—

> "Do you agree with Sir Joseph Bazalgette in considering that every scheme for taking a large tract of land in the residential district of the Thames Valley is practically out of the question?"

The reply was—"I have a very strong opinion upon it." He was further asked—"A very strong opinion that it was out of the question?" The answer was—"No doubt of it." "If it was attempted it would be merely to encounter great opposition and to incur great expense?" Answer—"No doubt of it. I think the plan would be your safeguard against that." The House would see, consequently, that there were two engineers of great eminence employed by the gentlemen promoting this scheme, who gave evidence before the Committee in relation to the sewage of the district which was altogether in opposition to the plan now proposed. He would not trouble the House with any further reference to this evidence, except to mention that another engineer employed by the promoters—Mr. Grover—gave evidence to the same effect, and almost in the same words. Most of the witnesses called before the Committee stated distinctly that any scheme for taking any tract of land was out of the question, and he could not find that any one of them spoke in favour of it. Had the ideas of those gentlemen—had their suggestions been acted upon? He answered again—No, they had not. But Parliament was now applied to to give its sanction to a scheme prepared by an engineer, almost unknown, to create a sewage farm right in the midst of the Thames Valley district. He would not go into all the details; but he would simply say that after a large meeting that was held in October, 1878, all the plans that were submitted were referred for analysis. The scheme adopted was reported upon by Colonel Jones, of Wrexham—

> "It sought powers to pump the sewage of 118,000 people, amounting to, at least, 5,000,000 gallons daily, to land situate in East Molesey, and in the adjoining parish of Walton, surrounded by valuable residential property, about one mile from Hampton Court Palace, three-quarters of a mile from Claremont Park, and within 80 yards of Sandown Park Racecourse. The effluent sewage was to flow into the Thames exactly opposite to Hampton Court Palace, close to the spot selected in 1873 by the Chelsea Waterworks Company for the construction of reservoirs, the Bill for which was rejected. The ultimate population to be provided for was estimated at 300,000 persons."

The reasons given for the scheme were three—First, that the farm would be wholly in the district; secondly, that the farm was suitable, as reported upon by Colonel Jones; and, thirdly, that it would cost less than any other scheme. Now, as regarded these reasons, it appeared that two-fifths of the land would be in the district of Walton-on-Thames, and the scheme met with very much opposition from the neighbourhood, who had petitioned against the second reading. With regard to the second reason, it was land that was constantly flooded by the Mole, Ember, and the Thames, and it was always water-logged. Then as regarded the cost, which was a most important element, there was a great defect somewhere. The estimated cost was £280,000, but he was told that there were omissions and errors which would bring it up to £600,000; and the board itself admitted now that it would cost £500,000. That was an important element for the consideration of the House. Another important question was, where were they to get the money from? They asked for power under the Bill to borrow £300,000, and the scheme would cost £600,000; and when the £300,000 was expended, where were they to get the other £300,000? They would, therefore, be compelled to apply to the Local Government Board for a Provisional Order. And the Local Government Board would be placed in this position—they would be compelled to complete the works; they would have no power to make inquiry; and with a half-finished sewage farm would be obliged to come to Parliament for a Provisional Order, that should, in the first instance, be asked for. He thought these were very strong reasons why the Bill should not be read a second time, unless the promoters went first to the Local Government Board to obtain a Provisional Order, in which case the public would have some little control over it. He had very little more to say. He had been simply desirous of showing the House the effect the adoption of this plan would have upon the whole of the surrounding country. He would tell them, however, what the hon. and learned Member proposed to do. They were going to lay down large deposit tanks to contain this sewage that would hold 2,000,000 gallons. The sewage would remain in these tanks for some time, and then be run over the land in a state of decomposition. He asked the House if that was not likely to do considerable damage to the surrounding country. His own opinion was that very few people would be able to live within a mile of it. The River Thames was close by, and they had people resorting to it constantly for bathing, fishing, and boating purposes. He would only say, in conclusion, that he thought it would be most unwise to collect this sewage in the middle of a populous residential locality; and it was upon the grounds he had mentioned that he asked the House to reject the Bill, rather than to send it to a Committee upstairs, where they would put the owners of property to an enormous expense in opposing the Bill, and deprive many owners and others, materially injured by the proposed scheme, from being heard. He begged, therefore, to move that the Bill be read a second time on that day six months.

Amendment proposed, to leave out the word "now," and at the end of the Question to add the words "upon this day six months."—(*Mr Isaac.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question."

MR. GILES presumed he was not singular in having been flooded with solicitations on both sides, both for and against this measure. The principal ground on which he was asked to vote in favour of a second reading was that it would be very hard upon the promoters to throw the Bill out without having investigated its merits. Now, he wished to say, in answer to that statement, that it was equally hard for an opponent to have to waste his time and money in opposing a Bill in Committee when the demerits of the scheme were such as to make it palpable to everyone that the Bill would never pass through Committee. He had looked at this question from an engineering point of view, and he could not help feeling that, in the first place, the sewage on the North side of the Thames had no business to be brought to the South side of the Thames, so as to become a nuisance there. He would also say that the plans showed that the ground proposed to be formed into a sewage farm was within a very few feet of the level of the Thames—he believed it was only 3 or 4 feet above the flood level—and a great part of the land was occasionally flooded by the overflow of the river Mole. He had himself seen the land proposed to be made into a sewage farm frequently flooded; and he would ask what would be the state of this sewage farm under these circumstances? His own opinion was that the objections to the Bill were of such a character that it would be impossible to carry it through Committee; and therefore he was anxious to save the opponents of the Bill the expense that would be incurred in taking their opposition to it upstairs. He must also add that he had seen the Parliamentary plans; and when he asked how the floods were to be got rid of, he was told that it was proposed to widen and enlarge the channels of the Mole and Ember. He believed, however, that no power was taken in the Bill to carry out such works. It was therefore an incomplete scheme; and, under such circumstances, it would be better to stop it where it was, and thus save the opponents the expense of carrying their opposition further. For these reasons, he should vote for the rejection of the Bill.

SIR ANDREW LUSK said, he hoped and trusted that the House would not refuse to read the Bill a second time, and send it to a Select Committee. He was not at all prejudiced in the matter. but he had a strong direct interest in the Bill, as all hon. Members had who lived in the West End of London. He thought their principal object should be to get rid of the sewage of the district in some satisfactory way, so as to prevent it hereafter from being passed into the Thames. In the present case, they had before them as promoters of the Bill a body of gentlemen who were trying to do all they could to fulfil the obligations imposed upon them by Parliament and the Board of Conservancy of which he was a member. He had been a member of that Conservancy for some years, and the board had been very much found fault with for not compelling gentlemen who lived on the borders of the Thames to do something to get rid of the sewage without discharging it into the river. The Board of Conservators had the power, and they were going to exercise it, of compelling the owners of property to dispose of this sewage; and if their injunctions were not complied with, they intended to impose all the fines they could upon those who did not get rid of the nuisance, for it was a frightful nuisance indeed that the sewage of 108,000 inhabitants should be passed into the Thames, and the water delivered into the houses at the West End of London to be used for domestic purposes. It was a horrible idea, and therefore he hoped the House would assist the promoters of the Bill in doing all in their power to meet the difficulties of the case. All the House was asked to do now was to send the Bill introduced at the instance of the Sewerage Board to a Committee upstirs. The board were doing the best they could to remedy the evils that were complained of. Hon. Members were taking a very extraordinary course indeed when they told them that they would not even read this Bill a second time and allow it to go into Committee. It was all very well for Northampton and Southampton to throw cold water upon the Bill, but those who lived in London and knew more about it were anxious that some remedy should be found. Some day, when they had a dry summer, they would find it a very serious matter if they continued to compel the discharge of the sewage into the river. He appealed to the House to look at the question from a practical point of view, and to allow the Bill to go upstairs. He should vote for the second reading, and he trusted the House would not reject so important a measure until it had undergone full inquiry before a proper tribunal.

Sir WALTER B. BARTTELOT said, he should not detain the House for more than a few minutes; but he thought the House ought to recollect that they had had a Bill before them, not precisely similar but somewhat similar, a year or two ago—namely, the Birmingham Bill. The House threw out that Bill, and one ground upon which they did so was that they did not wish to delegate powers of compulsory purchase until those powers of compulsory purchase had been better considered than they had been up to the present time. What he objected to in this Bill was not that there should be a remedy found for the evils that were complained of, because he admitted that the want of some proper plan for disposing of the sewage was a crying evil throughout the country; but he thought that the Government ought to take the responsibility of laying down in what way this great and difficult question was to be dealt with. If they passed this Bill, and allowed it to go to a Committee, they would place in the hands of 33 gentlemen, composing the Sewerage Board, the absolute powers of compulsory purchase, and they would prevent all those who might be interested in the district, except those who owned the land proposed to be taken, from having a *locus standi* before the Committee. They would have no *locus standi* whatever, and that was his great objection to the Bill. He thought it would be an unfortunate thing if they were to sanction, by a second reading of this Bill, the principle that compulsory powers should be conferred in this loose sort of way. The whole question was one that deserved serious consideration, and he was of opinion that his right hon. Friend the President of the Local Government Board was bound to tell the House the views of the Board and also of the Government upon it. Not only must his right hon. Friend have considered the matter, but he was quite sure the right hon. Gentleman was one of those who was not going to allow a body of this kind—who might, under a Provisional Order, have appeared before the Local Government Board, when all parties might have been heard — to have absolute powers of compulsory purchase by this Bill intrusted to them. It was because he believed it would be a fatal mistake to give such powers as those proposed to be conferred upon the Board by the Bill that he, for one, must vote against the second reading.

Mr. SHAW LEFEVRE remarked that the hon. and gallant Gentleman who had just addressed the House referred to the Birmingham Bill. Now, he (Mr. Shaw Lefevre) did not think that that was a precedent the House would like to follow. No case of a Private Bill being thrown out had given rise to so much discussion out-of-doors. He was able to describe another precedent, and one which he ventured to predict would be followed by the House in the present instance. He referred to the case of the town he had the honour to represent. Some few years ago the borough of Reading was in exactly the condition in which this sewer board now found itself. It was compelled to withdraw its sewage from the River Thames by Act of Parliament; and it was obliged, in consequence, to come to that House with a scheme authorizing the compulsory purchase of a farm in the adjoining district. Although that scheme was opposed violently before the Committee, the Committee gave the compulsory powers of purchase asked for, and they were similar powers to those now asked for by the present Bill. He knew nothing about the details of this Bill, nor whether it was a good measure or not; but he imagined the question now for consideration to be, whether such a measure should be allowed to go before a Select Committee. As the promoters of the Bill were a public body trying to perform a public duty, and as they had been compelled by Act of Parliament to withdraw the sewage from being discharged into the River Thames, he believed that they would be put to the greatest inconvenience and trouble and be subjected to heavy penalties under the provisions of the Act of Parliament, if they were not allowed the privilege of having, at any rate, their scheme inquired into. Under these circumstances, he ventured to hope that the House would at all events allow the Bill to be read a second time, with the view of referring it to a Select Committee.

MR. SCLATER-BOOTH said, he did not feel called upon to answer the appeal which had been made to him by his hon. and gallant Friend the Member for West Sussex (Sir Walter B. Barttelot) to state the views of the Government upon this question, and particularly in regard to the scheme which had now been brought to the attention of the House. The difficulty of disposing of the sewage of the Metropolis without allowing it to fall into the River Thames was very serious and great indeed, and it had long been an object to get the local authorities to combine themselves in one district in order that they might act together in the matter. After considerable negotiation, in which the Department he had the honour to represent took an active part, the present board had been formed, and any proposal, representing after a very recent election so large a number of the ratepayers of districts adjacent to the Metropolis, was entitled to very careful consideration. The question was, whether the House would take upon itself on mere *ex parte* statements to put a stop to the measure, which was a *bonâ fide* attempt to perform the obligations cast upon the promoters by Parliament. The matter was one which deserved very serious consideration. He wished to avoid expressing any opinion upon the details of this Bill. His hon. and gallant Friend the Member for West Sussex (Sir Walter B. Barttelot) said that a body like this ought not to be allowed to become, by compulsory purchase, the owners of a large sewer farm; but Parliament had the whole matter in its own hands. The promoters had not come to the Local Government Board for a Provisional Order for reasons that were well known, and that had already been stated, and with which he did not quarrel. They preferred to come to Parliament for a Private Bill; and the question was, whether the House would, on the second reading of their Bill, take upon themselves the responsibility of stopping what they had every reason to believe a *bonâ fide* attempt of this recently elected body to carry out the provisions of an Act of Parliament? If they rejected the second reading of the Bill, the House would take a grave responsibility upon itself. It would be quite competent for the House, after the Bill had passed the Select Committee, to say, if they found on examination that the power would seriously interfere with private rights, that the Bill should not be permitted to pass into law. That would be a very different question from stopping it before it went into Select Committee. His own opinion was that, *primâ facie*, there were sufficient grounds to justify the House in permitting the matter to be sifted in Committee. He had no wish to state any views on the part of the Government; but, as representing the Local Government Board, who had been much concerned in the constitution of this district, and had assisted in its creation under the powers of the Public Health Act, for his own part, he should feel it his duty to vote for the second reading of the Bill.

MR. HERSCHELL said, it seemed to him that this was a question involving an extremely important principle which, from some circumstances that had occurred of late, had been very much forced upon his attention, and to which the hon. and gallant Baronet who had spoken a few moments ago (Sir Walter B. Barttelot) had alluded. Under this Bill, if it were to pass into an Act and become law, there was no doubt that private rights must be most seriously prejudiced, and that that which before the passing of the Act would be a nuisance, and which would give the right to compensation, would be, after the passing of the Act, a right against which no complaint could be made, on the ground that the Legislature had thought fit to subject the aggrieved parties to it, and had ignored their right to compensation. It would be said that the proper course to have taken in the matter was to have appealed to the Legislature not to have passed the Act, and that it would be useless, after the Act was passed, to appeal to the law against the Legislature which had passed it. Now, if those persons whose rights would be affected, and whose property would be damaged if this Bill passed into law, could be heard to state their case before the Committee to whom the Bill was referred, if they had any *locus standi* to be heard against the Bill, no doubt a great deal might be said in favour of sending the Bill to a Committee; but as they all knew, the law as to *locus standi* had been so laid down and limited, that persons most vitally and deeply interested in the question whether or no a Bill should be passed into law, perhaps much more interested than the only people who had a *locus standi* to oppose it, were not permitted to appear in opposition to it. The result was that they shut the mouths of the only people who were really interested in the measure, because they had no *locus standi* to oppose it. Those who had a *locus standi* to oppose it might find no reason for fighting the promoters of the Bill. What was the result of such a state of things? The promoters, of course, laid their statement before the Committee, and produced evidence in favour of their scheme; those who had a *locus standi* had no great interest in opposing that which the promoters were doing; the Committee had no means of sifting the scheme, and so they passed it; the result being that they created a plan which might diminish by 50 per cent the value of the whole of the property of the district. Yet that Act passed into law, and having passed into law, the private property of individuals was taken away from them without one penny of compensation, and they were unable in a Court of Law to question the legality of the Act. That was a very serious and unsatisfactory state of things; and if they were to be told that those who had really the most vital interest in the measure were not to be heard, but that the question was to go before the Committee in the absence of those who were really interested, and who were not to be allowed to say—"You must not pass legislation of this kind that will affect my property without my being heard against it," the question came, what was the proper time for objecting to the Bill? When the matter came to be inquired into before a Committee, according to the regulations of the House, the *locus standi* Committee decided that those who had no *locus standi* were not to be heard. So far as he could see, the only opportunity afforded in this case to the opponents for opposing a Private Bill was upon the second reading. The question was one which had been brought under his attention in one or two cases recently wholly unconnected with the present Bill, and he alluded to it because he considered it an important matter of public interest. He had been interested in one or two cases where an individual's property was vitally and prejudicially affected. Under ordinary circumstances, the Legislature would not allow this to be done without granting compensation to the person who sustained an injury; but, in these particular cases, the aggrieved persons had no power to go before a Committee in order to insure any alteration in the Bill, or to claim compensation for the injury they sustained. If the persons so situated could show that, having regard to the position of their land and the position of this proposed sewerage farm, and also of the position of their neighbours' property, they were likely to be prejudiced by the plan submitted to Parliament without the possibility of obtaining compensation, he thought that would be a great case against the second reading of the Bill, and the only way in which their case could be laid before the House at all. It was said that the Bill would prevent the Thames from being polluted, and that it would save the inhabitants of London from annoyance; but it was not stated in the scheme where the measure did anything of the kind, and it was doubtful whether it would not seriously affect the sources from which the Chelsea Water Company got their supply of water. That might not be a matter in which the hon. Baronet the Member for Finsbury (Sir Andrew Lusk) took much interest, as he lived in another locality; but it was one in which he (Mr. Herschell) took a very serious interest, and which afforded to him a measure of serious consideration. He thought it was a matter of great importance, if this allegation were true, that the Water Company itself should have a *locus standi*. If the persons affected by this Bill were not to be heard on the second reading, how were their rights to be protected? It was a very important question whether or not the owners of property situate around the proposed sewerage farm should have a *locus standi* before the Select Committee; and he submitted to the House that there ought to be very grave reasons given in support of the scheme, showing that it was the only practicable one, before they sanctioned such an injury to private property. Under all the circumstances, he should vote against the second reading of the Bill.

MR. RAIKES remarked that, as the House had already heard, this was a very singular and exceptional case, and one which was exceedingly likely to become a precedent of no small importance in dealing with similar matters hereafter. He had no doubt the House would allow him its indulgence for a minute or two while he endeavoured to point out one or two points in the matter, although he would be saved from inflicting upon them some of the matters involved, as they had already been referred to by other speakers, and especially by the hon. and learned Gentleman the Member for Durham (Mr. Herschell). He thought the House understood that the Bill was promoted by a public body appointed for a public purpose, that that body was a representative body, and that they had come into existence in consequence of an Act of Parliament passed in the year 1877. Those facts formed a reason why the House should regard with great consideration and respect a Bill emanating from such a source, especially when they were reminded, as they had been by the worthy Alderman the hon. Member for Finsbury (Sir Andrew Lusk), that the great question of public health was involved, although he (Mr. Raikes) did not quite agree in the views of the hon. Baronet on the matter. In dealing with the sewage of this very large district, he had no doubt the House was particularly anxious to come to a right decision with regard to the scheme which ought to be adopted. He did not think as a rule that the House was a most convenient place for discussing the merits of Private Bills. It was almost always better, as they knew, that the merits of Private Bills should be sifted by the ordinary tribunal of the House, where the parties could be heard much more in detail than was the case in the House itself, and where plans would be submitted to the Committee, by which they would be greatly assisted in arriving at a just conclusion. There were, however, a very few cases, and he did not wish to include amongst them the case to which already reference had been made—namely, the Birmingham Sewage Bill, which was introduced a few years ago—there were a very few cases in which the House would only do right to exercise a veto of its own before a Bill went to a Committee upstairs. He did not wish the action of the House in such a case as that of the Birmingham Sewage Bill to be passed into a precedent. With regard to the present Bill, there were special circumstances which had not occurred before, and might not occur again. There was also one very important circumstance that was sure to occur again; and as this was perhaps the first occasion on which it had come before them in any important shape, he desired to call the attention of the House to it. He referred to the public question in relation to the compulsory acquisition of a very large tract of land amounting, in this case, to 600 or 700 acres for the purposes of a sewage farm. There could be no doubt that when they came to deal with so large an area of land they were raising an important question with regard to public health, and it specially behoved the House to have an opinion of its own upon that point, that should, as far as possible, guide those who came afterwards as to the caution and care with which matters of this description should be considered. In regard to this particular Bill, as had been very well pointed out by the hon. and learned Member for Durham (Mr. Herschell), and also by his hon. and gallant Friend the Member for West Sussex (Sir Walter B. Barttelot), and by other speakers, there were very peculiar and exceptional circumstances, and they had those considerations which generally induced the House to send a Bill to a Committee existing in a much smaller degree—if, indeed, they existed at all—than was generally the case. The main reason for sending a Bill upstairs to be inquired into by a Select Committee was that the parties concerned might be heard and plans be submitted that would assist the judgment of the Committee; but, in this case, the parties most interested could not be heard—there was no opportunity for the inhabitants of the district affected to appear before the Committee. Persons interested in Sandown Park and other portions of the district were ratepayers, and consequently constituents of the promoters; although they were, in point of fact, only indirect constituents, because the drainage board was not elected by the ratepayers, but by the different corporations and local authorities, who, in their turn, were elected by the ratepayers. The ratepayers had, therefore, no opportunity of saying "aye" or "no" to the policy of the board, because the board was the indirect result, though not the direct outcome, of popular election. So far as the present plan was concerned, the Standing Orders of the House required that, in any Drainage Bill where there was a cut to be made exceeding 11 feet in width, plans should be deposited. He presumed that the promoters of this Bill did not propose to make a cut of that width, because no such plans were at present accessible to the House or to the opponents, and there was no certainty that such plans would be submitted. In point of fact, the opponents of the Bill were fighting the Bill entirely in the dark. They were quite unaware of the particular form which the distribution of sewage over this area was to take, and whether 700 acres of filth were to be thrown over the whole area, or whether it was only the centre of that property to which it was to be applied, nor did they know whether the river was to be polluted, or whether some new process was to be adopted to purify and cleanse the river. All they knew was that a great tract of land, in the very garden of Surrey, was to be devoted to this purpose, and that two rivers in the most interesting and picturesque part of the district were to be seriously affected. Under these circumstances, he thought the opponents of the Bill were justified in coming to the House to oppose the second reading. He was certainly of opinion that these were circumstances on which the House was as well able to form a judgment as any Committee. There was, however, above all, one point to which he wished to call the attention of the House. The drainage board of the district consisted of 32 or 33 members appointed under the Provisional Order Act of 1877, and it was brought into existence mainly as the result of an understanding come to with the inhabitants, that they were, if practicable or possible, to carry this sewage outside the district. The main allegation put forward in support of the creation of the board in the first instance was that it would be able to represent a very large district, and thus secure the necessary funds for enabling them to carry out the works that would be necessary for carrying the sewage to a distance, and constructing the works that would be necessary to dispose of it. He was quite certain that all the gentlemen who were connected with the board were acting solely from a sense of public duty, and that they had adopted what they believed to be the best plan. But it must not be forgotten that the board had submitted to their judgment no less than 25 plans, and out of that number they had selected the present one; and it so happened that the scheme they had selected was the only one which it was necessary they should bring to Parliament, because it touched certain rights that could not be reached by a Provisional Order. If they had adopted any of the other 24 plans submitted to them, they would have been in the position of carrying it out, as Parliament intended they should do, by going to the Local Government Board for a local inquiry, in which case they would have obtained the assistance of one of those Inspectors of the Local Government Board, who were so well qualified to pronounce an opinion on this question by their experience and knowledge. He would have been sent down by the Local Government Board to hold an inquiry in the district which would be affected by the scheme, and before that inquiry every one of the ratepayers and residents would have had a *locus standi.* The House was now asked to carry the second reading of a Bill in order to shut out these persons, and to use the Forms of the House as a means of closing their mouths in opposition to the Bill. In point of fact, they were asked to use the Forms of Parliament in order to do that which it was the policy of Parliament to prevent. He had been somewhat amused at the speech of his hon. Friend the Member for Reading (Mr. Shaw Lefevre), who appeared there on this occasion as one of the champions of the measure. Now, he should like to know if it had been proposed by the promoters of this scheme to take some obscure common—a corner of some out-of-the-way waste, where some half-a-dozen tipsy gipseys held a pic-nic two or three times a year—whether his hon. Friend would not have used all the Forms of the House to oppose it? The present Bill proposed to destroy an immense amount of valuable property, to diminish the ease and comfort of a large portion of Her Majesty's subjects, and his hon. Friend appeared in his place to give them excellent constitutional advice as to the propriety of not rejecting the Bill. He (Mr. Raikes) trusted that he might be permitted to quote the authority of his hon. Friend on some subsequent occasion when he might have to meet him again. He thought he had now shown the House that there were special reasons why they should depart from their usual practice of reading a Private Bill a second time. He did not know in his experience, since he had held the Office of Chairman of Ways and Means, any case that had arisen which appeared to him to deserve more the decisive judgment of the House than the present. The House was in possession of every information to enable it to decide upon the principle which the Bill involved; and, for his own part, if the Bill went to a Division, he should feel it his duty to vote against the second reading.

MR. CHILDERS hoped that, after a rather warmer speech from the Chairman of Committees than they were accustomed to hear on a Private Bill, the House would allow him to say one or two words on the case as it had been laid before them. Parliament would, of course, do what was just. They were told that this Bill, of the merits of which he knew nothing, would affect the interests of a very large number of persons, and yet, if the Bill went to a Committee, it had been ruled, according to the Chairman of Committees, as to *locus standi*, that those whose property was affected could not properly come before them. He was not prepared to admit that the House had not provided for cases of this kind; and, therefore, he would suggest to the House that the Bill should be referred, after it had been read a second time, to a Hybrid Committee. If it were referred to a Hybrid Committee consisting of a certain number of Members selected by the House, and the remainder by the Committee of Selection, all those who were affected by the Bill and petitioned against it could be heard. The whole of the objections which had been raised by his hon. and learned Friend behind him (Mr. Herschell), and by the Chairman of Committees, could be laid, with the arguments of the promoters, in a proper way before the Committee, and justice would be done. He would therefore ask the House to pass the second reading of the Bill, and when it was so passed, to send it to a Hybrid Committee.

LORD GEORGE HAMILTON said, it was with great reluctance that he took part in the debate, because he knew the House had a just and natural prejudice against *ex parte* statements made by individual Members on behalf of their constituents. But this case was of such an exceptional nature that he trusted the House would allow him to say half-a-dozen words. He appreciated the spirit of the objection which had been raised by the Chairman of Committees, and if it was true, as he stated, that those whose property would be affected would have no *locus standi* before an ordinary Committee, it seemed to him that the whole objection would be met by the House reading the Bill a second time, and then accepting the proposal of the hon. Member for East Surrey (Mr. Watney), and appointing a Committee of 11 Members, six to be appointed by the House and five by the Committee of Selection. Such a proceeding, as he understood it, superseded all ordinary rules of *locus standi*, and would give those who were in opposition to the Bill a *locus standi*. If that was the principal objection of his hon. Friend the Chairman of Committees, he hoped the course he suggested would remove it. The House would allow him to point out what injury would be done if this Bill were rejected on the second reading, and were not allowed to go before a Select Committee. The whole time he had had the honour of being a Member for Middlesex the question of sewage had been one of great difficulty. The reason was entirely through an Act of Parliament passed many years ago, which prohibited all local authorities on the Thames between Staines and London from allowing their sewage to pass into the River Thames as hitherto. The House would at once see the difficulty in which every local authority in Middlesex was placed. The sewage must be got rid of, and the only outlet of sewage in the Thames Valley was the Thames. The local authorities, therefore, were in this difficulty—they were either liable to have an injunction served upon them to dispose of their sewage, or to a heavy penalty if they did not otherwise dispose of it. That difficulty went on year after year; and at last, in order to meet the special difficulty created by that Act of Parliament, the local authorities came to an agreement, after some consultation, and a special Act was passed, by which all the local authorities in the Valley, excepting two, combined together to meet the direct result of the Act. They met together, and formed a board, and they obtained an enormous amount of evidence; they had evidence from engineers, surveyors, sanitarians and others, and this board, which was the direct offspring of an Act of Parliament, had now deliberately selected one out of 23 schemes as that most likely to meet the requirements of the case. Now, he wished to ask the House, was it an encouragement to this board, which was the direct result of the legislation of this House, if, after a long and deliberate inquiry had been made by the board, this House ignominiously rejected the proposal which, in their judgment, was the best qualified to effect the desired object? He quite agreed that they ought to do nothing which would affect unfairly the rights of property, and he quite admitted it must be very unpleasant to those gentlemen who resided on the other side of the Thames, who might be in proximity to the sewage farm; but it seemed to him that on that account it was all the more necessary that this measure should be referred to some tribunal which would have the power, if necessary, and would have the opportunity of hearing all those statements *pro* and *con*.

Mr. WATNEY wished to say one or two words before the House divided. Two or three of the speakers had treated the matter as though the promoters of the Bill were bringing the sewage into the district. That was not so; the sewage was there; the sewage was now in the district, and was finding its way into the Thames. The great difficulty was how to deal with it; and he contended that it could not be better met than by the proposition now before the House. At Croydon there was a large sewage farm, which had been in existence some years, and was going on satisfactorily. At any rate, if the House would not adopt this plan, the only way was for the sewage to find its way into the Metropolitan sewage, and so go down to the Thames. That was almost impossible, and he hoped the House would agree to the second reading of the Bill, and allow it to go before a Committee, before whom everyone could have a hearing.

Mr. Serjeant SPINKS said, he could quite understand that his noble Friend the Member for Middlesex (Lord George Hamilton), acting for his constituents, highly approved of the course of bringing Middlesex drainage into Surrey. The Surrey people, of course, were not so much pleased at that state of things. But when the noble Lord referred to those 33 gentlemen who had looked at all those schemes, and had come to such an excellent conclusion, he would remind the House that they were not to be led away, and to suppose that those 33 gentlemen were unanimous. He thought he heard his hon. and learned Friend the Member for Chatham (Mr. Gorst) state that there was a minority of 12 on that board, and a majority of 15; and there was this remarkable fact—that there being 33 members on the board, there were only 27 who voted, and the 15 who carried the scheme were absolutely not a majority of the board appointed for this important purpose. Therefore the House was asked to sanction this important scheme, when at the beginning they had notice that there were 12 men on the board who were opposed to it. What hope could the board have that they would bring any such scheme as that to a proper conclusion? Then the House were told they were to refer this Bill to a Hybrid Committee, and that would give all the public who had objections a *locus standi*. He pitied the Hybrid Committee, if it should be appointed under those circumstances. There were hundreds, if not thousands, of people who were interested in this matter, and there was only one bar to their all appearing before the Hybrid Committee. He was sure their feelings would take them there, but for the misfortune which happened to so many people—that their pockets were not sufficient.

And they were to have, instead of the proposal that they now made—namely, that the House should decide the question—they were to have this herring of a Hybrid Committee trailed across the path, just when they they were about to come to a conclusion. And for what? What real question was there to be decided by the Committee? The House had the facts put before them. They had the fact that the sewage brought from a vast distance—the sewage of 118,000 people—was to be brought in a quiet and retired village, where people went for purposes of health, retirement, and comfort. All their comfort and the amenity of the place, would be entirely destroyed. The House had nothing more than that to decide upon; and what would be the result? There were cases before Committees where clauses might be introduced for the protection of one or two landowners and householders; but could clauses be introduced in this Bill for the protection of the hundreds of landowners and householders in this neighbourhood? And, therefore, it would be putting undue labour and trouble upon the Committee, and be, in fact, entirely and utterly unsatisfactory, because the people for whom they were appointing the Hybrid Committee would not be able to come there for want of funds. He did not propose to go further into the matter. All he would say was this—that he would beg the House to reject this Bill, which, if passed into law, would endanger the health and ruin the property of an indignant population.

Question put.

The House *divided*:—Ayes 146; Noes 168: Majority 22.—(Div. List, No. 38.)

Words *added.*

Main Question, as amended, put, and *agreed to.*

Second Reading *put off* for six months.

QUESTIONS.

CRIMINAL LAW—CASE OF SETH EVANS.—QUESTION.

MR. HOPWOOD asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether he has considered the facts of the trial and conviction of Seth Evans at the Salford Sessions last year; the circumstances which came to light after that trial; the two subsequent trials of the prosecutrix Alice Adams for perjury, with the result on each occasion that the jury could not agree in a verdict; and, whether he will feel it right under all the circumstances to advise that the mercy of the Crown be extended to the prisoner Evans?

MR. ASSHETON CROSS, in reply, said, this was, no doubt, a peculiar case; but he did not think it would be wise at the present time to express an opinion. He had been in communication with the learned Judge who tried the girl for perjury; but until he had received his Report he could take no steps in the matter.

CRIMINAL LAW—CASE OF THEODORIDI.—QUESTION.

MR. P. A. TAYLOR asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether it is true that a Greek named Theodoridi, who was sentenced to seven years' penal servitude on September 27th, 1877, for obtaining money from a lady by threats, is now at liberty; if so, whether he was released at the request of the Turkish Government, and on what grounds?

MR. BOURKE: No application has been made by the Turkish Government to the Foreign Office with respect to the person named. He has been dealt with, so far as I am aware, in the ordinary course by the authorities having the supervision of the execution of the criminal law in this country.

INSPECTORS OF MINES REPORTS, 1878.

QUESTION.

MR. MACDONALD asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, When the Inspectors of Mines Reports for the year 1878 will be printed, if not now so, and distributed to Members?

MR. ASSHETON CROSS, in reply, said, for the sixth time he would inform the hon. Member that the day appointed for sending in the Reports was the 31st of March. They had then to be printed; and the printing had to be revised before they were issued. It would, therefore, be some time before the Reports could be in the hands of hon. Members.

REGISTRARS OF COUNTY COURTS (IRELAND).—QUESTIONS.

MR. MELDON: I beg to ask Mr. Attorney General for Ireland, Whether it is true that serious inconvenience has been caused to suitors and others by reason of the temporary manner in which the registrars of the County Courts in Ireland have been appointed; whether the Government have considered the desirability of making definite arrangements with such registrars; and, what steps have been taken, or are about to be taken, to secure the services of properly qualified registrars on such terms and conditions as will enable the County Court Judges in Ireland practically to exercise their extended jurisdiction, and to give effect to the provisions of "The County Officers and Courts (Ireland) Act, 1878?" I beg also to add a Question which I think right should be put—What is the nature of the temporary arrangement which at present exists under which the registrars are paid?

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. GIBSON): I am not aware that there has been any serious inconvenience caused to suitors or others by the manner in which the County Court registrars have been appointed. The present registrars are, I believe, well qualified gentlemen, and are selected and appointed by the County Court Judges themselves, and approved by the Lord Chancellor. In addition, those Judges can avail themselves of the services of the Clerks of the Peace at all seasons of the year, and those officers are available to take accounts and prosecute inquiries when directed. The remuneration of the registrars is arranged by the Treasury, with the approval of the Lord Chancellor of Ireland, and the present system of payment was, I believe, not intended to be permanent. At the close of the present financial year it will be considered whether any and what change shall be made therein. With regard to this last question, I have to say that the present scale of payment of the registrars of Irish County Courts is two guineas a-day for every day the Court sits, and an allowance of a guinea a-day for hotel expenses.

NATIONAL TEACHERS (IRELAND).

QUESTION.

MR. MELDON asked the Chief Secretary for Ireland, When the Bill by which he proposes to deal with the claims of the National Teachers of Ireland will be introduced; and, if he can state whether the subject of the salaries of the teachers will be dealt with by such Bill?

MR. J. LOWTHER: The actuarial Report dealing with the question of the pensions of school teachers—the preparation of which, I may remark, proved a very lengthy and laborious task—has only recently been furnished to the Treasury, and, in fact, it was only to-day that a copy of that document reached me. As it will require careful consideration, it will not be possible to introduce a Bill upon the subject immediately; but I hope to be in a position to do so soon after Easter. I may add that it is intended, at the same time, to deal with the question of salaries.

INDIA—DISTURBANCES IN BURMAH.

EXPLANATION.

MR. E. STANHOPE: With reference to a Question answered yesterday by my right hon. Friend the Chancellor of the Exchequer, I have to say that, for my part, I had been in the House for the greater part of the day, and while here I had not received any information on the subject of the Question. The House is aware that certain disturbances have taken place in Burmah. We received yesterday afternoon a telegram from the Viceroy of India, to the effect that he thought it desirable to despatch three regiments—two Native and one British—to British Burmah, to reinforce the troops there.

POOR LAW AMENDMENT ACT (1876) AMENDMENT BILL.—QUESTION.

In reply to Sir CHARLES W. DILKE,

MR. SCLATER-BOOTH said, he had withdrawn from the Paper his Amendments to the Poor Law Amendment Act (1876) Amendment Bill, in consequence of the hon. Member for Ashton's (Mr. Mellor's) statement, that he wished them to be postponed for a fortnight, in order that the Friendly Societies might have an opportunity of considering them. Whether he would again put them on the Paper or not he could not at present say.

ORDERS OF THE DAY.

SUPPLY.—COMMITTEE.

Order for Committee read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair."

ELECTORAL DISABILITIES OF WOMEN.—RESOLUTION.

MR. COURTNEY rose to call attention to the electoral disabilities of women; and to move—

> "That, in the opinion of this House, it is injurious to the best interests of the Country that women who are entitled to vote in municipal, parochial, and school board elections, when possessed of the statutory qualifications, should be disabled from voting in Parliamentary elections, although possessed of the statutory qualifications; and that it is expedient that this disability should be forthwith repealed."

The hon. Member stated that he wished to present a Petition on behalf of the object of the Motion, signed by Professors at the University of Cambridge and others.

MR. SPEAKER said, the usual time for the presentation of Petitions had expired, it being past 5 o'clock. If the hon. Member's Resolution were brought forward as a substantive Motion, it might be accompanied by the presentation of Petitions; but, inasmuch as the Resolution which the hon. Member was about to propose was brought forward as an Amendment to the Motion that the Speaker do leave the Chair, the Petition could not be presented, but the hon. Member could refer in his speech to the substance of it.

MR. COURTNEY then proceeded to address the House in support of his Motion. He said: I regret that an accident should have prevented my presenting the Petition in due form, but I had put my name down on the Paper, and the prolongation of Private Business carried us over 5 o'clock. Sir, before addressing myself to the substance of the Resolution which I wish to propose as an Amendment to the Motion that you leave the Chair, there are one or two preliminary observations which I wish to be allowed to make to the House. In the first place, it may be asked of me why, having proceeded before by way of a Bill, I now propose to take the sense of the House on the same question by way of a Resolution. I think the reason for that is tolerably plain. Apart from the advantage which is always secured by a little change in the mode of procedure, I confess that I look upon the proceedings on a Wednesday afternoon as very frequently rather discouraging. Some five hours are nominally passed in debate; but only one hour can be said to have any life in it, and the other four hours are a period of semi-animate existence. There are hon. Members, whose courage I have often admired, who are capable of addressing a House consisting of yourself, Mr. Speaker, and two other hon. Members, with the same enthusiasm as if they were addressing a crowded and excited Assembly; but I confess that for myself I am unable to do justice, as I should like to do justice, to a subject which I have very much at heart, if I have not some auditors to whom I can address myself with the hope that my words may have effect. Again, by bringing forward the question at this hour, I gain this advantage—that instead of having to address the Government through the medium of an Under Secretary, in the absence of the right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the House, I have now the pleasure and advantage of securing the presence of the Chancellor of the Exchequer; and I think that alone a sufficient justification for the change I have made. Moreover, it has happened that the right hon. Gentleman in former years has been good enough to support the proposition which I make to-night, and, as he is present now, I think I may hope that he will repeat the conduct which he has adopted on other occasions. I may also say, Sir, with regard to this change of method in bringing forward the question, that there is no change whatever of substance or even of definition. I believe it has occasionally happened that after a Member has been in charge of a Bill which has gone on for some years without apparently any greater prospect of success, he has dropped his Bill and has put upon the Table of the House a Resolution embodying the principle of the Bill, but embodying it in a somewhat vague fashion; and in doing this he hopes to secure, and, perhaps, does secure, supporters for his Resolution from amongst those who declined to support his Bill. Hon. Gentlemen who are desirous of giving a friendly assistance to any particular Motion are thus enabled to do so under cover of a vague statement, when they had previously refused to support a specific proposal for an alteration of the law. Now, in the present instance, no such change is at all suggested, for the Resolution before the House is as distinct in its demands as the Bill itself, and possibly even more distinct. Some doubts were expressed as to the proper construction of the Bill when it was brought before the House; but I think no doubt whatever can be entertained as to the meaning of the Resolution. It refers to the way in which the suffrage has been conferred upon female residents in towns and municipal districts, school board districts, and parochial unions; and it asks the House to affirm that, inasmuch as the franchise has been granted in these local elections, it should, on the same principles, and subject to the same conditions, be granted at Parliamentary Elections. It is those persons only whom I desire, at present, at all events, to have a part in Parliamentary Elections, who are already enfranchised in respect to local elections. [Mr. BERESFORD HOPE: Hear, hear!] The hon. Member for Cambridge University gives me a cheer for that, and seems to indicate that hereafter I shall be found advocating the claims of married women to the franchise. I beg to say that is an object to which I do not see my way now, and to which I do not see any probability of my seeing my way hereafter. I shall, therefore, confine my observations to spinsters and widows who are at present entitled to vote at local elections. There is one other preliminary remark I wish to make. The Resolution states that the exclusion of women from the franchise is injurious to the best interests of the country, and that it is expedient that this disability should be forthwith repealed. I believe that statement is perfectly well founded; I believe it to be perfectly true that the best interests of the country are involved in this question; but I would say that I should not have used that phrase but for one consideration. That expression, which I believe to be well warranted, is quoted from the present Prime Minister, and I hope that authority will at least have some weight with hon. Gentlemen opposite. The present Prime Minister, in a letter dated in April, 1873, addressed to the late Mr. Gore Langton, expressed his opinion upon the anomaly of the exclusion from the Parliamentary franchise of women who were admitted to the municipal franchise, and stated that he believed it to be "injurious to the best interests of the country," and he trusted to see it removed by the wisdom of Parliament. Now, Sir, having that authority of the Prime Minister, I have ventured to incorporate the phrase in the proposition before the House. I confess I have borrowed it from that high authority, and in making this reference to the original from which I have borrowed it, it is difficult, when anyone desires to recommend the extension of the franchise to women, not to touch for a moment upon the name of a distinguished lady who has lately passed from among us, the wife of the gentleman to whom that letter was addressed. I had not the honour of knowing Lady Anna Gore Langton, but from her public life, and from the testimony of a large circle of friends, I can say this, at least—that no one had more at heart the interests of her sex, and no one, under varied circumstances and in many climes, was more thoroughly devoted to the alleviation of the wrongs or grievances of women. Now, Sir, the mere form of the proposition which I submit to the House to-night raises, I think, a presumption of argument in favour of what I suggest. If Parliament has seen fit, in its wisdom, to confer the franchise upon the dwellers in towns in respect of municipal matters, and upon the dwellers in school board districts and Poor Law Union districts in respect of education and the administration of the Poor Law, there is, at least, some presumption that it ought to be conferred upon women who live in Parliamentary constituencies, if they also are possessed of a Parliamentary qualification. I will touch hereafter upon the extent of that presumption, and would now observe that the form of the proposition necessarily involves some reference to the experience of the past.

We have now tried female suffrage in many forms. We have seen how it works, we can refer to its working, and if we have found it work so as to be beneficial not only to women, but to society generally, then I think our experience furnishes the best possible argument in favour of the extension which I recommend to the House. An argument derived from *à priori* considerations may often fail from the omission of circumstances which we have neglected to observe; but arguments derived from experience are of such weight that I think the burden is very strongly thrown upon our opponents to show us why the experience which has been good in one sphere would not be good in another. Now, I have endeavoured to ascertain what has been the result of the admission of women to the franchise, and I must say that, as far as I have succeeded, it has been very good. It has been good in the limited form in which we have adopted it here; it has been good also in the more extended form in which it has been adopted in at least one territory in America; and I will, with the permission of the House, refer to the experience of that territory first. The House is probably aware that in the territory of Wyoming women's suffrage has existed for some years, and questions have been raised by persons living in the Eastern States as to the desirability of extending it in their direction. I had the pleasure last summer of hearing a lady from Massachusetts, who had been in the West, and who gave us an account of her experience. She made this statement—In Wyoming, the influence of women had been remarkable; it purified and elevated the character of a politician, at all events of those politicians who had been chosen to perform the functions of legislators in the Legislature of Wyoming. A "politician," I am afraid, in the United States, is too often a word of reproach. It is mixed up with questions of trickery, intrigue, and even corruption. Well, when Wyoming was endowed with a Legislature, and when woman's suffrage was first introduced, one of the great Parties of the State put forward a list—a "ticket," as it is called in the language of the United States—containing the names of persons recommended for election, who were eminently of the class of "politicians." When this was made known, the women of Wyoming, who took a great interest in the subject, and who were going for the first time to exercise the privilege of voting, went to the Leaders of the Party and remonstrated with them upon the character of the men whom they had chosen. The Leaders of that Party utterly neglected the appeal so addressed to them, and the women then went to the rival Party. They said they came to express their opinion of the candidates put forward on the other side, whom they regarded as persons of a very obnoxious character, as being indifferently moral, of low reputation, and not fit to be intrusted with public functions; and they proceeded to urge that the Party they were then addressing would exercise a wiser discretion. This Party did exercise a wiser discretion in the choice of their candidates, and the result was that in the State of Wyoming the control of the Legislature passed from the first Party, who had it before, and went to the second Party, who consulted, if not the tastes, certainly the morality and feelings of women, in presenting to them for their support a body of men whom they could support without shame and mortification. I thought that was a very remarkable testimony; but I have here in my hand a letter, a short extract from which I propose to read to the House, from the Speaker of the House of Assembly of Wyoming, who was writing to a gentleman who had asked for his experience of the operation of women's suffrage. The letter stated—

> "I have always expected to be called upon to say something, and perhaps the time has come when the public have a right to hear from me on the subject. I started with the strongest prejudice against women's suffrage, and was decidedly opposed to it at all points; but on its introduction I became a close observer of the practical results of this innovation upon the rights of man. I have been for three successive Sessions returned, without opposition, to the Legislature, and I have been twice Speaker of the House of Representatives, and I have had opportunities of forming a judgment upon the circumstances. I can now say that the more I have seen of the results of women's suffrage the less have my objections been realized, and the more has the thing commended itself to my judgment and good opinion; and now I frankly acknowledge, after all my distrust, that it has worked well and been productive of much good to the territory, and of no evil that I have been able to discern. Women are more interested in good government and its moral influence upon our future sons and daughters than men. They look

above and beyond mere Party questions or influences in deciding their vote."

And, then, again, Sir, he says—

> "If the ballot in the hands of women compels the contending Parties to place their best men in nomination, this in itself is a strong reason for extending women's suffrage. It has been said that woman disgraces herself by going to the poll, and thereby loses the respect and esteem of man; but I must say that amongst all the wild and reckless men in public life, I have never seen any disrespect shown to women as a whole, and that men never forget in all the excitement of elections that woman is their mother; nor, to my knowledge, has the exercising of the political rights of women led to any domestic trouble, or made any of us speak slightingly of them. In whatever concerns the household or family, women are more interested in good government than a single man is or can be; and if it is the good government which is sought by a civilized people, I see no safer manner or better way of securing that object than by putting the ballot in the hand of woman."

Now, I think that is extremely remarkable testimony. It may, no doubt, be said to come from very far away. I am afraid that many of us would be at a loss to say exactly where Wyoming was, and I should not like to ask any considerable number of hon. Members to put their fingers upon it in a map; within 1,000 miles; but I am thankful to say I have testimony from nearer home. I heard it last autumn from a lady who lived in a large manufacturing Midland town. In that town, as in all great towns, there was one ward in which resided what might be described as the "residuum," the ward in which lived the lowest class of voters. Well, Sir, this lady went to some of the persons interested in municipal elections in that town, and said—"Have you considered the propriety of contesting this particular ward?" They said—"No, we have not; this is a hopeless ward; the influences in it are thoroughly bad, it is impossible to work up on it at all." The lady went away discouraged; but she came back again, and said—"Don't you think you could do something to put a better candidate in this ward?" "Utterly impossible!" "Do you know there are 450 women electors in this ward; have you tried to ascertain their opinions?" "No." "Let me call a meeting of the women electors, and talk to them." She called a meeting, and it was extremely successful—so successful that another was called, and the women who had not attended the first came to the second by their own desire — working women, women working in factories, widows, spinsters, shopwomen, and the result was this—that a candidate was proposed, and he was elected by a majority exceeding 400, just the number of the women electors brought in. I think that fact is extremely remarkable. Here, again, experience has shown that the system of giving the franchise to women has been of great benefit in improving the purity of elections and raising the standard of character required of the candidates, and it has forced upon the men the necessity of consulting the feelings of the women electors. Now, Sir, there is another witness I am going to cite. I know the House is not fond of extracts, but I am not going to read many; this will be the last; but, at the same time, I will confess I am going to read the whole of a speech. It is a speech made by Mr. Henley on this subject in 1873. I need not dwell in this House upon the excellences of Mr. Henley. This much may be said of him—he was not a man given to any gushes of sentiment; he was a perfectly sagacious, well-trained, reasonable, and moderate man, a man also of equal courage and intelligence. I remember one expression once used by this Gentleman in this House. He once said, with reference to a speech that was full of high-sounding phrases, perhaps not sufficiently ballasted by common sense—"Old as I am, I can at least lie down on my back in a ditch and cry 'Fudge!'" I am sure Mr. Henley could always "lie down on his back in a ditch and cry 'Fudge!'" Mr. Henley voted against giving women the suffrage in four successive years. He, therefore, was not only an opponent, but put his opposition on record; but in 1873 he told the House he had changed his mind. He said—

> "Sir, I have always voted against this Bill; but I have lately watched carefully the operation of the exercise of the franchise both in municipal and in school board elections, by women, and as I think it has been beneficial in these cases, I do not see any reason why it should not be beneficial in Parliamentary elections. . . . I confess I have always hitherto voted against the Bill, but for the reasons I have stated I shall now give it my hearty support."—[3 *Hansard*, ccxv. 1254.]

That is a manly confession by one who had the courage to look things in the face, and I think it is one of the strongest possible arguments in favour of the proposition I am submitting to the House. He was a man not to be led away by old prejudices or foolish phrases; he watched things, and no man could watch more warily than Mr. Henley. Everyone knew when he looked through a Bill he knew the whole Bill; he watched this thing, and having found that it had done good in municipal elections he supported it. I go back to my proposition. The form of it brings out another thing—it shows the moderation of it. I have been asked during the last two or three days—and I dare say some one will put the question this evening—how it was that I, who demurred to the extension of the franchise to the agricultural labourers, can yet want to extend it to women? People say—"Have you not yourself made the best possible speech against any extension of the franchise whatever?" Now, Sir, I do not think that the confusion is in myself when I say I am quite able to advocate the extension of the franchise to women, and at the same time to adhere to every word I said on Tuesday night. In the first place, I do not place the claims of women to the franchise on the basis of any claim of natural right. Of course, if I attempted to assert that women, being adult human creatures, were entitled to vote, I should be obliged to admit that the agricultural labourer, as an adult human creature, was entitled to vote; but I do not base my argument upon any such reason. My reasoning is solely of a utilitarian character, as it was also the other night. My argument is this—Admit women to the franchise, and both they and the State will benefit; and the form in which my proposition is put shows the extreme moderation of the proposal. It differs entirely from other enfranchising proposals in this respect—that it is eminently a case of lateral, and not of vertical, extension. I propose to enfranchise the women where the men are already enfranchised. Where a man lives in a house and has a vote, and his sister-in-law or his mother-in-law dwells in the next house as the rated occupier, I propose to give her the vote. In this proposal no new class is attempted to be brought in—it is a lateral, rather than a vertical, form of extension. There is another thing—our electoral system is one of an anomalous character. We have all kinds of constituencies, with different qualifications prevailing. The system is not a good one; I wish to see it amended in many ways. But, at all events, it is a workable system, and it does in some way secure a balance between the different powers in the State. The present proposal differs entirely from that to enfranchise the agricultural labourers in that it touches all constituencies, and all alike. You do not, as you would under another proposal, have any one-sided, over-balancing of the Parliamentary system, enfranchising voters in one half of the constituencies and leaving the other unaltered. You leave the different parts of the machine among themselves perfectly unaltered. Of course, that goes to the root of the question. Everybody knows, everybody confesses, that if the agricultural labourer were enfranchised you must necessarily have a re-distribution of seats. There have been many fantastic arguments advanced against women's suffrage, but I have never heard anybody argue against it on the ground that it would involve a re-distribution of seats; and I do not expect anyone will thus argue. It leaves your Parliamentary system very much *in statu quo*, the different parts bear the same relation to one another as parts of the great whole. I therefore can see no inconsistency in what I said the other day, and in what I say now. The proposition before us is one of the simplest, most moderate, and safest character; it is recommended by experience, it contains in itself nothing alarming, it involves no further changes. Why is it wanted? Well, it is wanted for many reasons; but, in the first place, it is for this reason—That these women whom I ask you to enfranchise have rights and interests very much the same as men have, and that their rights and interests will, at all events, not be so adequately considered as the rights and interests of men until they are admitted to the franchise. From the cradle to the grave women are under the subjection of the law; their rights and interests are regulated by law; and I ask hon. Members to consider carefully whether women have had equal justice, or even now have equal justice with men? It is not any imputation on the justice of this House; but men, whatever class they belong to, wherever they are, have not, and I think we, Sir, in this House especially, have not that power of sympathy which is a pre-requisite of human intelligence to enable us to understand how women are affected in their rights and interests, because we do not feel as women do. It appears to me that this House, at all events, is deficient in the power of sympathy and sensibility, and must always be so; because, as a matter of fact, those who are Members of this House have come into it on account of the possession of qualities that are anti-sympathetic. We must have pushed ourselves forward in order to get here. Of course, there are exceptions; some are brought here by their parents and guardians to perfect their education—and I am afraid some of these think it a great bore to go through this additional course of instruction—but the mass are pushing, energetic men, and must have a great deal of egotism in them, or they would not be here at all. Until women are able to speak for themselves, and to explain their special grievances, the disadvantages under which they labour at present will never be redressed. I said from the cradle to the grave girls were under the law. Take a girl's education. What provision is made for the education of girls? See how educational foundations have been appropriated. The boys have charitable trusts like Christ's Hospital. We all know what Christ's Hospital is as a school for boys; but I dare say the vast majority of the hon. Members of this House are not aware that Christ's Hospital was founded as a school for girls also. It was intended to be a school for both, but the girls' school of Christ's Hospital is a small school at Hertford, which is very limited in extent, and the education given is that which might fit her to be a sort of upper housekeeper, whilst for the best of the boys a career is opened; they are sent to the Universities, and can and do rise to fill the highest offices in the State; but the girls are few in number, they are imperfectly educated, and turned out fitted for no higher function than that of a moderate housekeeper. That is not a single case; there was the case of the administration of the Leeds Charity before them the other year, and I lately saw a case of a school in which £150 a-year only out of a large endowment was provided for the girls' education. If we were to look into that we should probably find it ought to have been much larger. Again, I would ask the House to consider what has been done for the higher education of women. What has the House done to promote the higher education of women? Even now what does this House answer? When a most modest request was made to this House, I am sorry to say this House refused to listen to the proposal. Only two years ago, when the University Bill was passing through the House, it was asked that power should be given to the Universities to grant degrees to women, but that was refused. At present the resident members of the University of Cambridge—all honour to them—do, in a by-way, examine candidates and give certificates of honour. This House was asked to meet that, and to give the University of Cambridge power to do openly and publicly what it does now by a side wind; but the House refused to do that. Well, Sir, I pass to another statement. I consider the case of marriage. Even your marriage laws are not equal. Are the rights and duties, obligations, and privileges of husband and wife equal? You know perfectly well they are not. The man and woman enter on equal relations into the married life; but the law at once destroys that equality; for we are told that when it has been a stipulation on the part of the woman that a certain condition should be imported into the contract of marriage, a condition the law acknowledged to be a good one, yet that can be disregarded at the will of the man after the marriage had been consummated. I am referring, of course, to the Agar-Ellis case. He, as a matter of fact, gave a promise that the children should be educated in a particular fashion; but after marriage the husband refused to carry out that contract. Of course, I cannot say what action the House will take when this question is brought before it; but so long as these things are the consequence of the relation of marriage, then I say you do not treat women in anything like an equality with men. I may here mention that I had the curiosity some days ago to look back upon the Divisions on this question, to see how Mr. Agar-Ellis had voted on the question of Woman's Suffrage, and I was not surprised to find that he had been a very consistent opponent; for whenever the question was brought before the House he voted against it. Now, Sir, I will pass for a moment or two to an objection that has often been raised against this proposal. It has been said with an air of great philosophy that government after all rests entirely upon force, and it is absurd to attempt to fight against that principle, by giving to those who are physically weak an equal degree of political power. Now I altogether repudiate that view. No doubt, government is supported by force, but government rests on the moral ideas of the people; the ideas of the people are those of a government, and it is in aid of those ideas only that force is introduced. If we had a moral conviction that the wills of women ought to be considered equally with our own, we should admit women to political power, and, having thus admitted them to power, we should respect and even enforce the decisions of the community, to which they were parties, even when we questioned their expediency. To do so would be no more than justice, and justice and law are the outcome, not of physical force, but of right ideas of public morality. Now, Sir, I do not wish to detain the House too long, but it is said in the proposition before the House, it is injurious to the highest interests of the country that the Parliamentary franchise should not be conferred on those women who are entitled to vote at municipal, parochial, and school-board elections, and the proposition is true for this reason, that the withholding of the franchise has the worst possible effect on the character of women. That, after all, I believe to be the crucial point of our discussion; it is the question that has acted as a stumbling block, it is the question that occupied my attention most seriously when I first considered this question—what effect would the giving of the Parliamentary franchise have on the character of women? If it is to elevate their character, then I say, anyone who knows how profoundly women influence men, and how the standard of morality in the whole community depends on that of the women, will readily say whatever keeps down women's character must be injurious to the best interests of the whole community. Of course, if political power is likely to injure the character of women, it had better be withheld so as not to lower the standard of morality. A good deal has been said, Sir, in many different ages about the character of women. I suppose there is no subject on which more nonsense has been talked. Pope cut short the subject, by declaring of the character of women, that—

> "Most women have no character at all;"

though we know Pope had among his acquaintance more than one woman who possessed strength of mind and character, and he has left us in his Atossas and Narcissus the most vivid pictures of individual character. For my part, Sir, when men begin to talk of the characteristics of women, I prefer to fall back on a confession of the difficulty of describing them, which occurs in the mouth of one of Molière's lackeys. It is the old story of a master and lackey in search of mistress and maid, and the lackey is planning how they are to proceed—

> "Car voyez vous, la femme est, comme en dit,
> mon maître
> Un certain animal, difficile à connaître."

Those who know most about women may perhaps be the first to admit of the sex, that it is *difficile à connaître.* I believe this, at all events, that whatever the character of the women will be, the character of the men will not be very far off it. We run together, as it were, in double harness. You cannot get very far ahead of women, and women will not get far ahead of you. Moreover, there is this truth to remember, that we are generally on our best behaviour when in the presence of women, and the influence which each exerts on the other is fruitful either for good or evil; and I venture to say that I can prove to the House—I hope to prove to the satisfaction of a majority of the House—that the result of giving Parliamentary franchise to women, will be to elevate her character and make her influence reciprocally good for us. Sir, if you find a sphere in which the influence of women does not prevail, then I venture to say you will find a sphere of life in which the elements of health and vitality are wanting. I say, that influence ought to be extended to the sphere of political action, which is eminently a sphere in which the influence of women is wanting. We have all of us been acted upon, in our early years, most strongly and deeply by the influence of woman, that influence is paramount in the domestic household, it is strong and enduring also in the sphere of religious thought. But when we go out from the household, when we go into practical life, when the boy leaves his mother and quits his home, he is supposed to enter upon a sphere where the influence of woman is excluded, and where that influence, being wanting, a lower morality prevails. If you could find, as happily you can in many instances, in spite of this disability —if you could find me an instance of a woman who is a mother, who is not only perfect in her domestic relations, who is not only pious in her inner life, but is moved by a deep sympathy for the life of nations, and indeed for the life of humanity, whose feelings go forth from her household, go forth from her town, go forth from her county, and extend to the history of her country, to the history of other countries, to the development of the whole human race—if you find such a woman living at home, exchanging on equal terms high thoughts, broad aims, with her husband worthy of her, and if children are brought up under the influence of such a pair, you will find that they too carry forward in their public life lessons deeper than are ordinarily found in those who have not been so placed. Is it not, indeed, in accordance with first principles to suppose that by making woman's sympathies wider, deeper, and nobler, she must be better, and being better she must carry with her greater influence, and her influence will be extended through her children to future generations, affecting the whole tone of the community? Is not that the lesson of that experience to which I have referred? Do you not see such influence exercised by the women who have interested themselves in public affairs in our townships and in the American territory? You have departed from the old ideal of woman that she is to dwell at home; long since have you departed from the ideal of the house-wife spinning among her maidens; you admit women now to the conduct of local and charitable affairs; she has become a very active agent in all forms of parish and town work. You consent to give her a parochial mind, why not give her a national mind? Why not give her, if you like, an Imperial mind? I am glad we have not been wanting in women of great minds in England in past generations. At particular periods, to which we can refer as periods of great distinction, periods for instance as those of Elizabeth and Anne, periods of great vitality, intellectually and morally, it has always been noticeable that women have been foremost. Let us carry our minds back to the days of Elizabeth, and of Lady Jane Grey. They were not alone—far from it—in education and culture. Women shared the highest life of that great time. Consider for a moment Sir Anthony Cooke's children. He had four daughters, all of whom were trained in the highest learning and morality of that day; and what was their influence? One of them was the wife of Lord Keeper Bacon, and mother of the great Chancellor. Another was the wife of Burleigh, and mother of Robert Cecil. A third was married to the Earl of Bedford, and from her the Russells have descended. Such women were like a great gift to their generation. They brought within themselves the highest life of that generation · and if you can only infuse into the life of woman generally feelings of national and Imperial duty, you will not only improve the quality of women, lifting them far beyond the idea of imperfect grammar which my hon. and learned Friend (Sir Henry James) once dwelt upon with such fond regard, you will give not only benefit to women, but reciprocal benefits to yourselves. Then we are told that women do not want this. I venture to say, although it may be rather paradoxical, that those who want it most want it least, and those who want it least want it most. The word want has two meanings, and when you say women do not want it, you mean to say that women do not wish it, or that they do not need it. The women who do not want it, are the women who are most in need of it; the women who are least in need of it, are the women who ask for it most. Why is this? The answer is very simple. Until a woman has reached a certain degree of education, until her sympathies are enlarged, until she understands with a living understanding something of the movements of nations, and something of the growth of successive generations, she has not got in her the power of political enthusiasm. When she has got it, she does not want it herself only, but she wants to infuse a similar desire in other women. The woman who has not felt the inspiration of political enthusiasm, of course does not want it. She has not received that education of heart and mind to appreciate what it is, and therefore she does not want it. But who are they who do want it? Let me refer to one illustrious example—Miss Martineau. Will anyone who knew what she was say that she only wanted the right to vote? We all know something about her history. She was a woman of most wonderful range of information, and of the highest political interests. At a time when such knowledge was rare, she had studied by personal travel, and by constant intercourse with travellers, the politics of the Northern States of America. She had mastered the most important and difficult questions of Indian administration. She had investigated in travel those Eastern questions which for three or four years have occupied our attention. She was at home in the truths of political economy, and she made these truths popular; and for years and years, living in her cottage at Ambleside, she wrote for *The Daily News*, thereby creating an influence upon an unknown number of men. Do you suppose that she wanted a vote? To her a vote would be worthless. She had already got influence and education; she had got that range of ideas which I am claiming for all women, and she knew what an educational influence the privilege of voting would have upon others of her sex. Her desire was to benefit them. So, too, with many of those influential women now living. Do they want a vote? They want it in order that other women may be educated as they have been educated, and that other women may be elevated to the position they have the privilege of occupying; and as long as these aspirations are unfulfilled, the best interests of the country will remain injuriously affected. I beg to move the Motion which stands in my name.

Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "in the opinion of this House it is injurious to the best interests of the Country that women who are entitled to vote in municipal, parochial, and school board elections, when possessed of the statutory qualifications, should be disabled from voting in Parliamentary elections, although possessed of the statutory qualifications; and that it is expedient that this disability should be forthwith repealed."—(*Mr. Courtney,*) —instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

MR. NEWDEGATE: Mr. Speaker, I have so frequently addressed the House on this subject, that I really feel I owe an apology to hon. Gentlemen by venturing to address them again. But I have listened to the speech of the hon. Member for Liskeard (Mr. Courtney), and it appears to me that the only advantage which he hopes to get from the present form in which he has put the question before the House, is this—that inasmuch as his Motion is in general terms, the difficulties of practically applying the measure he suggests may not be so manifest to the House, while it enables him to get rid of these qualifications which the pressure of the House induced those who preceded him in proposing this measure to include in their Bill. Under this Resolution, all married ladies would be introduced into the electoral roll. Hitherto, the promoters of this measure have been content that married women should be represented by their husbands; but I see no such qualification now. This would, indeed, be a great extension of female influence, because the very advocates of this measure have hitherto held that it is sufficient that a married woman should be represented by her husband. But as this proposal is now placed before us, the assumption is that the hon. Member for Liskeard discards any qualification of that kind, and, therefore, married women are to be doubly represented. My objection to this measure is this — that there is no precedent for it in the government of any independent country in the world; among civilized nations there is no precedent for it. The hon. Member for Liskeard came to the House the other night and strenuously opposed a proposal for extending the household suffrage to counties; but to-day he comes down and proposes an extension of the franchise manifestly much more democratic in its tendencies. [MR. COURTNEY: No, no!] The hon. Gentleman says "No, no!" Now, if I understand what a democratic Constitution means, it means universal suffrage;

and if you break down the limitation which all civilized nations have observed—the limitation of sex—I ask you what chance you have of preserving the limitation of property, or, indeed, of preserving any other limitation? It is on these grounds that the people of the United States, through the House of Assembly and their Senate, have rejected this proposal. They have manhood suffrage; but they dare not venture upon universal suffrage, upon the principle which has formed the basis of this proposal. Sir, the hon. Member for Liskeard feels this, and he has entertained the House with long extracts from a letter written by the President of the House of Assembly in the territory of Wyoming, which is not even a State; it is not numbered as one of the United States. It is a mere territory, containing less than 20,000 inhabitants, and this is the vast precedent which the hon. Member for Liskeard sets up against the unbroken testimony of the civilized world. Well, Sir, the hon. Member bases this proposal upon a principle which is in excess of the principles of the rights of man. As these rights were described by the late Mr. Thomas Paine, whom I suppose the hon. and learned Baronet the Member for Wexford has read of, if not heard of——

Sir GEORGE BOWYER: I simply said nothing about it. Why the hon. Member should bring my name in, I cannot understand.

Mr. NEWDEGATE: The hon. and learned Member carries on his private conversation in such loud tones that it cannot escape my ears. But I know that the hon. and learned Baronet is learned in the Roman law. Well, he will admit that the Roman civil law cannot be looked upon as a specimen of the crude legislation of an enlightened people. What did the Roman civil law provide with respect to women? It provided all protection for their rights, and all protection for their personal freedom; but the hon. and learned Baronet will admit that in no one instance did the Roman civil law entail any duties which involved public responsibilities upon women. They were not even permitted, when they possessed property, to become surety. Their rights over their children were preserved while their children were young; but without the intervention of some male guardian, these rights ceased upon their children coming of age. I might go through further provisions of this civil law; but I have only mentioned this, because I have heard it said that our objection to this great innovation is due to an ignorant prejudice, a prejudice which is unworthy of civilization. There is no code even now more advanced than was proposed by the Roman civil law. It is embodied in the Constitution of France, and so far as personal rights, it is embodied in the Constitution of England. Yet I have heard hon. Members speak of our objection to this Bill as if it were founded on ignorant prejudice. I have said that this proposal is, in principle, in excess of Mr. Thomas Paine's system concerning the rights of man. Well, Mr. Thomas Paine's system has been found so much in excess, that it is gradually being abandoned by the civilized nations of the world; and I will quote a few words from an authority who, although a German by birth, is an American by practice, and an American by the great reputation he has attained, first, as a Professor of Political Economy, at the Carolina College in the Southern States of America, and then—and I trust he is so still—as Professor of History and Political Science in the Columbia College at New York. It seems to me that it is the political ethics of this country that the hon. Member for Liskeard has concerned himself about, and I find this in *Lieber's Political Ethics*, vol. ii., p. 107—

> "Dumont, speaking of Paine, in the *Souvenirs Leu Mirebeau*, ch. xvi., says—'He was a caricature of the vainest Frenchman.' Paine said to Dumont, that if it were in his power to annihilate all libraries, he would do it without hesitation, in order to destroy all the errors deposited in them, and to commence a new chain of ideas and propositions with the rights of man. How many Paines, in their respective spheres, and more or less bold, have we not seen since and are we not seeing daily?"

Well, Sir, in principle, the proposal now before the House is in excess of Paine's theory, and if this was the opinion which Lieber records as entertained by Dumont and others, what do we think of the authors of the present proposal? But there is in this a mixture of sentimental kindness which commends itself to the minds of some people. The hon. Member has spoken of high qualities found in ladies distinguished in the history of this country. Well might he do so; but who amongst them will he find to advocate this ultra-democracy? Not one, no one lady whose name he has recited would have sanctioned the proposal now before the House. They were contented with their own influence and power to guide other voters; they knew their influence was greater as an adviser, because it was more natural and according to the character of woman. Well then, Sir, it may be suggested, but how can it be that woman should not be enfranchised when we have rejoiced in such a Sovereign as Elizabeth, and when we rejoice in being the subjects of Her most gracious Majesty Queen Victoria? The Roman civil law placed women, to a certain degree, in tutelage, and the Sovereign of this Constitutional State is, practically, in tutelage, for She cannot act without the advice and consent of the Lords, Spiritual and Temporal, and Commons in Parliament assembled. Therefore, I say that the position of Her Majesty and Her great Predecessors is a tribute to the wisdom of the Roman law, and to the Constitution of this country, which combines all that is best in the civil law, and tempers it with that great security for personal freedom which the civil law lacks. This Bill contains a most exaggerated principle—a principle which has not been admitted or adopted by any civilized country. The hon. Member has quoted, in support of his Resolution, the names of those who were Members of this House, and who, I admit should be regarded as high authorities; but when he quoted Lord Beaconsfield, I could not quite admit the force of the appeal, because I am under the impression that Lord Beaconsfield, in his reforms, was somewhat careless of the character, of the power, and of the position of this House. And I cannot forget that when he left this House, he left us without a word of farewell, and took his place above, leaving us the legacy of his Reform Bill. I am not one of those who fear to touch in any way the institutions of the country. I have been in hot water with the Tory Party in former days, because I would be a Reformer; but that never disturbed the confidence of my constituents. I am an old Whig and a Peelite, averse to personal government in all its forms; averse to the ultra-democratic theories being put into practice, because I look upon them as the parent of despotism. Read the history of France in your own time. Well, Sir, the hon. Member asserts in a Resolution, that it would be for these benefit of this country that this exaggerated democratic principle should be introduced into our political Constitution; and it is because I hold freedom to be a treasure which must be guarded by those who are competent to keep it that I always have opposed, and always shall oppose, the proposal which is now before the House.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: I intend, Sir, to trespass upon the attention of the House for a very few minutes only; but I think it necessary, for reasons which perhaps I need not now enter into at length, to explain the the meaning of the Vote I am about to give. I confess it seems to me that the hon. Member for Liskeard (Mr. Courtney) may have felt that there was some little difficulty on his part in reconciling entirely the speech he made a few nights ago with the speech he made to-night; but whether that is so or not, I, at all events, shall be under no such difficulty, because on the occasion referred to the noble Lord opposite (the Marquess of Hartington) took the opportunity of remarking that my speeches were rather too frequently, as my speech of the evening was intended to be, for the Previous Question. And it is my intention this evening to give a vote which will be also in the direction of the Previous Question. The fact is, that looking at the question from a narrow point of view, and considering the form of the proposal we are now asked to vote upon, it is difficult for a Member of the Government to do otherwise than give his vote for going into Committee of Supply, unless, indeed, he were prepared to adopt in its entirety the proposal of the hon. Gentleman, and to declare not only that in the opinion of this House it is injurious to the best interests of the country that women who are entitled to vote in certain elections should be disabled from voting in Parliamentary elections, but that it is expedient that the disability should be at once removed. To give such a vote as that would be, in effect, to pledge us to bring in or to support a measure for altering the law in that respect. Now I feel that to undertake to alter the law in that direction, though it may seem simple, would, in fact, land us in a very large and difficult undertaking, and upon the same principle on which I have on former occasions deprecated the House passing Resolutions pledging itself to re-open the Reform question, so upon the present occasion I deprecate the passing of such a Resolution as this. But while I say this, I wish to state my own opinion upon the abstract question. I cannot go so far as the hon. Member for Liskeard, and others, who hold out to us that it is a matter of the highest importance to the interests of the country and to the advancement of the female sex that this privilege of voting should be given to women. I think that that view, however eloquently it may be expressed, and however much we may approve of most of the sentiments of the hon. Gentleman, is decidedly a very exaggerated one. On the other hand, I think the view which has just been expressed, that this is an ultra-democratic proposal, is quite as exaggerated; and, for my own part, I incline rather to the belief expressed by my right hon. Friend the late Member for Oxfordshire (Mr. Henley), which has been so well referred to already, that women have shown by the manner in which they have exercised the functions permitted to them, that they are not unworthy and not incapable of exercising such functions, and at a fitting time, and under fitting circumstances, I should be prepared to assent to a proposal that the same rank should be given to them as to others. But, as I said before, it opens the door to a very large question. It opens the door not only to the admission of persons who hold a particular qualification, but to the whole question of the relations of the two sexes. I am bound to say that that is a question upon which I am not prepared to advise the House to enter. I altogether dissent from some of the views expressed by the hon. Member for Liskeard—similar to the views expressed by him a few months ago—that justice will not be done to women unless they are directly represented in Parliament. I believe that is as untrue, as I believe it was untrue, when we were told that justice could not be done to the agricultural labourers unless they were represented in Parliament. I think that argument is one that is entirely fallacious; and, similarly, I think that the other argument that the franchise is necessary for the proper elevation of women is as fallacious as the argument that persons who are excluded from the franchise by our Constitution are thereby put outside the pale of the Constitution. That is an argument which I have never admitted. I have expressed this opinion in these few words for the purpose of making it clear that my vote for your leaving the Chair, Mr. Speaker, in order that we may go into Committee of Supply, will be given with the express reservation that I do not by that vote intend to pronounce an opinion upon this question, but rather to pronounce my opinion that this is not the time or the manner in which we ought to enter into the question.

Mr. HANBURY: The hon. Member who introduced this question has argued, that from the precedents of municipal and school board elections we should be justified in extending the Parliamentary electoral franchise to women. It seems to me, however, that there is a very great distinction between giving them the municipal vote and giving them the Parliamentary franchise, because nobody can disguise the fact that by a Resolution of this kind we are really asked to break down entirely the distinction which has hitherto represented public and private life—the distinction between men and women. There are two things to be most carefully taken into consideration—first, the very difficult question of the relations of sexes; and, secondly, whether you are to give people rights who are not able to carry out corresponding duties. We have to face this fact, that in the whole course of the history of the world immemorial usage has sanctioned the custom which prevails at the present time. Therefore, we have no mere sentiment—no mere vague idea of right to go upon; but we have to ask ourselves whether what is proposed is really for the interest of the State? It seems to me that this is just the very worst time at which such a question could be brought forward. Women hitherto have taken no part in public life, and you are proposing now that they should be introduced into public life at a time when the franchise is being extended, when all our institutions are being made more democratic, and when public life is becoming more public than it has hitherto been. If you enfranchise these women, who do not represent their sex at all—women with more masculine minds than womanly sympathies—you are casting a great slur upon the sex if you do not go on and enfranchise those who are the best of their sex; and you will be placing yourselves in an illogical position if you give them the privilege of voting and do not admit them to sit in this House. That being so, I say this is the worst time possible at which to admit them into public life, because, in the first place, public life is much more democratic and much more public in every sense of the word than it has hitherto been. You may cite instances where women have been great Rulers, you may go back to the history of our Queens, and find examples of women who have admirably fulfilled the duties of that station. You may quote cases of women who have been sheriffs, and who have performed other executive duties; but none of them have ever been engaged in public life, as women would have to be now if they were admitted to public life. They did not plunge into the turmoil of elections and mob assemblies, as any one must now who takes a prominent part in public life. The argument is, that because women have brains equal to men they ought to have their share of the duties of men. But this is a time above all others when brain is less than ever it was a qualification for the franchise. You are extending the franchise wider and wider without making education or intellect any qualification for its exercise. Even looking at the moral condition of society, I do not believe we have reached so high a pitch of civilization that we can treat men and women as if there were no longer any difference of sex, and as if the world were living in a sort of moral Utopia. On the contrary, as far as I can see, this is the very worst time at which such a change could take place. One great protection enjoyed by women at the present moment is the sense of chivalry which is, to a great extent, being broken down by those women who have lately taken an active part in public life. Those women, who have emerged from their homes to enter into those affairs of public life which have hitherto been entrusted to and discharged by men, have done much to weaken our respect for the sex. This may be said of many of our female novelists, and of those who have taken an active part in agitating this question, and have flooded us with papers, some of which are not such as we like to see. This again, therefore, I say is the very worst time that such a change could take place. But my chief point is that the rights and duties of public life ought to go together—that they are, as it were, convertible terms. It is no use to disguise the fact that women can in no sort of way contribute to the police of the country in the maintenance of order, and yet they are the people who, of all others, both for person and property, require the protection of the police force. I say nothing about this being a great Empire, and the duties involved in its defence, and in promoting its interests abroad, though of course in these duties women can take no part; but I wish to impress upon the House that those who most require the protection of the law are the least capable of giving anything in the way of protection. When we are told that women ought to be entitled to vote in respect of their property, I say that property does not in the present day claim any great share in the franchise. The vote of the landowner is swamped by the votes of his own tenants, and it is not sufficient, therefore, to say that because women have property they ought to have votes in the election of Members of Parliament. A man is liable to military duties in this country and abroad, and he may be called upon at any moment by the police to assist them in the discharge of their duties. A woman has no duties of the kind, and I fail to see why in her case, more than any other, rights and duties should be separated. It is useless for the hon. Member for Liskeard to argue from the franchises women at present possess—in school-board and parochial elections, for instance—that they ought to have the Parliamentary vote. There is a great distinction between the cases. In parochial elections property is the great qualification. A man with a large property has ten times the voting power of a man with a small property, and where women have votes now, their power is proportioned to their property. In the case of school boards, woman has her rights, but she has her duties too. She is capable not only of voting in the elections, but of taking the consequence of that vote and being herself elected on the Board. The hon. Member for Liskeard would refuse to allow her to have any responsibilities of that kind. He would simply give her the vote, and not permit her to take upon herself the corresponding duties of election to this House. It is for these reasons, and because I believe this Resolution, if passed, would bind us to a very great extent to throw women into public life, and at a time when public life is less fitted for them than at any previous period in history, and because also that it would subvert the sound principle of the Constitution, based upon political economy, that rights and duties should go together, that I for one shall vote against it.

MR. BLENNERHASSETT: The hon. Member who spoke last (Mr. Hanbury), and the hon. Member for North Warwickshire (Mr. Newdegate), both appear to think that there is some inconsistency between the speech which the hon. Member for Liskeard (Mr. Courtney) delivered a few nights ago and that which he made this evening; but that is not the case. My hon. Friend told the House on the previous occasion that the reason why he took a certain course was his wish that the representation of the country should not be placed in the hands of one class, but that all classes, all opinions, and all parties in the country should be represented. The hon. Member comes forward to-night on exactly the same principle, and pleads for the admission of a class which is present unjustly excluded. The hon. Member for North Warwickshire seemed to think that the Resolution before us would have the effect of admitting married women to the franchise, entirely ignoring the express statement of the hon. Member for Liskeard that he did not intend to include married women, and appearing, also, not to have observed the wording of the Resolution that those women should enjoy the franchise who possess the statutory qualification. The hon. Member told us that he opposed this Motion, because it is of a most democratic character, and will lead to universal suffrage. It seems to me that this is a movement which, so far from being based on the rights of man, is based most distinctly on the rights of property and the established and recognized principles of our Constitution. In fact, no greater obstacle could be placed in the way of the advancement of ultra-democratic theories, tending towards universal suffrage, than by giving completeness to the principle you have already adopted, that those who possess a particular property qualification should have a certain influence in the government of the country. Of all the debates that ever take place in this House, the debates on this question of women's suffrage seem to me the most entirely unsatisfactory, not because there is any want of ability or of earnestness on the part of those who conduct them on the one side or the other, but because it is impossible to resist the conviction that they are debates which should never take place at all. When women were admitted to the municipal franchise, they were admitted without any divisions or discussions here. How much more dignified, how much more gracious would be the attitude of the House if the same course were adopted with regard to this plea for the Parliamentary franchise? It is a plea which once made, and urged with earnestness and sincerity by those who really wish to obtain the rights they are asking for, should be granted without discussion and without delay. Instead of that, we have had, for 11 years, debates—painful and humiliating debates I think they are—and we have been deprived of the opportunity of passing, quietly, simply, and graciously, a measure, not of a sensational or sentimental character, but a plain and simple act of justice. If hon. Members wish to find a way of bringing women into political life, leading them into political agitation, and introducing them to political platforms, they could not have hit upon a better plan than resisting this Motion. It has been pointed out by an eminent writer, and the statement has received the approbation of the highest authority in this House, that the great access of power and impetus of movement which the great Reform Act gave to the Liberal Party, was due not so much to the measure itself as to the energetic mood created by the arduous and long continued struggle to obtain it; and it is by leading women to see that they must fight, must agitate, must work this question for themselves—that they cannot rely upon the justice and generosity of men—that you will lead them to resort to forms of political action which none of us would like to see common in this country. There is one other possible result of these debates which I think would be very deplorable. Their general effect must be to remove some illusions that exist, and to weaken the respect women feel for the intelligence and common sense of men. The hon. Member who has just spoken told us that the effect of this moderate and reasonable proposal—which means nothing more than that some thousand women, for the most part quiet, virtuous, stay-at-home, industrious, pious people, should quietly, once in six or seven years, go in to a ballot-box and record a vote—would be to break down the distinction between man and woman. I shall not follow him in his allusion to women with more masculine minds than womanly sympathies. I can only say this, that I have followed for several years the working of this movement very carefully, and I cannot find words too strong to express my respect for the earnestness, the prudence, the self-sacrifice, and the remarkable ability by which it has been brought to its present position, mainly through the efforts of a number of ladies, who, animated by no selfish desire, looking for nothing for themselves, but working in the interests of those who are weaker and more in need than they are, have devoted themselves to a great and generous work. I do not know how long the opposition to the movement will be continued; but one thing I do know, it is a movement that will not lightly be abandoned. It has not been lightly taken up. It has been taken up from a feeling of duty and under a sense of responsibility, and it will not lightly be laid aside. Whatever the fate of this Motion to-night, whatever the fate of our Bills and Motions at any future time, the work will still go on, and women, who believe that in advocating this measure they are advocating that which will be a blessing to the weak and the oppressed among their own sex, will never relax their efforts till they have brought the question to a successful issue. There is one ground on which the advocates of this movement have reason to complain, and that is that their opponents show a strong desire not to meet us face to face and to discuss the proposal that we bring before them; but they endeavour to direct the attention of the House, not to our proposals, but to irrelevant issues and vague suspicions and consequences which they imagine may under certain circumstances ensue. Now, I think it may be fairly said that woman has shown that her sex has at all events some claim to the possession of intellectual faculties such as may qualify anyone for a vote. A woman who has placed herself in the front rank of literature—I refer to George Eliot—has said that this way of arguing against a question because it may be ridden down to an absurdity, would soon bring life to a standstill; it is not the logic of human life, but that of a roasting-jack, that must go on to the very last turn when once it has been wound up. Now, Sir, what I ask you to consider is the actual proposal before us, and not the consequences that may or may not follow in some remote future from the adoption of this proposal. Allusion has been made—allusion always is made in these debates—to the fact that the franchise ought not to be given to women, because they are inferior in physical force to men. I remember reading with interest the report of a debate which took place in this House on this subject last year, and one of the criticisms was that some foolish things had been said in the course of the discussion; but the most foolish remark that had been made was made by me. This remark was that I denied that the Government rested on physical force. Now, I never meant to use words conveying the impression of an opinion that physical force was not the ultimate recourse of a Government; but I did say, and I repeat it now, that as civilization advances the appeal to physical force becomes more and more remote. The Prime Minister himself has told us, in one of his most eloquent speeches, that as civilization progresses it equalizes the physical qualities of men; it is not the strong arm, but the strong head, that is now the moving principle of society; you have disenthroned Force, and placed in her high seat Intelligence; it is not muscular strength that will qualify either men or women to take a part in the government of the country, but those intellectual and moral influences which are being brought more and more to bear on the regulation of affairs. The hon. Member who has just spoken has said—or, at least, I so understood him—that woman ought not to have a vote because she cannot become a policeman. Well, I do not know a more apt illustration of the triumph of moral force than the very policeman who is here referred to. You will see a great crowd of people gathered together eager to do some particular act, and you will find that half-a-dozen policemen are sufficient to keep that crowd in order, and to prevent their taking the course which probably most of them are bent upon taking. This is simply because a policeman is the representative of law and order, and of moral force as opposed to the mere physical force of the rough and the savage. But, Sir, I do not think that women who are working on behalf of this movement desire the franchise so much for what it actually is as for what it is likely to bring them. As a justly eminent lady has said, they approach this question not so much from the point of view of abstract right as from the point of view of practical justice and necessity. My hon. Friend has pointed out that women, in one sense, are not a separate class. That is quite true. As he has said, this proposed extension of the franchise will be in a lateral and not in a vertical direction, and when you give the franchise to women, you do not do what you would be in danger of doing if you gave it to the agricultural labourer or the artizan, or any other class whom it is proposed to enfranchise. You do not, in the case of women, run the danger of placing the whole political power of the country in the hands of one particular class, and giving them the means of exercising an exclusive power, it may be, to the detriment of the nation. The women it is proposed to admit belong to different walks of life, and hold the most different opinions on the majority of the questions of the day. In this sense my hon. Friend is right in saying that women are not a class; but there is a sense in which women are a class. They are affected by the law in a manner different from the other sex. They have duties and responsibilities which are peculiar to them, and which necessarily mark them out as a class. If you wish that women should not be a class, are you prepared to say that the word "men" should always be read as including women, and that the word "women" should always be read as including men, in every Act of Parliament? If not, you must admit the distinct position in which women stand. Well, seeing how women are separately affected by the law, I say that they ought to have a voice in the making of the law, they ought to have the power of making their opinion felt on all questions relating to themselves. They have special experience and knowledge of their own wants and necessities, and they base their claim to the franchise on the fact that they bear equally with man their proportion of the burdens of the State. They pay rates and taxes, and contribute by their work to the wealth of the community. They are not free from any responsibility as regards the bearing of our national burthens, and they have the same interest as men in the good government of the country. They do not differ from men in the disposition and desire to judge rightly of public affairs, and on these grounds they ask you to accept their claim on the same condition as is observed in the case of men; since you do not ask in the case of men whether they are prudent, or educated, or wise, but simply do they possess the property qualification imposed by the law. We ask you, therefore, to accept the same kind of qualification for women, and no longer to keep them in the degrading position in which you place lunatics, imbeciles, and criminals. I think these are strong and weighty grounds for the admission of women to the franchise, and such as should cause us to reflect very seriously before we deny their claim. If there are any who look on the franchise as a right, I do not see how they can possibly resist this claim. But I do not put the question on this ground alone. I quite admit that there are other considerations. We have to consider, before we make this or any great change in our representative system, what will be its effect on those whom we enfranchise, and on the general government of the country. With regard to its effect on women themselves, I have no doubt that their admission to the suffrage would have a useful and beneficial influence on them. It would open to them a noble and ennobling field of duty, would bring them in contact with new ideas, would make them look at questions from a public as well as a private point of view. I do most heartily thank those women who are working this question for the freshness and vigour they are bringing into the thoughts of women; they are bringing a breath of fresh air and intelligence into the dreary and dismal round of life and thought which many of them are compelled to lead—a life of petty cares and anxieties. Do not tell me that to give women practical reasons for interesting themselves in great public questions will not greatly improve them in intellect and character. At the present moment you admit women to the exercise of the vote on municipal questions; why, then, do you shut them out from the broader, nobler, and more elevating topics involved in considerations affecting the general government of the country? I have no doubt that the admission of women to the franchise would raise the moral and intellectual standard of the country. You cannot raise women without also raising men. The effect of the moral and intellectual improvement of women must be to improve the moral and intellectual standard of men. It is impossible for people to live together without being greatly influenced by each other. By giving to women the political status to which they are entitled, the effect would be raise the general tone of thought. While you would thus raise the intellectual character of both sexes—each in its own sphere—you would also widen the common ground on which they meet to exchange ideas and to share in intellectual intercourse. There is another argument, which, I think, is a strong one, not for the exclusion, but for the admission, of women to the franchise, and it is that women are different from men. It is because of this difference that it is specially desirable that they should be admitted. They are in many respects peculiar in their way of looking at things; they have special interests and special habits of thought, and why should not these special interests and ways of thinking receive consideration in the distribution of political power? Every new class admitted to political power has less political experience than the classes already admitted. It may have less education, and scantier means of obtaining information upon which to form sound judgment with regard to public affairs; but, nevertheless, the admission of the new class is a public gain, because it gives a clearer and profounder insight into their condition, and a keener sympathy with that which they require. Do not let us be deterred from rendering this great act of justice by old and feeble jokes and witticisms such as we are accustomed to hear in the course of these debates. There is no question which is more grave, important, and serious than that of the electoral franchise. Nothing is more serious than who are to be the repositories of the political power of the nation. This is a most serious question, and every class of our countrymen or countrywomen who claim to be admitted within the pale of the Constitution deserve to have that claim treated with respect and attention. How much more strong is this claim to serious and respectful attention on our part when it comes from those who are weaker than ourselves, and who have nothing to rely on but the justice and generosity of the House of Commons? Let us not be deterred from passing this measure of justice by vague suspicions, by false sentiment, and unkindly ridicule. The folly really lies in the supposition that we must rely upon mere legal restrictions to maintain great natural distinctions, and in thinking that if these legal cobwebs were swept away the condition of the country would be imperilled. I have more confidence in manhood than to suppose that the position of men is at all dependent on the exclusion of women from the suffrage. Let us, I say, be more manly, let us be more generous to those who are weak, relying not upon our generosity, but upon our justice. Let us lay aside those unmanly and ungenerous fears to which we should never have lent our ears. Let us give a favourable response to this appeal, which, though it be not urged upon our attention by a turbulent or dangerous agitation, is founded on right and justice, and is in harmony with those great principles of liberty by which the law and the practice of a just and generous people should be regulated.

MR. BERESFORD HOPE: The hon. Gentleman opposite has talked of the logic of a smoke-jack. Well, I own that I do not understand what that is. A smoke-jack is a most useful and practical invention. We owe the cooking of the meat which furnishes our dinners to the smoke-jack; but I think that probably the hon. Gentleman opposite would prefer the logic of the tea-kettle—steam and bubble. I am sorry that the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer is not present; but, at any rate, although I thank him for the promise of his vote, I do not thank him for his speech. Great affairs of State must have so pre-occupied him that he has only awakened from the confusion in which this question stood some eight or nine years ago to find it like the state in which the House now is—a state of fog. The time is past for opportunism. If there be any good in the proposal to give women the suffrage it ought to be granted at once; but if it is, as I believe, a mistake, it is not to be opposed by arguments based on opportunism, such as protestations that "it is not the time to argue the matter now—the House should wait for a more convenient season." But that convenient time will never come to the advantage of those who are petitioners for this change in our Constitution. Happily the question can be argued to-night from original matter and on fresh ground. We have often and often been reproached in the organs of public opinion, and by the last speaker (Mr. Blennerhassett), for not appealing to those who parade themselves as most interested in this matter, in order to ascertain what real grievance exists as material upon which to discuss the question. Well, Sir, we have that material. The ladies have not been satisfied with the advocacy of the very philosophical champions who speak for them on the other side of the House, and they have put their own case in a brief of their own devising. They have published, not a Blue Book, but what is next door to it—a Green Book—and in that Green Book there are documents of the most authentic character. The book is entitled, *The Opinions of Women on Women's Suffrage*, issued by the "Central Committee of the National Society for Women's Suffrage." This book, I suppose, means what it says, and must be accepted on both sides of the House as representing that intended state of things which the hon. Members who will vote for the Motion of the hon. Member for Liskeard (Mr Courtney) are now advancing. It authentically represents what we, on this side, dread in the future, and that which we trust will not be accomplished, at any rate, by a Vote of this House to-night. We are not voting against it because we care anything about going into Supply to-night; for with all due regard of the necessity of taking Supply, I must say that I do not care one halfpenny whether the House goes into Supply or not, as compared with the decision it may come to on this very important question. Of course, my hon. Friend the Member for Liskeard has read this pamphlet; but I think it must have been a great disappointment to his fair clients that he has not made a single reference to it from the beginning to the end of his speech. However, I think that anyone who has read the pamphlet cannot fail to draw these conclusions from it—First, that the contention on which the ladies base their arguments negatives the idea that it is possible to set up a distinction between married and unmarried women. They throw away with ostentation this flimsy pretext. They argue the thing, *a priori*, and, more than that, they work well and evenly. They come square to the front, and march most manfully with the extension of the suffrage party. Their arguments, in short, lead straight up to universal suffrage, based as they are on the contemptuous denial that virtual or indirect representation is of the slightest value. As to the practical part of the question, the pamphlet involves two considerations. One is, that if these arguments be worth anything at all from the point of view taken by the ladies, we are now in for introducing a very large, certainly not a small, fresh element into the constituencies; and the next, that most irresistable, argument in favour of women's suffrage—must also lead to a claim for women Representatives. The hon. Member for Liskeard has pointed to the fact, that in the school boards "she" as well as "he" is found to sit, and among the women contributing their "opinions" are found members of school boards, ladies who are scientific, literary, philanthrophic, and ladies who have written novels. We all know there is a class of women who, very laudably, and I give them nothing but praise for it, have made themselves names, and who, therefore, have ambition. Being ambitious, they naturally want, each for herself, to have a vote; but they know very well that this House would not look to novel writing, or sitting upon a school board, or being a pharmaceutical chemist, or at being able to order her milliner to put "M.D." upon the bill as a qualification for the franchise. No doubt, it must be very mortifying to them, but they find they must float on the inflated bladders of their ignorantine sisters, and submit to claiming that all who may happen to pay rates and taxes shall have an equal advantage with themselves. But what does this prove? It proves that the hundred names might be those of women who would make very good voters. But that does not prove that the female sex generally, whether they pay rates or taxes or not, have a sound claim to the privilege they ask for. It reminds me of an event which happened in our political history about a quarter of a century ago, and which may not be known to hon. Members who have come into the House since that period. It was about the time of Lord Aberdeen's Government, when philosophical theorists were trying a good many experiments. A Memorial was sent into the then Prime Minister—I am not certain whether it was Lord Aberdeen or Lord Palmerston—by some of the most eminent men of the day, in favour of the creation of a higher class of constituencies. The project was to create a kind of territorial College overlapping the existing counties and boroughs, containing as constituents men with certain intellectual qualifications. This woman-plea really reproduces that action, and indicates a literary, scientific, and philosophic ambition to get such share in the Government as a vote gives. I honour the ladies for that feeling, but in their action they multiply themselves by a large multiple, and parade themselves so multiplied as womanhood in general, ignorant as well as learned. After these prefatory observations, the House will, I hope, allow me to read some brief extracts from the Green Book of the "Central Committee of the National Society for Women's Suffrage," so that we may see what it is that the hon. Member for Liskeard asks us to vote for. The first "opinion" is from a lady, whose name is very familiar in the annals of the London School Board as Miss Fenwick, now, however, Mrs. Fenwick Miller. She says—

> "Laws regulating the existence of women where their daily life differs from that of man (as in the maternal relation for instance), cannot be properly made, and questions specially affecting the female half of mankind cannot be wisely decided without the opinion of the class to be affected being given, and without their knowledge of their own needs being admitted to counsel the legislators."

By this, Mrs. Fenwick Miller means to say that by an infusion of ratepaying spinsters and widows into the constituencies, you will make hon. Members on either side of the House good authorities on the "maternal relations." The next authority is Miss Helen Taylor, also a member of the London School Board. She says—

> "Domestic life can never have all the elements of the happiness it is capable of giving, while women are careless of one large branch of men's interests in the world."

That means that no man is to be happy if the wife cannot, when he gets home, tell him how she is going to vote when she has put him under the ground; for, mind you, it is only spinsters and widows who they say are entitled to vote. Then we have Mrs. Arthur Arnold, translator of Senor Castelar's works, who says—

> "If 'taxation without representation is tyranny,' it is also robbery. Under the form of taxes women are defrauded of vast sums of money, frequently for objects of which they wholly disapprove. This Afghan War, for instance, how many women are opposed to it! Yet they must help to pay for it, and try to fancy they are living in a free country."

Mrs. Arthur Arnold says, in effect—

> "Any woman who lives in a free country may refuse to pay taxes if she disagrees with the policy of the Government."

There is another extract from an opinion of the same lady, namely—

> "Every educated woman with whom I am acquainted desires a Parliamentary suffrage."

Well, my lady acquaintances must be uneducated, for my experience is totally contrary to that of Mrs. Arnold's. We have from Miss Alice Bewicke, author of *The Last of the Jerminghams* and *Lonely Carlotta*, that—

> "In the blackened ruins of Paris may be read the handwriting on the wall, telling how women, degraded even as those of Paris are degraded, yet cannot sink past feeling their degradation and resentment against the society that inflicts it."

Is the hon. Member for Liskeard prepared to say that the ladies of England, whether they are ratepayers or not, who have not the franchise, have a right to burn Buckingham Palace, to destroy Westminster Hall, and to reduce the Mansion House to cinders? The next opinion is by Mrs. F. E. M. Notley, author of *Olive Varcoe.* I am sure, if we saw her a Member of this House, we should find her speeches original in construction, for her novel is a clever one, rather strong in its situations, but decidedly clever. She says—

> "I am of opinion that to withhold the franchise from those women who are undertaking and suffering all the burdens and responsibilities of men is an injustice as senseless as it is illogical. I hold this opinion upon much wider grounds than the mere payment of rates and taxes."

So here the cat is let out of the bag. The ground upon which they ask for the franchise is much wider than the mere payment of rates and taxes, and the hon. Member for Liskeard and his lady friends can no longer deny the impeachment. Miss Simcock, author of *The Ethics of Law*, also says—

> "I can only give the same reasons for desiring the political enfranchisement of women that I should give for desiring the political enfranchisement of anyone else—*e. g.*, of the agricultural labourers now, of the manufacturing towns before the first Reform Bill, and of male householders and lodgers before the last."

Then comes Mrs. Villari; but I will not read through this extract. She admits that indirectly political influence is exercised by women, and says that that influence is sometimes mischievous for the reason that it is secret. She would make us believe that, with open influence, moreover, the secret one would disappear. Now comes a lady of great literary and political weight, Madame Belloc, who has interested herself considerably in Continental politics, and who was well known as Miss Bessie Parkes. She says—

> "I think that in a time and country wherein the power of the vote is supreme, that power should be increasingly diffused. The will of the majority has a tendency to become all-powerful; and, therefore, that majority should be composed of every diverse element, or injustice in a thousand subtle forms will result. It is on this ground that I think women should ask for and obtain the suffrage."

We are here asked to give women the suffrage, because the supreme power does not reside in the Estates of the Realm, but in the supreme vote. This is a confession of political principle not to be overlooked. There is another lady, Mrs. Crawshay, who says—

> "The degradation of women will never cease until means of earning an honest livelihood are afforded to that large majority which cannot achieve marriage."

On this I can only ask, how is a woman to earn an honest livelihood by the franchise now that bribery is so strictly forbidden? She adds—

> "To this end, women must have a voice in modifying laws which impede their doing a fair day's work for a fair day's wage; and this will never be until the franchise is granted to women on the same conditions as those on which it is granted to men."

I am sure, as she speaks of laws preventing a woman from doing a fair day's work for a fair day's wage, some hon. Member who supports the Resolution will explain what those laws are. I am not acquainted with them. Finally, comes a lady who is piteous—Mrs. S. A. Barnett, member of the Whitechapel Board of Guardians. She pleads—

> "It was the slaveowner, not the slave, who suffered most from the institution of slavery. The women who agitate for the suffrage are now claiming the pity of the world because they are deprived of their rights. Might it not be that the men who refuse to others the right which they themselves possess are the more to be pitied?"

We are the slaveowners, I presume. I can accept the lady's pity, and I trust the House will. I beg to point out that in taking these extracts I did not pick and choose. I took the extracts as they came, and did not attempt to classify them. I read them in the order in which they were printed in the pamphlet—a pamphlet, I must repeat, authoritatively published by the Society, and sent round within the last week, of course, in order to influence the vote of to-night. The demand which is made is that women should have the suffrage as a right, and that is advanced on purely philosophic principles. It is the woman that they want to have enfranchised, not the taxpaying person, and it is because the woman claims it as a woman, and it is because her advocates lay down that she is so distinctly a different—I will not like the hon. Member for Liskeard, say "animal," but quoting Molière—character to the man that I oppose the Resolution. The hon. Member has referred to the State of Wyoming, as the only place in which women have had their own way. I beg the hon. Gentleman's pardon. There was another instance in which the female appeared in the Senate. The Roman Emperor Heliogabalus — the House will remember—did set up a Senate of women, and put that respected lady, his mother, in the Chair. But, except in Wyoming and in the case of Heliogabalus, the wisdom of the world and the experience of the world has gone one way, and the Society for Women's Suffrage, the hon. Member for Liskeard, and one or two other people, have gone the other. They may be right; we may be wrong. But, let us see what they ask for? Do not let these miserable pretensions, this claim as to rights of property, this talk about rates and taxes, influence you. It is mere birdlime to catch the sparrows. We know what they want. They have been sapping and mining; but they have made a mistake at last, and have published a pamphlet that is a little too straightforward, too earnest, too ambitious. These politicians have shown after all that they are women. They have written as women. They have told us what they want, and we ought to be guided by that confession; and when we vote for it, let us know that it is not for the rights of property, but for real universal suffrage, to be established for the first time in the history of any country—not for manhood suffrage, but manhood suffrage and womanhood suffrage, for the franchise to be given to every creature of the human race whose limbs are sufficiently strong to carry him or her to the ballot-box.

MR. HEYGATE: I have always been quite unable to approach this question with any of those feelings of excitement or enthusiasm which appear to be felt by hon. Gentlemen on both sides of the House when they advocate or oppose it from time to time. I have neither been able to indulge in any of those sanguine hopes or gloomy apprehensions which appear to be entertained on one side and the other. On the contrary, I have treated the question from the first in a very matter-of-fact, prosaic way, and have been curious to see what would be the outcome of the agitation. I refrained from voting on one side or the other for two or three years, because, showing as I do that conservative spirit which distinguishes those who sit on this side of the House, especially on questions connected with the representation of the people, I have viewed with some suspicion and dislike any new attempt at a general enfranchisement which did not at once commend itself to my mind. But, having listened from year to year to the arguments advanced in favour of this proposal, it seemed to me there was positively nothing against the proposal —which has hitherto been brought in as a Bill, but which is now the Motion put forward so ably by my hon. Friend the Member for Liskeard (Mr. Courtney)—except prejudice and sentiment. There have been feelings of a sentimental dislike to the idea of giving a vote to a woman, because she is a woman; and, on the other hand, we have had hon. Members showing, year after year, that a woman who occupied a position at the head of a household, paying rates and taxes, and discharging every function which a husband would discharge, ought not to be deprived of the right which attached to her, by reason of her not being a man. We have already the advantage of an experiment. The experiment has been made in the elections of school boards and guardians and municipal elections, and the result has been "beneficial," as was freely declared by an old Member of this House, who is always considered one of the first authorities on this subject—namely, Mr. Henley. I have listened in vain to hear from those who attack this proposal anything to the contrary. It has not been suggested by any hon. Member who is opposed to this proposal that the experiment, so far as it has gone, has not been entirely successful. One of my hon. Friends, the Member for North Staffordshire (Mr. Hanbury), tries to draw a distinction between municipal franchises—what are called ratepaying franchises, or parochial franchises—and the Parliamentary franchise; but I fail to see any very great distinction such as he desired to draw. In the one case, that of municipal government, there are something like £40,000,000 or £50,000,000 to be dealt with annually, and in the other case, that of Imperial government, there are something like £70,000,000 or £80,000,000; and are we to be told that a person, who is considered capable of electing representatives who have to vote away £40,000,000, is incapable of electing representatives who have to vote away £70,000,000? Can anyone say that there is such a distinction, or that it could be logically maintained? And then, as regards the question of fitness, I understand that is never contested either—in fact, it is impossible to contest it. We all know that there is in any constituency a class of persons, a residuum, who are unfit to be electors, in respect of their want of intelligence and moral character, and otherwise unfitted to assist to pass laws and govern the country. And there is no one who would maintain that there is not a class of women who should not be enfranchised; but as against the claim of the fair average class of women householders there is nothing to be said. I most distinctly and emphatically deny the intention at any time of supporting anything further than the removal of the disability with regard to widows and unmarried women (householders), placing them in the same position as men. I cannot for one moment see the possibility of admitting married women into the franchise. I was very sorry to hear my hon. Friend the Member for Liskeard drop the words, which were adroitly taken advantage of—"not at present" —in reference to married women; because I believe he damaged his cause thereby. Speaking for myself, and supporting this Resolution, as I do, as a matter of logic and justice, I do not and shall not ever see my way to the enfranchisement of married women, and I do not consider that is a question of practical politics. I also look upon the present proposal as an enfranchisement of property. We all, as Conservatives, must approve of that. I do not mean that it is because they are likely to give Conservative votes; I do not ask in what direction their votes will be given; but I say it is a representation of property, and therefore it is Conservative in the best sense. We all know that when a farmer dies the widow is often left in a position of great discomfort—at least, that was specially the case some time ago—because the landlord used to think that he had lost a vote by the disqualification of a particular farm, and therefore he would often take it from the widow, and re-let it to a new tenant capable of voting in right of the occupation; but I cannot see why, if a woman is considered fit to follow her husband in ordinary matters, and to perform the same duties as her husband used to perform, she should not have the franchise. I have said I do not share the extraordinary fears or hopes which have been indulged in upon this question. I do not imagine that all women are going to be improved by being enfranchised, nor do I imagine that legislation in this country is going to be supported or improved by their admission. I simply look upon it as a plain, matter-of-fact, logical, common sense matter of justice. Here are certain people performing certain duties, and I think they have a right to ask for the same consideration which is given to men in their position. The hon. Member for North Staffordshire said he should like to see rights and duties represented. I was surprised to hear him refer to that, because it does seem to me that at present it is so. The only hindrance which has been pointed out is that women are unable to serve on juries or to act as soldiers or policemen. Well, there are other classes of society who are not called upon to perform those duties. A clergyman, for instance, is not called upon to serve as a policeman or a soldier, nor can he sit in Parliament; and I think those are nearly the only duties which women are unable to perform. Something has been said of the supposed inconsistency of my hon. Friend the Member for Liskeard in proposing this, which is regarded by some as so sweeping and democratic a change, and in opposing the Motion of the hon. Member for the Border Boroughs (Mr. Trevelyan) to enfranchise the agricultural labourers in the counties. For my own part, I do not think there is any necessity for apology on behalf of the hon. Member; I think the two positions are entirely consistent. I must say I think the apology is rather due from hon. Gentlemen opposite, who are able and willing enthusiastically to support a measure which would be a most disturbing measure with reference to the representation of the people, and who are yet unwilling to see passed this very small modicum of justice to a very worthy class which would entail very little alteration of our electoral system. How is it possible that they can support a proposal like that of the hon. Member for the Border Boroughs, which would enfranchise nearly 1,000,000 of people, all of them of the lowest class, who live by daily wages, and which would virtually disfranchise 60 or 70 boroughs and towns, and yet shrink with timidity from the proposal to give enfranchisement to some thousands of women, who would be equally distributed throughout all the constituencies, and therefore would not cause the slightest disturbance in the general arrangement of the representation? I do not support the Motion with the idea that it will confer upon women any great and extraordinary advantage, nor do I think that they are now suffering under any very great disadvantage or injustice which it is necessary to remove; but I do say there is one injustice to which my hon. Friend the Member for Liskeard might worthily direct his attention. I do say that the marriage laws of this country, as they stand now, are not fair between man and woman. What is more, if some of the propositions which are made in the House were to be carried into law, the thing would be made so much worse. A proposal has been brought forward and rejected time after time, which, if carried, would leave it all in favour of the man, and nothing in favour of the woman. I mean the proposal to do away with the prohibition of marriage with a deceased wife's sister. Time after time I have heard it argued that the husband should be free to marry his deceased wife's sister, or even his deceased wife's niece; but I never heard anything of the wife marrying her deceased husband's brother or nephew. There is a practical injustice, which would be prevented at once if we were to legislate in reference to the marriage law in a fair and equal manner. To alter the law entirely in favour of the man and not the woman is, I think, quite indefensible. With that single exception, I am not prepared to say that women are damaged or aggrieved by the laws of this country, or that they are going to be specially benefited by this change. But looking at it all round, seeing that they are performing the duties which their husbands performed before them, and that they are very often the most respectable persons in the position they occupy, looking at it also as a representation of property in its best sense, and that it will not disturb the present general electoral arrangements by disfranchising any particular towns or places, I say it is a very reasonable and just proposition, and I have much pleasure in supporting it.

MR. BRISTOWE: Sir, I have had the honour of a seat in this House for nine years, and I have always hitherto contented myself with giving a silent vote. That vote has always been against the Motion of the hon. Member for Liskeard (Mr. Courtney), and, so far as I can see into the future, that will always be my view of the matter as long as I have a seat in this House. I have listened to the speeches year after year upon this subject, and it appears to me that very little that is new has been advanced by those who have come forward in support of the measure. Now, the hon. Member who moved it to-night made an elaborate speech on a similar occasion last year. He tells us, and he tells us truly, I think, that there is no change in the form or substance of the Resolution as compared with the Bill which he had the honour of introducing on a former occasion. I believe that, and it is because I gave my entire opposition to the Bill last Session that I shall follow the same course this evening in opposing the Resolution. The hon. Member told us that he always had intended, and that he still intended—and my hon. Friend who has just sat down (Mr. Heygate) tells us he always intended, and he still intended—to exclude married women from the benefit of this proposed change. Well, I cannot comprehend for the life of me how it is that those who are in favour of this Resolution tell us they will do all they can to oppose the extension of this privilege to married women. It seems to me to be a most inconsistent proposition. "Oh," they say, "we want property represented." Well, then, how about the case of married women living apart from their husbands with property to their separate use? In many cases that occur property is not represented, and yet it is in the hands of a married woman. "Oh," they say, "I will never sanction anything which, by any possibility, can give the right to vote to a married woman." I want to know whether a married woman has not as great an interest in the matter as an unmarried woman? Of course she has. She has the interests of her property, of her husband, and of her children. As far as the interest of the country is concerned, the married woman has a far greater interest at stake than any single woman. Then we are told this is a matter in which the greatest interests are involved. That sounds a very fine phrase; but really is it not carrying the matter too far to try and make us believe that the greatest interests of the country are involved in a question whether women are or are not to have the right of voting? That is the way the hon. Member for Liskeard put it to-night; and he then gave us an illustration of the experience which he and other people have acquired of the advantage of the extension of the suffrage to women. He told us of some remote district in Wyoming. Really, I do not think any experience derived from that locality is to be brought into this House as a thing of great weight and importance for us to decide upon. The hon. Member also spoke of some borough which was unnamed, in which there was a ward inhabited by the lower class, and some energetic women introduced the question of bringing in a better representative. Well, I suppose all will admit that you cannot get a more useful canvasser, whether in town or in country, than an energetic woman; I believe she is the most useful canvasser you can possibly have. But because she is a most admirable canvasser I am not prepared to go to the length of saying that that is a reason why she should have the right of voting. That is quite a different thing. Then we were also told that this was very much wanted, and the reasons why were assigned. The hon. Member told us that he did not claim it as a right; but if I understood him properly, every word of his practically amounted to saying that he claimed it as a right, and in no other sense. It is quite true he said "I do not," but then every word of his speech did; and it is quite true that he said he claimed it on utilitarian grounds; but in his speech every word was devoted to the right, and the utilitarian grounds were utterly neglected and disappeared. We are told also that this will have a great weight on the character of women generally. I am sure the hon. Member for Liskeard would not have enunciated that proposition if he had not thoroughly believed it; but permit me to say that the fact of his being convinced of it does not convince me the least in the world, and unless he adduces arguments far beyond his own convictions, I shall be left quite in darkness on the subject. Well, Sir, some kindly individual, having regard to the ignorance in which I am, and desirous of enlightening me a little, has been kind enough to forward me a little work called *Opinions of Women on Women's Suffrage*, and which has been printed by "The Central Committee of the National Society for Women's Suffrage." I believe that work has been alluded to by my hon. Friend the Member for the University of Cambridge (Mr. Beresford Hope), who referred to certain extracts. All I can say is, if this book was forwarded to an unenlightened person, it would be considered as a curiously unsatisfactory document. Some of these extracts are very curious indeed. Here is one lady who tells us—

> "There is among women collectively much intellect, much conscientiousness, and much energy, which might be employed in public affairs to the benefit of the whole community. And further, men and women in our complex social state, of necessity act and re-act upon each other to so great an extent that men cannot progress far alone; civilization and good government must needs be hampered and delayed so long as women are excluded from sympathy and participation in the thought, the devotion to public causes, and the active patriotism by which improvements in legislation and society are effected."

If that means anything at all, it appears to me it goes the whole length to which the advocates of this system must go. This Resolution really means that women are not only eligible to elect, but must be eligible to be elected; it is impossible to stop there and say they have only a right to the suffrage; you must go further and say they are not only fit to sit in the House of Commons, but they are fit to occupy the Chair you occupy, Sir. If hon. Gentlemen put it on the question of right, you must concede that, for it is absurd to think you can stop there. Here is an extract from another lady, which is really very curious—

> "If 'taxation without representation is tyranny,' it is also robbery. Under the form of taxes, women are defrauded of vast sums of money, frequently for objects of which they wholly disapprove."

Consequently, if a woman is to pay money for taxes of which she disapproves, that is an act of robbery. Some of us on this side of the House disapproved on a recent occasion of the policy of the Government; but on that ground are we to charge the Government with robbery for taking taxes of which we did not approve? And yet that was adduced as an argument why we should give women the right of voting. Here is another delightful little piece—

> "So far from the truth is the reiterated statement of certain honourable M.P.'s, that

women do not desire the franchise, that in my large experience I have scarcely ever known a woman possessed of ordinary common sense, and who had lived some years alone in the world, who did not earnestly wish for it. The women who gratify these Gentlemen by smilingly deprecating any such responsibilities are those who have dwelt since they were born in well-feathered nests, and have never needed to do anything but open their soft beaks for the choicest little grubs to be dropped into them."

So curious is that passage as illustrative of the importance of giving the right of election to ladies that it rather struck me; but there is a little more of the same style behind it—

> "It is utterly absurd—and I am afraid the M.P.'s in question are quite aware they are talking nonsense—to argue from the contented squawks of a brood of these callow creatures that full-grown swallows and larks have no need of wings, and are always happiest when their pinions are broken."

It does appear to me that extract would be as well not printed in this little book. I suppose that extract would really have no influence on the opinion of this House, or any single Member, as I think it a somewhat exaggerated view of the National Society for Promoting the Suffrage of Women. Here is another lady who is giving us a good reason why they should have a vote. I want the House to see this, as this is an opinion that the women should have it as a matter of right. Hear what the lady says—

> "If women are too weak and too foolish to be trusted with votes, they ought in common fairness to be spared the burden of taxpaying. The latest arguments I have heard of—all the others having really been worn to death—against the manifest injustice of departing, in the case of unmarried women, from the Constitutional maxim about taxation and representation being joined together is that which is based on the ground that all Governments rest ultimately on physical force; and, therefore, it would not be well for the State to have a large class of voters who could vote, but could not—or, it is to be hoped, would not—be able to take part in the rough work of politics."

I want to know the meaning of that, though I suppose it means that they should be admitted to the suffrage, and nothing else. I will not give the House any more extracts from this valuable book. I hope it will get the circulation it deserves, and that, in my opinion, will not be very extensive. I cannot help thinking that the active, energetic, and very industrious ladies who were on, I presume, the acting committee of this society, are rather eccentric in the way in which they trust their interests to Members of this House. We must all recollect, in the first Parliament this matter was introduced, with all the earnestness and energy which, if we could not agree with, we might praise, by the hon. Member for Manchester (Mr. Jacob Bright). Everyone must admit it was managed by him in a way that was admirable; for a short time after he was no longer amongst us; but when he did return to this place, and was welcomed by all of us, I believe, one would have thought that the interest of this question would have been submitted to so tried an advocate as himself. But no—["It was!"]—Well, before that, the hon. and learned Member for Marylebone (Mr. Forsyth) undertook this duty, and discharged it for some time; and then, for some reason or other, he was put on one side, and now it is undertaken by the hon. Member for Liskeard. I quite admit the energy and ability with which he has undertaken the duty; but I fancy his success in this matter will not be any greater. The House must have observed there is one little matter that ought to be relied upon by hon. Members more than has been the case, and that is, as a certain hon. Member has been insisting upon—namely, that it is a matter of right for all women to exercise the privilege of voting. Well, then, one would naturally have supposed, in addition to that, he would have gone on a little further, and would have endeavoured to satisfy the House that those for whom he was anxious to get it wished for it. Certainly, he did touch upon that matter in the slightest manner at the end of his speech; but I ask the House if he argued that question? I admit he touched upon it. He spoke a great deal on the arts, and educational advantages, and so on; but he did not say hardly a word about the all-important question, whether those whom he was seeking to enfranchise wished for it at all. Surely, a Member of this House who introduces a measure of this kind should do something to show that those he was seeking to enfranchise were desirous of exercising the franchise. He gave extracts from the writings of a number of ladies who are zealous for the exercise of the franchise; but let me ask the House if they think those are representative women in the sense in which they ought to be considered as such when dealing with a large number of persons to be enfranchised, as in this case? This, I think, is clear—if the hon. Member wishes to enforce this matter strongly upon the House, he is certainly bound to give us some idea of the views of the majority of those whom he says wish to be enfranchised. I say he has done nothing of the kind; he has told us a great deal about their proficiency in the arts, but nothing at all about the wants or the wishes of those proposed to be enfranchised. On former occasions, the hon. Member has said—and the House was astonished at the view he put forth—that those who resisted the proposal should show grounds why women should not be enfranchised. I say the burden lies on those who wish to alter the law, and not on us. I say this change ought not to be made. My hon. and learned Friend the Member for Marylebone on former occasions never said a single word as to appealing to the women themselves. It is true the hon. Member for Manchester illustrated the great desire there was for the enfranchisement of women, by referring to a great number of cases where women had got on the register and had come to the Court of Common Pleas, where their claims to votes were ignored. From illustrations of that sort I appeal to the experience of hon. Members themselves. I ask every Member of this House, and I ask it fearlessly, amongst the whole range of their acquaintances how many women they know who desire to possess this franchise? How many do they know who protest strongly against it, and say they do not desire it? It is all very well to tell us of Petitions presented in favour of it; but I want to know how many of those petitioners are of the class it is proposed to enfranchise? Those who do not wish for it are the very persons who want it, some think; but the very persons now proposed to be enfranchised are clearly entitled to have opinions on this subject as well as my hon. Friend. Among my own acquaintance—I will not say to every "man," because here every "educated woman" is, I think, a better term—every educated woman, with one exception, deprecates the idea of being enfranchised under this Bill. I can, therefore, see no sufficient evidence in favour of this proposed extension of the franchise; or, at all events, only of the slightest possible character. In the history of civilized States there is no instance of governing powers enforcing the right of voting upon an unwilling class, and I contend that the persons who are proposed to be enfranchised are an unwilling class. I have heard that in Switzerland, many years ago, persons were subjected to a fine if they did not exercise certain functions, that of voting amongst others; and I cannot help thinking, even if this class of persons were enfranchised, there would be a large proportion who would not exercise the right he proposes to give. And on those grounds, believing it is an injury to force it on a class unwilling to accept this boon, as my hon. Friend thinks it is, and believing also that this House ought not to force it upon those who are unwilling, I oppose it, and hope this House will not pass it.

Mr. STORER: Mr. Speaker, I think the great majority of the community it is proposed to enfranchise, if canvassed from one end of England to the other, and from the drawing-room to the kitchen, would most undoubtedly object to have this privilege thrust upon them, according to the views of some of the most energetic, but not the most retiring, of their sex. The hon. Gentleman opposite (Mr. Courtney) has evidently come here under extreme pressure, if we may judge from those journals which we have had extracts from. One great objection to this measure is that the character of this House might deteriorate if this was carried into law, for in future the House would not consist of the most aged, and, perhaps, not of the most experienced men, as many would be selected on account of their good looks and their activity in canvassing. The hon. Member for North Staffordshire (Mr. Hanbury) has well said that the duties of the State ought to go with the privilege of voting, and I ask—Are these ladies prepared to fulfil those duties of the State which should go with the privilege? Are they prepared to serve on juries, as special constables, and, in cases of emergency, to defend their country in the tented field? Perhaps they would not object to defend their country by performing the duties of Volunteers, when the weather was fine, and if the uniform was a pretty one of their own choice; but I think very few would like to go further than that. There have been Amazons—and there may be still—as one lady I have heard of in particular went through the whole of the Peninsular War and was not discovered to be a woman until the end of the war; and I also have heard of that lady who is remembered in song as the celebrated Billy Taylor, who performed such heroic actions, that at the end she was presented to the Admiral, and "very much complimented for what she had done, and was appointed First Lieutenant to the gallant *Thunderbomb*." Let us be logical, and I hope the ladies and the supporters of the Resolution will reflect that the majority of ladies are perfectly satisfied with the domestic sphere in which they find themselves, and in which many of them are such bright examples. If by accident or choice this is denied them, then science, art, and literature—in which so many of them excel so greatly—are open to them; and even if they are not satisfied with those, they have the hospital, they have district visiting, they may become, as many are, the honoured agents of that charity which distinguishes them, not only in this country, but in all foreign countries, in which they have shone so ably and so conspicuously of late, and with which their names are so nobly associated; I hope they will be satisfied with the high position they already occupy. Above all, let them avoid the difficult task of competing with the sterner sex in the dusty and soiled arena of political warfare.

MR. COLLINS: In listening to my hon. Friend the Member for Newark (Mr. Bristowe), I had hoped I should have heard some solid argument, some substantial reason, which he would have been able to adduce for voting as he has stated he will on this question. In what he has told us, I confess I have been greatly disappointed, for he has not advanced any argument. He has quoted from the pamphlet issued by those active and accomplished ladies, and has cited extracts suited to his purpose; but he has not given us any substantial argument of his own—as far as my judgment goes, no substantial argument has fallen from him to support the line he has taken. He told us he agreed with those who stated that married women had the greatest interest in this question. I perfectly agree with him in that proposition; but, Sir, owing to the circumstances under which this case is considered, the unmarried ladies have more interest in this question than the great bulk of those who are married, and to them it would be doing a great wrong. That word "wrong" may be taken exception to; but the great wrong that is done to ladies is in not removing abuses. Now, Sir, with regard to the next case that is supplied, it is this — that logically, if women claim the right of a vote, they ought to claim the right to sit in this House. That is a threadbare argument. But then there is another class to whom reference has been made. Clergymen possess votes, but they never possessed the right of a seat in this House. One of the most important points that he has endeavoured to establish—although I cannot see much in it, at all events, it is one that can be easily controverted—is that women do not desire a vote—that is, a vote of electoral representation. Well, Sir, that can be very easily met, for there is evidence enough on this subject; we have this strong fact staring us in the face—that this is a question that has been making progress from year to year, from the time it was first introduced into this House 10 or 12 years ago. At that time, when the subject was brought into this House, Mr. John Stuart Mill challenged a division, and then the number who voted in support of it did not exceed 70; but now the number is something like 140 or 150. Is not that evidence that it is making progress? It does not look exactly as if the agitation were dying out. I will now address myself to the main question. Like the hon. Member for Newark, up to the present time I have taken no part in the discussions that have taken place in this House on the subject of women's disabilities, and not alone in this House, but out of the House, I have not allied myself with any of these agitations; I have never attended meetings; I have never taken an active personal interest in the proceedings, but nevertheless I have always taken a great interest in the question; I have contented myself up to the present time with giving a silent vote in support of the proposal; but as the opportunity presents itself I think it right I should record some of the reasons why I advocate this measure.

Sir, my reasons will not be of the philosophic character, or upon the philosophic principles, that the hon. Member for the University of Cambridge (Mr. Beresford Hope) contended that this question was based by its advocates. I am not influenced in my views, which I have entertained for a considerable time, by any sentimental or speculative considerations as regards the difference between the sexes, as to whether the moral and intellectual organizations of the one are superior to the other. That, to my mind, is altogether beside the question. Nor do I care to contend, though so much stress has been laid upon it from time to time, that this is an electoral right to vote for the Parliamentary franchise or representation. I shall not contend it is a right or a privilege; but I go on the broad basis that it is a necessity, in a sense, in order to enable those who feel aggrieved by the condition of the law as it stands at present to put pressure on candidates as their representatives. For a considerable time past I have noticed the injustice of the laws in reference to the treatment of women; those laws, to my mind, do not deal equal justice to women and to men. Sir, before the question was seriously considered I had my own opinions on this subject, and I felt sure that the state of the law in reference to women was not in harmony with the just requirements of a civilized community. I have felt that the law regarding the custody and guardianship of children was strained to the prejudice of women. I have felt that in the matter of education the laws affecting education were not in a healthy condition; and I have felt also very strongly that women in the humbler classes were entitled to a greater degree of protection than the existing laws provided. Well, Sir, it was for the purpose of remitting abuses, and not for conferring political rights, that I have been able to support the proposal introduced by my hon. Friend the Member for Liskeard (Mr. Courtney). At the same time, I cannot shut out from my mind the important matters of well-being to the State, such as the matters of municipal elections, school boards, vestries, and Poor Law Guardians, for the election of whom women are entitled to vote—and in some cases, such as school boards and Poor Law Guardians, have a right to a seat. In the matter of the municipal franchise there is this broad fact which shows the interest women take in these things—that the votes given by women at municipal elections compare very favourably—are in reasonable proportion—to those given by men. Now, that is an evidence, to my mind, that women do take an interest in these subjects, and that if the franchise were extended to them they would use their votes. But this Parliamentary franchise seems to be altogether too precious, and too much prized by its manly possessors, to allow women to share it. What is the argument that justifies that action? It is so ridiculous and absurd that, after reading it over and over again, and considering the separate points, I had a difficulty in understanding it. No doubt, my power of dissection was not very great; but eventually I did arrive at what I may call the main point of the argument. It was this—that those who are unable to rest their claim to the Parliamentary franchise on physical force are not entitled to it. How is that physical force to be evidenced? Why, it is to be evidenced by their ability to maintain peace and order at home, and to fight the battles of the country abroad. I confess I am altogether unable to understand an argument of this description. As to the employment of force, I take it that it was intended as a practical joke. At all events, I have not been able to understand it. But what is the state of the law? Can it be denied that inequalities exist which are most unjust and injurious in the administration of the law as affecting the condition and the position of women? Why, Sir, what do we find? A point in the question has struck me with great force, and for a considerable time past, and it is this—that it is one of the strangest and most anomalous positions in a free and liberal Constitution such as ours, that the fact of a woman's marrying is made by the laws of this country absolutely penal. Absolutely, by the marriage laws of this country, a woman cannot contract marriage without sacrificing her rights over her personal property. By the fact of the marriage, the woman's property reverts to and vests absolutely in the husband. Is that a state of things that married women would elect to have for themselves, or in the interests of their children? Is that the position which they would choose if they were not forced into it by the state of the law? As to the property of married women under these circumstances, I have had some experience of the world, and have seen sufficient of it—and every hon. Member of this House must have seen sufficient of it from time to time—to know and to feel that at times very serious and grievous results have come from the state of the law as it stands at present on this matter. Before a woman marries, in order to obviate the difficulty that exists with regard to the inheritance of property, a sort of legal fiction called a trust is created. Friends are appointed in the first instance; it may be that reliable friends are got as trustees. In a short time, or at some time or other, the husband dies. He leaves provision for his wife and her young children. Well, in the course of time, it may take place that the trustees, who were kindly and who took an interest in the widow and children, die too. What comes next? Why this—that other trustees are appointed in their place, and it may turn out that from want of association, want of acquaintance, or, at all events, want of proper feeling towards the wife and children, it may happen, and it often does happen, that they turn out to be bad or unscrupulous men, and they alienate or dispose of, for their own purposes, the property that has been left—they take it from the children and reduce them to want. Does that not prove to practical men in this House that the law, as it stands, is wrong, is unjust? Most of the Members of this House must be aware that such things do occur—nay, most of them must have had such cases under their own personal cognizance. Well, if the law were altered, and women had a right—as they have elsewhere, and this is a point which I shall deal with presently—if they had the power to exercise a right over their own personal property in their married state, do you suppose a state of things like this could possibly occur? My hon. Friend the Member for Newark told us, to my surprise, that the condition of things we contend for does not exist in any country in Europe. Why, Sir, I am perfectly and personally acquainted with a condition of things which proves altogether the inaccuracy of my hon. Friend's statement. I happen to have a somewhat intimate acquaintance with a country that it has been the fashion to abuse in England more than I should have cared to abuse it—a country that has been charged with barbarism, want of civilization, and I do not know how many things of that kind. I allude to Russia. With the laws and social arrangements of Russia I have a tolerably good acquaintance. What is the state of things in that country? Why it is this—that in the Assembly of Nobles—that is, proprietors of property—women have a right to vote; and to show the equity of the principles upon which the laws in respect of property are based, if a woman of the proper rank should not have the required qualification to enable her to vote, she may associate herself with others in the same position, so that the cumulative or accumulated property of those who associate themselves together gives her a right to vote. To go to a humbler class, there is another instance. There is a certain class of Communards in Russia, representatives of a system where democracy exists in its brightest form side by side with the most aristocratic personal government in the world. What is the position of the women in these Communards? Why it is this—that every woman who is the head of a family—that is, a woman who possesses a share in the communal property that has not been divided amongst her children—has a right not alone to vote at their meetings or take a part in their proceedings, but she has a right to speak in the Assembly, and express any opinions she may consider it in the interests of herself and her family to express. And there is again—I hope I do not bore the House by going into these matters, but there is a great deal of stress laid upon this subject, and this, together with the fact that there are probably few in this House so well acquainted with the country of which I am speaking as I am myself—there is again a system of local government at which women are represented. I refer to the provincial councils or zemptzvos, for the members of which women have a right to vote, whether they are married or unmarried, provided they have attained the age of 21. All this I have stated in answer to the argument that no civilized country in Europe has given women what is alleged to be so exceptional and strange a right as that which we contend for—for the intelligent and educated women of the country. I will go one step further, and tell the House that not alone in the matter of votes, but in the matter of property—and this I should like to impress upon the House—every woman in Russia who is possessed of personal estate or personal property, whether she marries or remains unmarried, has for the whole of her life an absolute right over that property. Her husband has no power whatever to deal with it in any way, or to interfere with her in the management of it. If she wishes to give up the control of it to him, she has to do so as she would yield it to a stranger. Well, I have no doubt whatever that the zealous and intelligent opponents of this Resolution will tell me that the condition of things to which I have been referring, as regards the right of voting and the right of possessing property, results from the condition of Russia, from the fact that it is semi-barbarous and uncivilized. Well, if that be the case with regard to Russia, let us take the converse side of the picture. I will take, for the purpose of supporting my view, a country that we are in the habit of referring to, and upon which our attention has every day and every hour been concentrated recently—namely, Zululand. What is the condition of things there? As regards the position of women it is this—that every man who wishes to marry or to possess a wife, buys her with a certain number of cattle. That is the difference between the two countries. Will it be contended that Russia has given these privileges to women from the fact of her not being civilized? If so, what will be said of Zululand?—one is civilized, and the other is barbarous. How does England compare with these two countries? It is like neither one nor the other. We do neither the one nor the other—neither give these privileges to our women, nor buy our wives. As I have pointed out in my argument, in dealing with the property of women who are about to marry, we are obliged to have recourse to stratagem for the purpose of preserving that property to them—and, in fact, adopting a course of proceeding which, if it were not sanctioned by law, we should say was neither just nor honest. Well, Sir, I will not weary the House by going into the other points that have been raised during the course of this debate. I will only touch on one matter—namely, that of education. I contend, as I have always done, that, with regard to the matter of education, the laws are not in the condition that most of us would desire to see them in. I will not enter fully into the question, and I think I can better support my view by reading a few lines extracted from this pamphlet which the hon. Member for Cambridge University has reminded my hon. Friend the Member for Liskeard he did not make a single reference to throughout the course of his speech. I will make a reference to it, however, in support of this view that dangers are going on in our social system affecting the condition of women. The question of female education is making great progress, I am glad to say. The condition of this discussion is very different from what it was a few years ago. I will not refer to it at greater length, but I will read an extract from a letter from one of these ladies dealing with this subject. I hope the House will excuse me for troubling it, but I will not occupy it long. The writer says—

> "As the social position of women in the civilized world is very different from what it was in primitive times, it is only reasonable to believe that what has altered and improved so much in the past must be capable of alteration and improvement in the present and in the future. There are changes which the generations of to-day are witnessing in the education of women and their employment in professions and trades hitherto closed to them. It appears to me that the extension of the franchise to women is only a natural concession to a just demand made in conformity to the advancement of civilization and the changes effected by the acquirement of new privileges and responsibilities."

Well, Sir, one word before I conclude. Most fortunately for us in the discussion of this matter, it is no Party question. No individual nor Party can claim a monopoly of respect and consideration for women. Sir, the supporters of this Resolution, as well as its opponents, are influenced alike, I am sure, by feelings of affection and devotion towards those who must be affected by it. But I will not continue on this point, for I know there are others who will follow me who will deal more exhaustively with it. All I can say is, that I am so convinced of the desirability, expediency, and justice of dealing with this question for the purpose of removing the disabilities of women which I have been referring to, and so conscious am I that before long a sense of justice and right feeling in this country will recognize the claim of women for redress for what we all—some in the abstract, and some as practical men—admit to be wrongs, that the country, if not this House on the present occasion, I believe, will see there are inequalities which, as I stated before, are unjust and ungenerous. I am conscious that a change is approaching, and I have the utmost possible pleasure and gratification in being afforded this opportunity of stating to the House and putting on record my adherence to the principle of this Resolution. I have the greatest possible pleasure in supporting the Motion.

EARL PERCY: I am very much obliged to the hon. Member who has just sat down (Mr. Collins) for admitting that those who oppose this Motion are actuated by no improper motives—that no argument of that kind can be employed against them. I must say, however, that from the tone of the language used by some other hon. Members, it would seem that we who are opposed to this extension of the suffrage to women are guilty of great injustice, and have no feelings of sympathy for the other sex, and cannot understand the motives which actuate them. The hon. Member who brought forward this Resolution (Mr. Courtney) has assured us there is no change in the principle, or in the "definition" I think he said, of what he and his Friends have in view, and the hon. Gentleman who has just sat down says they think great progress is being made in this affair. I should rather argue that the hon. Member for Liskeard is advocating a failing cause. I would argue so for this reason—that I observe the hon. Member, after repeated attempts, Session after Session, to pass a Bill, is at last forced to take refuge in a Resolution. If this Resolution simply embodies, without going further than, or in any way retreating from, the original grounds of the measure which he has so frequently endeavoured to induce the House to accept, it is because it is felt that the measure itself is not receiving that acceptance which the hon. Member thinks it ought to receive. Perhaps we have a Resolution now, because the hon. Gentleman believes the lateness of the hour to which a discussion of this kind can be carried will enable some hon. Members to vote who have not voted before on the Bills brought forward on Wednesdays, when the House adjourns at 6 o'clock. I cannot congratulate the hon. Member for Liskeard on his position tonight, because I find he has estranged the Chancellor of the Exchequer, who has, I think, on other occasions supported the Bills. I am greatly struck also by a change of front, or, at any rate, a change in the method of treatment or handling of this question. I had not the advantage of being present last Session when the Bill was discussed; but I have referred to the record of the debate on that occasion, and I am struck by this fact—that the hon. Member for Liskeard treated the question then far more from an argumentative point of view than he has done today. To-day he has chiefly confined himself to quoting instances where this suffrage has been tried, and pointing to the success it has met with. He pointed also to instances in which he thinks great injustice is done to women because this privilege is not accorded to them. He quoted one instance that I must confess staggered me a great deal, apparently much more than it did any other hon. Member. He quoted the case of the State of Wyoming, but I was very much relieved when I discovered that the people of Wyoming are —at any rate, in one respect—different from the people in this country. He told us what influence the women wielded, and he spoke of the effect of that influence in some respects; but he failed to tells us what the effect was on the women themselves, or the general population. He said no inconvenience was occasioned by women going to the poll, for the extraordinary reason that the men never forgot that their mothers were women. I must say—and I regret to say it—that as far as experience goes that reflection in this country has not prevented men, on occasions of great public excitement, from treating women in a manner in which, if this Bill passed, I should be very sorry to see them treated. It appears to me that the real difference between those who vote for this measure and those who oppose it is rather one of principle than of expediency. I am quite aware that the hon. Member for Liskeard has told us, or, at any rate, that he has implied, that he does not so much argue this question as a matter of right——

Mr. COURTNEY: Perhaps the noble Lord will allow me to explain, as I appear to have been misunderstood by other hon. Members. I said I did not argue the claim of women as a matter of abstract right. I put the claim on the ground of expediency, holding that expediency is the basis of right.

Earl PERCY: I am very much obliged to the hon. Member for his explanation; but on referring to his speech last year, I found that he used different language then. He said that in proposing the Bill, as in bringing forward any question before the House, the first thing to be done was to appreciate and point out the necessity of arriving at some common ground and base. Then he went on to make a number of assumptions, which, I believe, may have misled many hon. Members when they voted for his Bill, and it is because I cannot accept his assumptions that I cannot vote for his Resolution. One of his assumptions is this—"Every Member of this House is of opinion that representative government is one of the best forms of government, and that it would be to the interests of the House to make ourselves as representative as possible." Well, we are all agreed in one sense, that the representative is the best form of government. But to say that we must make ourselves as representative as possible, and extend the suffrage to all those who require in every way to be represented, is an argument that I, for one, cannot agree to. Where will such an argument stop, I should like to know? It seems to be assumed that the vote is a remedy for "All the ills that flesh is heir to," and I know no instance in which that assumption is more apparent than in the advocacy of the admission of women to the franchise. We hear from hon. Members who support this Motion of the inconveniences and wrongs to which women are subjected in the present state of things, and the inference must be that they will be remedied through this measure. Now, if as is argued, women have the same rights and interests as men, surely men will protect those rights and interests which are their own; and if they have rights and interests which are different from those of men, I should like someone to point out how their position will be improved by the possession of the franchise? The chief evils which women are subjected to, if we are to believe the statements we constantly find in that journal which I believe has been circulated among all the Members of this House, are evils which arise from the abuse of power by men, and chiefly by the abuse of power of husbands over their wives. I confess that the details given on that subject, in the journal to which I have referred, are so harrowing that it is often almost impossible to read them; and I cannot conceive with what object those details are constantly brought forward, except it be for the purpose of arguing that if a measure of this kind passed into law those evils would not continue. But I cannot conceive how the admission of women to the franchise could have that effect. I do not believe there is a single Member of this House who, if he could diminish the suffering of women at the hands of those who have power over them, would hesitate for a moment to support a measure which he thought would have that result; but before we are asked on that account to pass a measure of this kind, it should be distinctly pointed out how it will accomplish the object in view. I fear that the worst evils suffered by women are suffered by married women, and though the hon. Member who spoke last considers that married women might safely trust their interests to be represented by the unmarried, I confess that when I read the pamphlet which has been so much quoted this evening, and see what is written by those who make themselves most prominent in this cause, I cannot say that I feel disposed to commit the interests of the married to the unmarried. I do not think that the interests of married women would be very well represented by those who are capable of using the argument with which the hon. Member for Liskeard concluded his speech. He told us that although it was often said that women did not want the franchise, he was prepared, though it was a paradox, to affirm that those who did not want it wanted it most, and he went on to explain his meaning by saying that those who did not want the franchise were wanting in intelligence, in culture, and in education. I appeal to the House whether that is a justifiable description of those women who do not want the franchise. I am sorry that such an opinion of their sex should be put forward by those women who come forward as the advocates of this measure. The hon. Member for Liskeard reminded us that the clergy were permitted votes, but were not allowed to sit in this House, and he drew a parallel between their case and the case of women, whom he wished to see in possession of the franchise, but not in a position to be elected as Members. There is a Bill before the House at present to remove the disability of the clergy, thereby showing that a portion of their number, at all events, feel the restriction to be irksome and unjust. How that is I am not here to argue; but the argument of the position of the clergy cannot apply to the question before us. No one would suppose that a clergyman is by his nature incapacitated or unfitted for the exercise of the franchise; but what was supposed was that he had other duties incompatible and incongruous with the duties he would have to discharge in his calling, and the duties of Membership of this House, though not with the exercise of the franchise. But our objection to the exercise of the franchise by women stands upon the ground that we consider women unfitted by nature for the discharge of that duty. I do not say that there are not certain women who would duly and properly exercise the franchise; but our argument is that there is a barrier, by nature and by society, against it, and that is precisely the order of things which the hon. Gentleman wishes to upset. He told us so. He told us that his object was to make women independent of men. I venture, on the contrary, to think that it is better for their interests that they should remain in their present position. I admit that men have in this, as in every other relation of life, abused their power; but I do not believe the remedy for that is to be found in upsetting the existing order of things, in revolutionizing society, and putting women in a position in which they would be independent of men.

Mr. HOPWOOD: I must say—if I may say it without irreverence—that Divine Providence has been unduly invoked on several occasions in this House to settle these questions of county franchise and woman's suffrage, and we have just heard it authoritatively delivered that it is ordained that the present state of things, as regards women, shall continue. And we are referred to Revelation as the best evidence that it is so ordained. If we are to go to Revelation to settle the matter, we have abundance of choice of the institutions under which to put women, varying from a state of slavery to polygamy, the willing slave, and the Royal sharer of a Throne. I do not think, therefore, that that will help us; and when I turn to the cumulative wisdom of this House to settle the question, what do I find? We are sitting here with a certain smug complacency dealing with women as a class, settling to our enormous satisfaction what they think of us, what we think of them, how far they are entitled to our confidence—indeed, we have been distributing in a lavish manner, with the historic grace of the hon. Member for Cambridge University (Mr. Beresford Hope), by turns, rewards, praises, and criticism; and we have settled, infinitely to our own satisfaction, that we are right, beyond cavil. I laughed at some of the jokes of the hon. Member; but when I did so, I was not quite sure that I should have laughed at them if a woman had been sitting here among us. I am not sure that the hon. Member would have evoked woman's laughter, and it is woman's laughter, or the laughter of an approving audience, that we seek on this occasion. Why cannot we be serious upon it? It is a moderate thing to ask. Many of you say that you know women of ripe intelligence and rare ability, capable to advise, to console, and to cherish. We ask you but to give them power to vote. Nothing very extraordinary, and perhaps a little commonplace. And this is all we ask for women. You say it is too much. It is wonderful to hear the arguments put forward. Consider the danger of deterioration of the character of women—the destruction of all the charms of woman. You say, we should no longer find it necessary to approach them upon the terms of ordinary drawing-room courtesy, but they would be persons to be cajoled or flattered after the manner of some male electors. The vote, I apprehend, is a small matter to grant. I do not say that it is a small matter considered as a privilege. It is one of those matters small in itself, but which, the moment it is denied, becomes a great grievance;

and in that sense, when it is sought for by women, it is desirable that this small matter should be conceded. It is only to elect Members like ourselves that they desire the franchise. There is no man in this House at the present moment, if I may say so respectfully, who is not quite competent to consider and deal with any one of the affairs that come before it. Is that true or not? Every man in this House feels himself capable of dealing with any question that arises here to whatever part of the world it relates, and even to enter upon a discussion about the State of Wyoming if complications should arise between it and us. But let us compare ourselves with women we know. Cannot we parallel those paragons of men we know with some women as capable as they are? What, then, is the reason for the refusal of this request? We have only to argue this on one of two grounds. Either it will benefit the race of women and not hurt the country, or it will benefit the country and not hurt the race of women. If we make out either of these propositions, we are entitled to this measure, because to raise the status, to improve the minds of women, must be admitted to be a rare enterprize, worthy of the most earnest endeavours of a House of Legislature; and to raise the country, to improve the country, is a duty to which our best efforts are always directed. Will this improve the status of women? When I ask for information upon the grounds for assuming that it will not have that effect, I am answered with references and extracts, taken haphazard from a book, and these interlarded with comments, though always in a kindly and good-humoured spirit, by the hon. Member for Cambridge University. Nothing unworthy ever escapes his lips in these discussions, but still he is prejudiced on the subject, and it is quite possible that if he were in another place, and in presence of one or other of those ladies he is criticizing, he might stand more in awe of them, and feel his liberty of speech a little coerced. I felt at first a little terrified by the opposition of an hon. Gentleman of his talent and long experience, and I trembled as I heard his extracts, for I felt that even a cause like this might be prejudiced by some injudicious or imprudent advocate. I listened, therefore, attentively; but what did I find? Really nothing but what was exceedingly innocent; nothing in the world that anybody could say was false reasoning. The style was perhaps a little florid in one or two passages; but who of us does not occasionally resort to a trifle of exaggeration, and it is not always that a florid style is exaggeration. If you are talking to stupid or unwilling minds, you must colour the picture a little stronger to enforce conviction. Then the hon. Member for Newark (Mr. Bristowe), who poured forth an abundance of words, read some of the same extracts, but for the life of me I could not see what they proved in support of his view. It is said that women do not desire this, and my hon. Friend near me (Mr. Courtney) has been taken to task by the noble Lord opposite (Earl Percy) for having said, while advocating this measure, that women are uneducated. But I think the noble Lord misunderstood my hon. Friend. What I understood him to say was that they were not educated *quoad hoc*, and to illustrate what I mean, I would refer to the use made of the word "educated" by the present Prime Minister with regard to his Party. That, I think, is a very apt illustration of what is meant when we speak of women not asking for the vote because they are not educated. Education in that sense means the opening up of the mind to the importance of questions to be encountered, though not, I hope, as in that memorable instance, making the educated unsay all they had said before, or bringing them to some belief politically which they had bound themselves by the strongest ties never to look upon with favour. It is said that women do not ask for this; but that argument has been already disposed of. Apply the same test to education. In the beginning, how many women asked for higher education? Remarkably few. Until the small band of those to whom this idea came, and who were so greatly strengthened in their enterprize by Mr. Mill's thoughtful advocacy, were able to get the question raised in Parliament, the question of the higher education of women had made very small progress indeed. The education of women up to that time may be said to have been in a state of disgraceful neglect. Only accomplishments of the prettiest sort were indulged in, but of higher education there was none. And the promoters of this movement may claim that, in advocating that the suffrage should be given to women, they are endeavouring further to set free the enterprize of the sex to acquire that education which they have shown themselves capable of indulging in, which they have by their own personal vigour so forcibly and so effectually won. I was sorry to hear the noble Lord describe this as a failing cause, and I think he will find to his surprise that it is not. The very instance he gives of the change from Bill to Resolution does not always hold good, as he will find in the case of the Burials Question. I ask anyone if a cause can be described as failing, when it has received the support of prominent Members of a Government, men of a ripe age long before they determined in its favour, men of acknowledged sagacity like the Postmaster General and the Chancellor of the Exchequer? Are they going to desert us to-night? Will either of them have the courage to support us; or will they wait till this is a question upon which "Aye" or "No" must be said? I suppose that is so. The Conservative mind, having arrived at the conclusion that this would be a dangerous move, after having been deluded for some time into the belief that if it were conceded it would bring perennial power and influence to that side, may, when enlightened again by some of their Party, be disposed to give up their opposition, and then we shall have the question taken up as one of expediency; but the Party opposite seems to have made up its mind to wait till a great move is made on this side. I remember when, on a former occasion, a strong appeal was made on the score of Party, an hon. and learned Friend of mine (Sir Henry James) in doleful tones prophesied the downfall of the Liberal Party if it indulged in such feelings, for women would be so Conservative; but, if that were so, we ought not in these questions to be bound by Party considerations in the course we pursue. I trust a few of us, and probably the hon. Member for Liskeard, after his speech of the other night against the extension of the county franchise, will be prominent among the number, will be ready to do even unpopular things in this House to prove that its character has not deteriorated.

MR. RAIKES: The hon. and learned Member who has just addressed himself to this question (Mr. Hopwood) has not contributed very much to our store of information on the subject, although he has done his best to rid himself and the House of the impression that the friends of the hon. Member for Liskeard (Mr. Courtney) are not greatly in love with his proposal. Women regard this question with indifference, and the main reason why women acutely alive to all matters involving injustice to themselves fight shy of this idea is that they regard the proposal as very hollow and insincere. It leaves out of consideration the great body of the women of this country who certainly possess that experience of life which should qualify them, before all others of their sex, for the exercise of the franchise. We are always told that woman is the equal of man; but, at the same time, it is proposed that a married woman shall not be treated as the equal of her single sister. I cannot for the life of me understand, and I have listened to these debates for many years, how any practical man can come before this House and propose a change to this House so vast as to its theoretical importance, and so extremely limited, so trumpery, if I may be allowed to use that expression, in its practical effect. We are told that all these great movements are going on which are to restore to woman the great place which she occupied as the equal of man in some antediluvian, or, as I believe, pre-Adamite day. We are required to re-construct the very basis of society to introduce a change only warranted by principles which must affect the life and habits of every man and woman in this country; and this is proposed to be done simply and solely to enable a few estimable widows and acidulated spinsters to possess a privilege which will be almost imperceptible in the body of electors of these Kingdoms. I ask the House to consider, if it is not almost impertinence to ask them to consider that which is so obvious, what are the qualifications of which the existing Parliamentary franchise is the test. A man is endowed with the franchise in this country not because he is a householder, but because his position as a householder affords a test of certain qualities which are likely to make him a valuable citizen and a useful elector. His position of householder is supposed to argue that he has had some of the experience of life, that he has been brought in contact with some of those great problems and common-place difficulties which go so far to sober the judgment and to produce something like political, or, at all events, practical sagacity. But what we are now asked to do is to exclude from the franchise the whole body of the women of this country who are in the same position, or rather some 95 per cent of them. All the married women of the country are to be excluded from the franchise, and those very qualities of household management and the daily experience of the difficulties of life which at present are tested, as far as men are concerned, by that household qualification, are to go for nothing in the case of a woman, except she enjoys the advantage of single blessedness, or of having seen her husband go out of the world before her. Anything more unpractical I have never seen brought before the House, and I have never been able to believe that any of the Members on this side or the other side, who have advocated this cause, have been serious in proposing to deal with it in this particular form. But it is not this question in this particular form that is sought to be brought before the House. It is a very much larger question, and that question has been discussed to-night almost to the exclusion of the Resolution. We have had all sorts of lofty sentiments and aspirations from the hon. and learned Member for Stockport (Mr. Hopwood) and the hon. Member for Kinsale (Mr. Collins); but very little has been said in the course of the debate as to the real question involved in the extension of the franchise, such as must necessarily follow if the Resolution of the hon. Member for Liskeard is adopted, and an Act of Parliament passed upon the basis it presents. The debate has rather been distinguished by that vague kind of declamation which always prevails when the real matter in the thoughts of the speakers is rather one of first principles than of practical legislation. I am quite willing, for the sake of argument, to admit that women, as a rule, are as worthy of the franchise as men, if by worth we are to mean the possession of moral principle; and I would also, for the same purpose, admit that women, as a rule, would exercise the franchise as well as men. As far as I can judge from the Acts by which we have given them other franchises, they have exercised them well. But this is not the question to which we have to restrict ourselves. The real question is not whether women can exercise the franchise, or whether they exercise it well, but what would be the effect of giving them the Parliamentary franchise? And this question ought to be considered from three points of view—First, the interests of women; second, the interests of the other sex; and, third, the interests of society at large. With regard to the first of these points of view, I think it would be very difficult to prove by any advocate of woman's cause, however enthusiastic he might be, that the higher interests of women have been served in any way by the agitation which has disturbed the country in regard to this question. The hon. and learned Member for Stockport has told us that the agitation has stimulated the appetite of women for higher knowledge. I should be inclined to say that the sort of crusade that has been preached throughout the length and breadth of the land, to the great annoyance of mankind and to the great disgust of the majority of womankind, has tended in a great degree to prejudice the mind of the country against these attempts to give to women what the world might perhaps have otherwise deemed a better position in the work of public life. Speaking for myself only, I confess that when I see on the programme of any particular movement some of those names with which in the history of this question we have become so well acquainted, I am inclined to regard them with something more than suspicion. Suppose for a moment that we regard this question from the point of view of the results of this agitation—and as an agitation I look upon it as one of unmixed evil—suppose the proposal of the hon. Member for Liskeard were crystallized into law, does anyone believe that the additional 3 or 4 per cent of voters would trouble themselves much about questions really important to women—questions relating to divorce, the custody of children, the protection of women's earnings, and matters of that kind? I am bound to say that, as far as I have been able to see the interest they take in politics, these are the last questions on which they would be found to express their opinions. I rather think that their opinions would be much more likely to be exercised on questions affecting the liberty of men, on some pet idea for the endowment of this or that religious body, or on the question of the sale of intoxicating liquors. These are the questions that would be most likely to affect deeply the mind of the voters who would thus be added to the constituency. The new elector would be more likely to give a vote for the endowment of some particular sect, or for the shutting up of some particular public-house, than to interest herself on the other questions to which I have referred, which more truly concern women, and with which Parliament, as at present constituted, has dealt more or less wisely on different occasions. If the franchise were to be given to women, the legislative power of this House would not be strengthened in any material degree, and women, as a class, would suffer by asserting their equality with men and becoming their avowed antagonists in the race of life. In that contest you may depend upon it that women would get very much the worst of it. What, I ask, is the position in which women must be regarded if this claim be acceded to? Are they in future to be regarded simply as other men, to receive the same education and develop the same faculties, and to challenge us to constant rivalry in every walk of life? You may depend upon it that in this conflict women can gain nothing, but they would be likely to lose a great deal. Now, as to the results of such a change to men. Will men be happier by the removal of that diversity of tastes and training which now is the true cause of concord? Fancy a Member returning home, tired even of the eloquence of the hon. and learned Member for Stockport, and finding there a politician in petticoats ready to continue the debate! Yet if women are to perform the same duties, who can blame them if they cultivate the same faculties and follow the same models as men? The hon. and learned Member for Stockport may wish to bring women as nearly as may be to his own level. I think that most of us entertain an ideal of women as unlike as possible to the hon. and learned Member for Stockport. But perhaps the most important question for us to consider is as to the effect which the proposal would have upon the interests of society at large. What would be its effect regarded not from the sexual point of view as a matter of individual convenience, but upon the fabric of a great organization developed through a long course of years. The plan suggested by the hon. Member for Liskeard is simply the pilot balloon of a system that would eventually destroy the home and cover London with institutions of a sexless and epicene character, in which men and women, young and old alike, would meet, without any of the controlling influences, without any of those checks and safeguards which, at the present time, tend to soften and temper the relations between the two. I, for one, have regarded with some amount of anxiety the attempts recently made to introduce female students into Universities, because I do not approve of the suggestion that there should be uncontrolled communication between young persons of both sexes at the time when women are passing through the most defenceless period of their lives. On the broad ground, then, of men and women setting out on an equality in the race of life, I do not think it can be suggested that the two sexes are equally endowed by nature with those faculties that could make the contest an equal one. I would ask the House—Is this proposal to be submitted to it year after year, not only with a diminishing support here, but with an absence of interest in its favour throughout the country? Are we to listen time after time to the same speeches, composed of the same arguments, made by the same hon. Members, and always with the same result? The country cannot be moved upon this matter, even by the drawing-room meetings and speeches of the hon. Member for Liskeard. The hon. Member must alter the profound convictions which animate society in every class of both sexes on this subject before he can bring about the change which, under a paltry and flimsy pretext, he has tried to introduce. I trust that the House will pronounce against a change against which the hon. Member must know the great majority of his fellow-countrymen, and, still more, the large majority of his fellow-countrywomen, are arrayed.

MR. PARNELL: Sir, I speak to-night for the first time on this question, and I wish to add my voice in favour of the Resolution brought forward by the hon. Member for Liskeard (Mr. Courtney), although I am not able to go the whole length to which many of the advocates of women's rights would lead us. I have never been able to see, although I feel the force of much that is said by hon. Members who oppose the Motion, why the House should refuse a trial to the proposal of the hon. Gentleman. It is one which is admitted to be of a limited nature; indeed, the hon. Member for Chester (Mr. Raikes) has just told us that the Motion before the House is of such a character that it would be infinitesimal in its results. All that is asked is to give the franchise to unmarried women and widows, and we are told that the number would be reduced by those who would not avail themselves of the privilege if it were given to them. If it can be shown that the result would not be to injure anyone or hurt any particular interest, I do not see what harm could be done by acceding to this proposal. I think also a number of hon. Members, who pursue a particular line of argument on this question, ought to vote in favour of the Motion of the hon. Member for Liskeard, in order that they might ascertain by experience whether women are really indifferent to the franchise or not. I imagine that if we were to put the question to most women—"What do you think of the franchise?" they would answer—"I know nothing about politics." Young ladies are sometimes not very particular as to the amount of humbug they adopt in order to carry their aims and objects. They do not tell their minds to every man, and they may attempt a subterfuge when people attempt to get at their opinions, especially on political questions; still it seems to be a sort of social law that women should not say anything to men that is not pleasing. With regard to the form in which this question has been brought forward, I have always understood that it was purely a matter of convenience whether the question should be approached in this House by a Resolution or by a Bill, and I think it is perhaps more convenient that it should be discussed in its present shape. The hon. Member for Liskeard has been taunted with having at first treated the question from a merely philosophical point of view, and with treating it now from a more practical point of view, thus indicating that he is conscious of the advocacy of a failing case; but I do not see that there is any real ground for that assumption; indeed, it is in accordance with my experience that we usually endeavour to treat questions arising in this House in the first instance from a philosophical point of view, and when, by that means, we have been enabled to bring these questions into prominence, and public opinion has become ripe for their solution, we give to them the practical form which eventually results in legislation. This is what has been done by the hon. Member for Liskeard. With regard to what has been said on the other side of this House, it has been admitted both by the noble Earl the Member for North Northumberland (Earl Percy), and by other speakers, that women have the same rights and interests as we have; but I think it has been practically proved that men have neglected those rights and interests. I suppose that there is no question that has arisen in the history of Parliament which has made a more real and solid progress than this, and of late years laws have been passed which have rendered it possible for women to exercise a control over their own property, which they were not formerly allowed to exercise. But much remains to be done in this direction. Men have power to enact for the protection of women; therefore, I think that the case has been proved, so far as expediency goes, for, having that power, you have neglected to use it. Consequently, women are justly entitled to say—"Since you have neglected to protect us, at least let us try to protect ourselves." We have, as an instance, the school board and municipal elections to show us that women can, without profit, take part in political matters. You know that municipal elections and school board elections are fought out on Party lines—municipal elections almost so, and school board elections very frequently so—and we see that no baneful evil to society has resulted by allowing women to vote. We see, on the contrary, that they have proved, as members of the school boards, that they are not only well qualified to be members, but absolutely indispensable. There are many men who will admit that they can point to female members of school boards, whose presence at the board is almost indispensable. School board elections and municipal elections take place once a-year, but Parliamentary elections take place only about once every five years. If social life has not been disturbed, if the sanctity of the heart has not been invaded, if all those finer feelings which women ought to be possessed of have not been destroyed or vitiated by the participation of women in municipal and school board elections, surely we should not fear that all these finer feelings will be destroyed by the participation of women, once every five years, in Parliamentary Elections. Elections are not what they formerly were. We have not the riot and turmoil such as we had in former contested elections; but now a woman can go in the polling-booth and register her vote just as quietly as if she were in her drawing-room. There is none of that violence and contest which characterized elections under the old system. You will, therefore, have a guarantee that women would not be brought in contact with conditions which are in their nature unsuited to the sex; and I should think, from that point of view, there is really no argument why we should not assent to the Motion of the hon. Member for Liskeard. Then we have the further consideration as to whether the mind of woman can be so perverted by reading newspapers, and by considering political questions during the intervals when she is called upon to exercise her vote, as to upset the foundations of society, and disturb any of the laws which now regulate the condition of our social existence. It seems in this way also there would be no such disturbance, because many women now are just as much interested in politics as many men, and we have seen that women can turn their attention to politics and can express their opinion upon political matters without losing those finer attractions which are the special attributes of the sex. Therefore, Sir, although, as I said previously, my mind is not made up as to the necessity of going further than the Motion of the hon. Member for Liskeard, I think we might very fairly grant the very small trial which he asks us to make—that we might give a very limited class of women the right to vote once every four or five years at the elections for Members of Parliament.

SIR HENRY JAMES: Sir, it is some years ago that I formed the opinion that very little that was novel could be added to any debate on this subject, and I certainly have come to the conclusion that I cannot say anything that is new. Whilst there is nothing that has occurred this evening to cause me to change that opinion, and certainly nothing passing through my mind to induce me to alter the decision I had arrived at, there are one or two circumstances connected with the change of the form of the Resolution now submitted to the House, and connected also with the peculiar nature of the advocacy of the hon. Member for Liskeard (Mr. Courtney), which makes me desirous of occupying the attention of the House for a brief period. Now, the hon. Member for Liskeard made a declaration to us this evening as to what were his personal intentions in relation to the effect of this Resolution; and he also, at the same time, paid a compliment — which I am sure everyone felt was a well-deserved compliment—to the courage of a late respected Member of this House, who had always no fear of stating the opinions he entertained on any subject. Sir, I wish I could return the compliment with full effect to my hon. Friend the Member for Liskeard. The hon. Member, though certainly not lacking in courage, has failed, as it appears to me, to look the logical effect of his Motion in the face. He tells us that he is desirous to include within the terms of his Motion the right of voting only to widows and unmarried women. That declaration on his part I am sure is sincere, and yet, at the same time, it is of very little value. We must look not only at the mere wording of this Motion, but we must look also at the natural effect and result of it. We must look at the declaration of those who are far more powerful than my hon. Friend in the agitation on this subject. Now, first of all, the direct effect of this Resolution would go farther than the hon. Member apparently desires; for, by virtue of it, if passed in the shape of a Bill, certain classes of married women would have the right to vote. My hon. Friend said that, whilst the subject is now presented in the shape of a Resolution, still he intends to include within it the provisions of the Bill of 1878; and I venture to suggest to him that he must then see that a certain class of married women under that Bill would have the right to vote. Every married woman who is a lodger, under the lodger clause of the Act of 1867—and there can, in fact, be such—is entitled to record her vote, and every married woman who holds leasehold property, under the Act of 1870, will be entitled to vote. Therefore, if we stop, and only carry into effect this Resolution, you will admit a certain number of married women upon the electoral roll. The number of married women thus entitled to vote would be limited, no doubt; but we must look at the effect of establishing such a principle and making such a concession; and we must look at the natural consequence, not only of this measure, but we must look at the effect of the Resolution in relation to further measures. Why, Sir, I am certain that the hon. Member for Liskeard, and those with whom he is acting, are at this moment the very strongest supporters of a Bill, which many opponents of this Resolution also support—namely, a Bill to give married women equal rights of property with their husbands. There is also another class of politicians who are hoping—and I join with them in the hope—that the time is coming when all property qualification to enable persons to vote will cease and not be required—when, on account of the advanced education and increased knowledge of the people, we shall not require that property qualification that exists now. Why at this moment we have reduced the qualification to a nullity. A person is allowed now a borough vote, although he is not liable to pay rates, and who pays no rent, but has only promised to pay it. Well, Sir, if we have now reduced the property qualification to almost a nullity, and if we are striving—as many are striving—to give to married women equal rights of property with their husbands, will hon. Members bear this in mind—that if this Resolution were put in the form of a Bill, and if either one of those two measures to which I have referred—namely, that married women shall have equal right of property with their husbands, or that no property qualification shall exist, every married woman in this country might vote. That will be the result of our accepting this measure. It is said, make this concession, and we ask no more. You have taught us several severe lessons in that respect—your whole Resolution is founded upon the concessions we have already made to you. Look at the municipal vote. When the right for women to vote in the municipal elections was asked, it was said it had nothing to do with the Parliamentary elections, and the same was said about the school board vote, and yet the whole Resolution now before the House is founded upon the theory of these very concessions. Of course, I accept the full effect of the statement of the hon. Member for Liskeard, and I am certain of his sincerity; but it is not his statements or his declarations which must guide us, but what we know is the feeling of those who are his supporters in this matter. In 1874, my hon. and learned Friend the Member for Marylebone (Mr. Forsyth), who was then in charge of this Bill, fatal to his own existence as custodian of the Bill, inserted a provision that no married woman under that Bill should be entitled to vote, and thereupon there was a demonstration made against him. A lady, whose name I wish to mention, Sir—only, I assure the House, with feelings of respect and honour due to that name—a lady immediately made a strong declaration against my hon. and learned Friend, and the form of the declaration was made in these words—

> "Some of us would be glad to know on what grounds Mr. Forsyth proposes to exclude those married women who have freehold property, or other qualification, from the exercise of the right we wish to confer on unmarried women in the same position? The various societies for women's suffrage are formed with one object, which is to obtain for women the right to vote for Members of Parliament on the same conditions which entitle men to vote. Mr. Forsyth's Bill, therefore, does not meet their case, and unless suitable Amendments would be agreed to in Committee, the agitation will go on after the Bill is passed to enable the societies to congratulate each other on their partial success."

That letter was signed "Ursula M. Bright." The hon. and learned Member for Marylebone was put on one side. He did not accept those views, and, therefore, ceased to have charge of the Bill. The hon. Member for Liskeard reigns for the moment in his stead; but what will be his fate after to-night? The hon. and learned Member for Marylebone was denounced by the supporters of the Bill, and I congratulate my hon. Friend the Member for Liskeard that he is likely to meet the same fate after his declaration of to-night. The Bill will be handed over to one of its true supporters, who will accept the real consequences resulting from the measure as now proposed to us. What is the natural result which then will happen? Will the House for one moment recognize what the result will be if married women are allowed to vote? At this moment there are 900,000 adult women in excess of the number of adult men in this country; therefore, if women are enfranchised, we shall have them more or less exercising this preponderating weight. If property qualification ceases, or if you give equal rights of property to women, you will have a great proportion more women on the register than men. I ask the House, is there any man who can wish to see that result? Let us think of the consequences that would ensue when we have to consider questions of peace or war, or enter on some grave deliberation where both sides of the question have to be discussed, and where enthusiasm would only lead us astray. Why, where we ought to listen only to reason and calm deliberation, we should be governed by the enthusiasm and sympathy of a woman's mind. Alone amongst the nations of the world our councils would be the councils of women. A word or two in reference to the position which the hon. Member for Liskeard has taken in relation to this subject. I well understand that the supporters of this measure may be drawn from two distinct and well-known classes of politicians. I can understand that the advanced Liberal and also the most sincere Conservative may both find reasons—though I much differ from them—for supporting this Resolution. There are two schools—or, perhaps, one school with two classes in it—of politicians from which I should have thought there would ever be found recruits to strengthen the array of those who are opposed to these principles. It is the school of which my right hon. Friend the Member for the London University (Mr. Lowe) and my right hon. Friend the Member for the City of London (Mr. Goschen) are the two chief masters. This school entertains the opinion that you should enfranchise no other class than those already enfranchised; that enfranchisement has gone far enough; that we are now subject to so many dangerous influences of a democratic nature that we do not say unpleasant things enough in this House or to each other; that we ought not to enfranchise anyone beyond those already enfranchised, lest we should be subjected to influences that we ought not to give way to. I think I have reason to believe that the hon. Member for Liskeard is an apt pupil of that school, because if on next Tuesday night the hon. Gentleman the Member for the Border Boroughs (Mr. Trevelyan) came down to the House and proposed to establish household suffrage in counties, I think we should be told by the hon. Member for Liskeard "you are doing wrong in adding to the number of enfranchised persons," because you will be enfranchising those who are unfit to exercise political power if they are enfranchised—you will be subjected to influences against which you cannot contend, and you will be saying pleasant things instead of the unpleasant things you ought to say. There is a Bill before the House, brought in by the hon. Member for Ashton-under-Lyne (Mr. Mellor), to remedy a defect in the Poor Law Amendment Act. My hon. Friend the Member for Liskeard would assume it was a wrong Bill; he would assume that the House of Lords was right in rejecting it, and he would say this is a proof that we have yielded to influences we ought not to have yielded to. What do we think of the Member who entertains such opinions now asking this House to extend the franchise to a possible 900,000 persons, and thus add to influences we ought not to be subjected to? Does he mean that unmarried women form an uninfluential class? I should have thought that he would have regarded them as a class who would be likely to have an influence above all others most difficult to contend against. I am not quite sure that my hon. Friend is himself armour-proof against such influences. He has been travelling about a great deal with these ladies lately. He has been with them in the country, and he has seen a great deal of them in the afternoons, and the result of their influence over him has been so great that they have prevailed upon him, between a Tuesday night and the following Friday, to sacrifice every shred of consistency. It is said, too, that it is representation for the misrepresented that is required, rather than enfranchisement for the unenfranchised; and yet those who entertain that view—and my hon. Friend is one of them—are willing to refuse enfranchisement to a man who, living beyond, but within a stone's throw of a borough boundary, pays £11 19*s.* for rent, and who also pays rates, and yet are willing to enfranchise the woman who lives in the borough and does not pay rent or rates. This is what the hon. Member terms a consistent course. He says, enfranchise no more; and then he asks us, at the same time, to enfranchise hundreds of thousands of persons. I confess I look strangely upon these things, and had I not heard the speech of the hon. Member the other night, I could not have believed that he could have made that speech and now bring forward this Motion. Anyone who so argues shows so much inconsistency that one can only laugh if such a man there be. And, although I am not myself about to show any emotion to-night, there must be some ardent admirers of my hon. Friend —and I know no one who deserves such admirers more—who must be disposed to weep if Attacus he be. The hon. Member has said to-night that he gives up the whole question of abstract right in favour of women voting. He has thrown that to the wind, and he says he makes this Motion simply on the ground of utility to the country. "I look at it," says the hon. Member, "from an utilitarian point of view, and I am only supporting my Motion from that standpoint." This argument appears to me to come strangely from one who wants to add to the electoral roll only those he thinks shall be competent and fit to give a vote. He does not ask us, surely, to add persons to the register who he thinks unfit to occupy that position; for if he did, the agricultural labourer would go on at once. Assuming that the hon. Gentleman is desirous of adding only those to the register who are fit to give a vote, I should like to quote the opinion of a Member of this House—an opinion which I am sure will have great weight with the House, and which the hon. Member himself will respect. In the course of a previous debate, an hon. Member said—

> "The narrowness of women's range of ideas is absolutely deleterious in its effects. Our earliest lessons are received from them. Are they not often lessons that we have afterwards to unlearn with great difficulty and pain; and do we not often find a difficulty in freeing ourselves from them, and in emancipating ourselves from the errors of our earliest education? Again, to those who enter into the marriage relations of life, how constantly does it happen that the man's freedom of intellect is a thing kept to himself, that he is incapable of imparting to the woman with whom so much of his life is spent any conception of the range of his thoughts. He does not find in her any companionship; but, on the contrary, he finds her a drag upon his aspirations, and a drawback upon his advance."

I hope the House does not agree with that statement; but that, at all events, is the view of my hon. Friend the Member for Liskeard; for what I have just read is a portion of a speech made by him when proposing the second reading of his Bill last year. The hon. Member tells us of the lessons we have received from women; he tells us of men who have received those lessons of error and injury, and who have had to unlearn the teaching of the mother.

Mr. COURTNEY: Perhaps the hon. and learned Gentleman will notice I use the words "How often?"

Sir HENRY JAMES: He says "how often?" Yes, he speaks to us as having often to unlearn a mother's lessons. Perhaps it is better not to speak of one's own experience; but surely the majority of Members in this House will be disposed to think how much better it would have been if they had learnt those mother's lessons more and forgotten them less. Again, of those who enter into the married relations of life, my hon. Friend, in the same speech, said—

> "How constantly does it happen that the man's freedom of intellect is a thing kept to himself, that he is incapable of imparting to the woman with whom so much of his life is spent any conception of the range of his thoughts?"

Sir, on that subject I can offer no information. I have had no experience on that subject; but if this so constantly occurs, and if the results of a mother's lessons are such as my hon. Friend represents them, and if the wife is of such a nature that the husband is incapable of imparting to her any conception of the range of his thoughts, is it not strange that that mother who teaches wrongly, and that the wife who has such a degraded intellect should be the very persons to whom the hon. Member is now asking us to give the franchise? He has asked us to give the franchise to the mother who teaches wrongly, and to the wife who drags down her husband's intellect. The hon. Member, in effect, says—"I would give it to them because they are unfit, and the more unfit they are, the more they want the franchise." Why—and I appeal especially to hon. Members opposite—if you are to give the franchise to people because they are unfit to exercise it, to whom are you to refuse the franchise? Are you to refuse it to the agricultural labourer? You tell us he is so unfit that he cannot be enfranchised; and to-night we have heard the argument which was substantially used last year—that the more unfit the person is, the more it is your duty to give the franchise, in order to remedy that unfitness. But what is to become of the country if that doctrine is accepted? What is to become of the government whilst this unfitness is being cured? It will not be remedied by the fact of women being registered. Time must roll on; years must pass by; generations must go and come, before the nature of the thoughts and minds of a sex can be changed. What, I ask, is to become of the government of this country in the meantime? Why, the whole country, the entire community, must suffer grievously—I think almost to their destruction—whilst this vain combat with nature is being carried on. My hon. Friend spoke but lightly of some subjects, which I should have thought would have been more pertinent and relevant to the matter than this attempt to alter a woman's nature and condition. Did it ever occur to him that after women had been enfranchised—and then, of course, by natural consequence, they must come to this House—that that unfitness must still continue? It is not only a question of the franchise. It is a question of the habits of life, of knowledge, and of practical study. When men go forth for the work of their daily life, they gain knowledge on practical subjects; in their different callings they gain knowledge, which they bring into this House, and which they use at the polling booths. They form judgments not only from mere study, but from practical knowledge, resulting from their different occupations in life. Well, Sir, can a woman ever learn practical subjects as we have learnt them? What is her profession? I say it with some diffidence, but I fancy that a woman's profession, perhaps her only profession, is marriage. ["Oh!"] Sir, I hear dissent behind me. I knew the danger of making that assertion without having an authority to support it. I can foresee that, in some of these itinerant lectures we hear so much of, I shall be figuratively pulled to pieces for making that statement, and I shall have dissent more loudly expressed than that of the hon. Member for Liskeard. I am anxious, therefore, to support my statement, almost for my safety, as well as for any weight that is to be given to what I say, by what I find in the records of this House. The hon. and learned Member for Durham (Mr. Herschell) introduced last year a Bill which proposed to abolish any action founded on the breach of a promise to marry. A Petition was presented to this House against that measure. It was the "humble Petition" of certain persons undersigned, and it showed that—

> "Marriage is the natural and honourable profession in which the majority of women maintained themselves by the discharge of conjugal, social, and domestic duties which appertain to the condition of a wife. That profession comes to a woman by an offer or promise of marriage. That men do not usually marry for a maintenance, whilst marriage is regarded as the proper means through which a woman may obtain a maintenance. That, therefore, a breach of promise of marriage causes pecuniary loss to a woman which is not usually suffered by a breach of promise of marriage to a man."

Sir, that Petition is signed "Lydia Becker." My hon. Friend has contradicted me. Will he let me give him a little very sincere advice? I earnestly advise him not to contradict Miss Becker.

MR. COURTNEY: I may be permitted for one moment to explain the misconception. My hon. and learned Friend said that marriage was the only profession for a woman. The statement of the Petition is that marriage is the profession of the majority of women.

SIR HENRY JAMES: I am glad to relieve my hon. Friend from the difficulty, because I thought he contradicted the statement that marriage was the profession of women. But let me point out to my hon. Friend the effect of his declaration this evening. He will not give the vote to married women, but only to widows and spinsters. Well, that is very hard upon married ladies. As we men become successful in our profession, and, like my hon. Friend, are called to the great honour of occupying a seat in this House, we date our rise from the beginning of our professional success, when we began our political career by placing our names upon the electoral register. But now, if my hon. Friend's views be carried into effect, directly a lady becomes successful in her profession, you not only will not give her a vote, but you take away a vote from her, and you have to tell her—"If you will only be unsuccessful, if you will only fail in your profession, if you will refuse its honours, its happiness, and its rewards, you will be able to maintain your vote, and you will have that position which is always the only happy position for a woman to occupy—namely, a position of equal electoral rights with men. But if once you attain that which is the true and honourable profession of a woman, if the crown of success be yours, you will lose your vote, because you will become so changed that you will not be fit to exercise it." Sir, is not this an illogical conclusion to bring us to? Is it not a pretence of argument to say you are afraid to give the vote to the woman who has had the advantage of the society of her husband, learning politics from him, hearing his views, and becoming successful in her profession; whilst you would give the vote to the woman who has not had those advantages? Sir, I purposely do not dwell longer on this argument; but there is one argument that is often used in support of this measure to which I should like to call the attention of the House. I believe it is almost the most popular argument that can be used in support of this Resolution. It is not, I think, a very logical one; but it is still popular, very popular, for it appeals to the best feelings of every class of persons—it appeals to the loyalty of the people of this country; and I believe that in the meetings which are held throughout the country—where itinerant lecturers have it all their own way—it is an argument that is much cheered, for it seems for the moment to be unanswerable. That argument is that the Sovereign of this country is now a woman, and as, of course, everybody feels that hers has been the happiest rule for the last 40 years, that it is illogical to suppose that the women of this county are not fit to vote, when a woman has proved herself more than fit to rule. But I have once before in this House, when I first took part in a debate on this question, ventured to point out that this argument was not a sound one, and that it was met by this fact, of which we are all aware—that although the Queen had had the advantage of the advice of wise statesmen in Her Council, and had imbued her mind with the great principles of the Constitution of this country, yet when beneath her roof her husband came—a foreigner, and one of only equal years with herself—upon him she always leant for guidance and support, for this one simple reason, that she was a woman, and he was a man. Since then, we have had a statement of Her Majesty's own views upon that subject. It has pleased Her Majesty to place before her subjects a history almost of her inner life, and there in that book, which I am sure everyone who has read it will have closed with a feeling that it has done him good to read, Her Majesty makes this statement. In her diary, she refers to a letter which she wrote in February, 1852. In that letter she says—

> "Albert grows daily fonder and fonder of politics and business, and he is wonderfully fit for both; whilst I grow daily to dislike them more and more."

"We women"—and I beg the attention of hon. Members to this—

> "are not made for government, and if we are good women we must dislike these masculine occupations."

["Order!"]

Mr. SULLIVAN: Sir, I rise to Order. I should like, with the greatest deference, to ask your opinion on this point. I know I am about to appeal against one of the most eminent lawyers in the House; but as one of the lowliest in the Profession, I ask you, Mr. Speaker, if it is in Order to quote the language of the Sovereign on the floor of this House, in order to weigh down and overawe the arguments of Members?

Mr. SPEAKER: It is irregular to introduce the name of the Sovereign for the purpose of influencing the judgment of the House; but in this case I understand that the hon. and learned Member is merely quoting from a book published with the sanction of Her Majesty, and, therefore, he is not out of Order.

Sir HENRY JAMES: Sir, I had borne in mind the necessity of being prepared for that objection. Of course, the name of the Sovereign ought not to be used in this House to influence it for or against any particular measure; but this is written in a book which does not affect any measure, and which has been widely read and noticed in public journals, and if the hon. and learned Member will allow me, he will see that these words do not apply to this or any other political subject before the House. They form only a general statement, that

> "We women are not made for government, and if we are good women we must dislike these masculine occupations."

The House will recollect that these words were written by one who for 15 years had borne the heavy responsibility of her position; and when Her Majesty tells the women of this country that if they are good women they must dislike these masculine operations, what she means to tell them, I presume, is not that it is a question between a good woman and a bad woman in the sense in which we sometimes use those words, but that if women devote themselves to the highest object and aim of a woman—to be a helpmeet to man, to guide and cheer him in times of success, to soothe and console him in moments of difficulty, to share with him the reward of his triumphs—they would find the masculine occupation of government was the last to which they would wish to devote themselves. Sir, I have little more to say. One word I wish to address to those who are Liberal Members of this House, and who are supporters of the Bill. I would ask them to consider what it is they would do in giving support to this measure. What is it they are looking forward to? In every struggle of our political life we are seeking for the independent action of every elector in this country. We are asking for free action and independent judgment for the year-by-year increasing number of electors. We are endeavouring to give them safeguards that they shall be uninfluenced by any power, and that they shall bring to bear upon every subject their own thought and determination and judgment. Do you think, then, to do good at this time by the enfranchisement of women who are unfit for political life, and by giving to them the power of voting? Why, you will send your country back year by year, instead of advancing it. You would give to a class who are utterly, and, from their very nature, subject to influence, a power as great as you give to men. Can that be your object here, from a once hastily formed opinion, that you desire to see extensions of the franchise, whatever they might be, to give power to a class who are influenced by clergymen, by friends, by husbands, by anyone, whose will is stronger than their own. I cannot believe that that will be your deliberate policy. I am sure it will not be the policy of hon. Members opposite; but whatever view they or you may take, there is a power still greater than that of any Party—a power still greater even than the innate power of the Constitutional institutions of the country—it springs from that great body of men who stand apart and neutral between the two great conflicting Parties of the State—they are the men who value and cherish the work of these English homes of ours, and who will do nothing to destroy the happiness of those who live within them.

Mr. SULLIVAN: Since I have had the honour of a seat in this Assembly, I have never opened my lips upon this question before. I have voted upon this and similar propositions in the direction of the Motion of my hon. Friend the Member for Liskeard (Mr. Courtney); but I have declined to speak, although I have been frequently asked to speak in support of the measure. When I was first elected to a seat in Parliament, I was solicited by some friends of the woman's suffrage movement to take a part in the agitation, and my answer was just this—that I could not be an advocate of the measure; that I had much to learn and much to hear upon the subject; that I wished to hold myself perfectly independent; but that, so far as I had any conviction at all, it went in the direction of supporting the proposition, mainly because of the nature of the arguments which I had heard used against it; and I undertook to give my vote on the floor of this House in favour of the measure, unless I should hear some better argument against it than I had heard up to that time. But now the speech to which we have just listened at this moment has pushed me somewhat further towards the women's suffrage movement, and the result of that speech upon me has been this—that that which I have hitherto refused to do I feel bound to do, having been converted into a speaker by the speech of the hon. and learned Gentleman the Member for Taunton (Sir Henry James). And why? Because in his eloquence and in his supreme ability, marked and signalized in many an arena beside this, I knew I might look for the very best that could be said against woman's suffrage; and if the best that his eloquence and his genius can afford to the House is the mere *argumentum ad hominem*, is the mere attack upon the hon. Member behind him, and upon his (Mr. Courtney's) consistency, why I say this is *Nisi Prius*—it is not Parliamentary argument. Eloquent, and, no doubt, sharp in its taunts upon the hon. Member for Liskeard, I complain that he has not projected this speech this evening from the high level I should have expected of him. I deny that this is a mere question as to whether the hon. Member for Liskeard was right in his speech and in his vote the other evening, as judged by his speech and vote this evening. I, for my part, have listened to all that has been said on the question, and I would fain ask the House — even though I know how powerless my voice may be, following upon that of one so able and influential —I would ask the House to come back —to disenchant itself for a moment— and to study what is really the issue before it at the present time. And it is this—Are we ready to do justice—are we prepared to say that mischief and danger will follow from the demand that is made upon us to-night? Now, there has never been a proposition made for the emancipation of any class, for the extension of any suffrage, in this country or in any other, that the advocates of restriction did not take their refuge in the arguments that have been used to-night, and the fears which have been expressed. For my part, I think that in these arguments there is an ancient and fish-like smell. I know very well that when in this House men rose and asked that the millions of Irish Catholics should be emancipated, did not the hon. Members who, like the hon. and learned Member who has just sat down, were eloquent and able, reply? They said—"If you admit the Irish Catholics the Constitution will be overthrown, the balance of political power will be gone, the Sovereign will not be safe, the whole edifice of public liberties will be insecure." Nay, more, very like what we have heard here to-night, hon. Members said—'We protect the Catholics, we feel for the Catholics, and we can manage for the Catholics better than they could manage for themselves, if they were ever admitted to the floor of this House." What is this but the argument, in all ages and in all climes, of those who seek dominion for themselves and would keep others in subjection? For my own part, I freely admit that harm has been done to whatever there is of merit in this question by the extravagance with which its advocacy has been surrounded. I say emphatically that I deny the doctrines which are sometimes linked with this question of women's suffrage. I deny the doctrine of what is called the equality of woman and man. Woman has her sphere, in which she is man's superior, and man has his sphere, in which he is woman's superior. In the economy of Providence they have their several spheres, which do not conflict, and in many respects they are conjoined. I deny entirely the assumption, moreover, that the marriage life is not a unity; and I, for one, repudiate the idea that when a woman enters into the marriage state she does not become one with her husband in the eye of the State for all purposes. I will not enfranchise married women. But are we to be deterred from conceding as much of this claim as may be found just and expedient, because of the extravagance of the demand? If we are, we shall never do justice in this House. Do what is just, be bold, be wise, be not extravagant, and deny what is unjust or cannot be conceded with safety to the State. Then there is the argument that it is new to us that women should have a share in public life. Yes, it is quite new, and, Mr. Speaker, why is it new? Because the arguments in this matter, such as they are, are derived from a barbaric time, in which women were a cypher in public life. We are to-night, consciously or unconsciously, perpetuating by those arguments against this Motion the barbaric barriers of 600 and 700 years ago. Why were women of no account in the political system from which those arguments are derived? Because, under the feudal system, the State took no account of any but lances in the field. The greater Baron or the lesser Baron was a constituent part of the State, because he brought armed men into the field, a sword or lance, or a knight equipped; and the feudal system ignored woman, and banished her as far as it could from public life. It gave her no pathways to public honour; it relegated her entirely to the parlour and the dining-room, and made her, as it were, a mere nonentity, because she could take no part in the warfare of the time. From that hour to this the public system so created has survived; but have we not lived into a nobler, better, and a purer age? I admit it is very much an argument against this proposition that not even in the Republic of America, not even in the French Republic, not even in the most democratic and progressive countries in the world, has woman been admitted equally with man to the suffrage. I admit it. I am not here to conceal any argument that tells with myself either one way or the other on this question; but I do say that if England will but put herself in the van of this true civilization, she has no right—nor has any country any right—to allow mere want of precedent to stand in the way of any Act that would tend to the civilization of the world. And what would be the influence of women upon our public life? Sir, I listened with pain and indignation to some of the language which fell from my hon. and learned Friend who has just sat down. He told us of the narrow-mindedness of women, and how unfit they were to take part in public life. Yes, indeed, as the Chinese ladies are said to have small feet, so it is that we have dwarfed the mind of woman as regards public life. We who have narrowed her mind as regards the public issues in which she has responsibilities, and in which she does bear her burdens, are we to taunt her with that very incapacity which is the creation of the system we are asked to perpetuate here to-night? And he says—"Think what would be the fate of this country if women's suffrage prevailed, and if we were called upon to decide a question of peace or war?" Why, if there were no other argument to call me upon my feet to-night, for the first time upon this subject, the thought is amply sufficient which was awakened by that question. I do deplore that we have not had hitherto some counterbalancing and creditable influence upon our too quick impulses towards war. He tells us, indeed, that our "councils would be the councils of women." What does he mean by that, if not a sneer—a sneer and an insult? Women can be brave as well as weak; women can be wise as well as frivolous. Women can play the statesman—if I may use the phrase in connection with women; they can exhibit statesmanship greater than that which has elevated men to the Attorney Generalship of England. There was a Marie Theresa once known to the world, and her councils were the councils of a woman. He tells us that the women would be craven-hearted, yet we did once hear of a Joan of Arc who led the armed battalions of her country to resist an invader. He tells us our councils would be the councils of women, yet surely there was a Queen Elizabeth in this country at one time, and her councils were the councils of a woman, and she directed the English nation in an hour of peril. I need not run through the list of names that will occur to every hon. Member, from Isabella of Spain to Catherine of Russia. For my part, I do not view with terror the day when women's influence will be felt in the creation—in the formation—of public opinion in this House; I have no such mean conception of women's intellect, of women's influence, of women's ability, and of women's education. I am not ashamed to avow here to-night that in the most serious issues of my own career, in public or in private, the best and the wisest counsels I have ever received have been from women. I say I have found in women on those occasions an unselfishness that is not so prevalent, perhaps, among men; I have found a greater purity of motive in women in judging public matters than I have found in the average of men. Whether it be in imparting a greater gentleness into the course of public life, or whether it be in imparting a greater unselfishness into the public actions of public men, I, for one, view with no terror or apprehension the admission to the franchise of the women who are proposed to be enfranchised. For my part, I leave consequences to One who is higher than we are. I dare to be just; I will not say, having the franchise myself, no one else shall have it, because I can manage for them; I would like them to speak for themselves. The experience of my own country warns me of the errors that men have been led into on issues like this—that is to say, on questions of enfranchisement or emancipation; and therefore, to the class that bear their share of the public burdens, who pay their taxes, who have sent into the war-camp a Florence Nightingale, and on the throne a Victoria, I cannot deny admission to political privilege.

MR. W. E. FORSTER: Mr. Speaker, like the hon. and learned Gentleman who has just sat down (Mr. Sullivan), I have never taken part in the debate of this much discussed question; but I should be glad, with the permission of the House, to say a few words, and I can promise the House they shall be but a few words. I am aware how impossible it is to say anything new on this matter. My first objection to my hon. Friend the Member for Liskeard's (Mr. Courtney's) Motion is that I dislike the form in which it is brought before us. The hon. Gentleman said it would, or might, include a very large number of married women; but I understood the Motion meant to be somewhat similar to the Bill brought before us on former occasions. Now, I object to that, Sir, and I object to it upon the ground upon which I think my hon. Friend the Member for Liskeard also ought to object to it—I object to it because it appears to acknowledge and establish the inferiority of the wife to the husband in a way I do not admit. If it be true, as my hon. Friend says, that for political matters, for political affairs, and administering political affairs, the unmarried woman is as good as the unmarried man, he must also think that for that purpose any woman must be as good as any man; therefore, if he says the married woman is not to be included, it is as good as an admission she is not equal to the married man. The wife must be inferior to the man. I do not admit that. If I thought voting was as much the woman's business as the man's, I should admit at once that in thousands of instances, and I dare say in hundreds of households in England, the women would be more fitted to give an opinion than men. My objection is much deeper than that; I do not think it to be women's work, and I do think it to be man's work. There is another ground on which I object, perhaps not so important as others; but I do not like in these matters of the franchise to give a vote to persons to whom I do not at the same time give the right to be elected. I do not think this is a good precedent which my hon. Friend introduces. An hon. Member has referred to municipal elections and school-board elections. I very much doubt, as far as regards the municipal elections, whether there has been any remarkable success. As regards school-board elections, I think it has been successful; for I think educational work, especially for young children, more than half of whom are girls, requires the assistance of women; there you do want the work of women. As I was responsible for the Bill that made women liable to be elected, and also gave them the power of voting, I may say I should never have thought for a moment of giving the vote, if I had not at the same time given them the right to be elected as members of school boards. So much for the form of the Motion, but I am well aware that my hon. Friend would say—"I am obliged to introduce it in that form to meet the present state of public opinion; if those are all your objections, you may go with me, for I am prepared to give a vote to every woman, married or unmarried, who is in the same position as the man who has a vote." There is one thing, however, I want to say, and that is that my hon. Friend has to contend with this difficulty—it is not a difficulty that applies to the agricultural labourer; we think we can prove that the agricultural labourers wish for the vote—but if he was to poll the women through England, he would find they do not wish for it. My hon. Friend I do not think will deny that; I do not think he will deny that if he was able to take the vote of the women of England they would not desire to have the vote with all its burdens, with all its responsibilities, with everything that would follow from it. But I think it was my hon. Friend the Member for Meath (Mr. Parnell) who said that is all the more reason why you should give it, for here you have a class so degraded—that was the line of his argument—so degraded that they are not aware of what ought to be their rights; give them their rights, and then they will show how well they can exercise the franchise. I want to say if you take the great body of women through, if you take the more intellectual, if you take the more philanthropical, if you take the more high-spirited women, the women who take the greatest interest in political and public affairs, I believe the majority of each one of those classes is at the present moment against my hon.

Friend. I do not say there are not many eminent and most public-spirited women who are doing great good to the country who agree with my hon. Friend; but I say that all my hon. and learned Friend who has just sat down said did not go to prove that women were desirous for the franchise. He said that men had gained influence from the advice of women. I expect it would be a great misfortune to any Member of this House who was not able to say the same; I heartily agree with my hon. and learned Friend. I have found those women from whom I have had advice have been of great help to me. You think on the whole it would be better a vote should be given to women, and they say no. Well, now, why do they say so? Here I do not entirely agree with my hon. and learned Friend the Member for Taunton (Sir Henry James). I do not think the best of women think with him that marriage is specially woman's vocation; I do not admit that. I do not think it is more a woman's vocation than it is a man's vocation. My hon. and learned Friend does not like to look at it in that light, and I did not wish that we should deal with the question on the notion that nature specially intended that women should look after marriage more than men; and I perfectly admit—and I think we must all admit—that the country, that England at present, England in past times, has gained good and had done good by no class more than single women, from Queen Elizabeth to Florence Nightingale; but what we find women saying and thinking is, not that marriage is specially the vocation of women, but that when there is marriage the husband has one thing to do and the wife has another thing to do. My hon. and learned Friend says what a great advantage it would be to bring women in to the vote, because they would always give a vote in favour of peace. I do not admit it.

MR. SULLIVAN: If the right hon. Gentleman would allow me, I am sure they would often deter us from unnecessary wars.

MR. W. E. FORSTER: I think just the contrary. I think if the women had to vote, it would be a vote in favour of war rather than peace. I remember when I was travelling in the Southern States of America, I asked how they were getting over the Civil War, and they told me the men who fought wished to be at peace with the North; they had had quite enough of it; and they had had quite enough of it long before, if it had not been for the women. And why? Because the women did not do the fighting, and the men did. And we must, when we come to the different duties, and the different walks of life—we must consider what it is, what Government depends upon, and what the administration of public affairs depends on. It depends on the force and power of getting the verdict of the Government of the country carried out, and that must be done by men, for my hon. Friend the Member for Liskeard surely does not wish women to be subjected to the conscription. We have no conscription here; but if we had, surely he would not wish them to be subjected to the conscription. I do not wish to detain the House; but I want simply to say that I believe the enormous majority of women, and the best of women, do not wish to have the vote, on the ground on which I agree with them, and which can be simply expressed in three words—that women are not men, and that the business of public affairs belongs to men rather than women. And, remember, that it is not a question merely of giving them a thing which they do not wish for; but it is a question of forcing on them difficulties and responsibilities and duties which they do not desire, and that the women who do not wish for the vote, if my hon. Friend's Motion was carried out, and they were thus forced to have the vote, would be actually injured by having a vote given them they would rather be without—they would not like the duty imposed upon them, or the difficulties and dangers in connection with it. I have only one further remark to make. It is not very desirable, for many reasons, for any man to prophesy upon any sort of public question. But I do venture to say this—that I feel certain that, although we shall probably have this Motion year by year, that it never will be carried. I ask my hon. Friend to look at America. I recollect, many years ago, in England and Wales, almost before many of you were born, that this question was so much talked of that it looked as if it might be passed; but then it suddenly stopped. That happened in America which is happening here, and will happen everywhere, according to my opinion. People will play with it, men will play with it, they will seldom deal with it seriously; but the moment they find there is any possibility of the question being carried, that will happen that happened in the United States—the large majority of men, backed by a larger majority of women, will say that this hard work of government, this law-making, belongs to men; it is their duty to do it, and we women would rather not have the franchise.

Sir HENRY JACKSON (who spoke amid great interruption) said: Mr. Speaker, I promise not to detain the House more than a few minutes. I wish it were possible to bring down the level of this debate from the high platform it has reached, and just before we divide to recall attention to the actual Motion before the House. It seems as if, during the whole discussion, it had been almost impossible for hon. Members to confine their remarks to the proposition my hon. Friend the Member for Liskeard (Mr. Courtney) makes to them. My hon. Friend says, in the plainest of terms, that he merely desires to extend the franchise, already given for municipal elections, to those women who, were they men, would have the Parliamentary franchise. We are met, first, by the statement that we do not mean that; secondly, by the statement, if we do mean that, more will come upon us to our own despite. In vain we protest our sincerity. We are assured that we know not what we ask. What are we going to divide upon? Is it not the abstract question of the position of women in society? Upon this I believe that both sides of the House are nearly unanimous. I am sure hon. Members who support the Motion have as great, if not a greater, respect for all that is estimable and good in women than those who oppose it. We take a more practical line. We base our argument on that experience which we have, of which no one has said that it has worked badly. Even the right hon. Gentleman has not produced one scrap of evidence in support of his assertion. We ask this because we conscientiously believe that justice requires it, and more, we conscientiously believe that those for whom we ask it really desire it. How is that to be ascertained? Every hon. Gentleman who has spoken against us has declared that he does not believe women want it. Every single Member who has opposed us has said that. I, for my part, venture to say that those women whose judgments I rely upon, as a rule, do want it—that is to say, those women who have considered the subject and have mastered it. What do we do to ascertain public opinion? We take the opinion expressed by the Constitutional method of Petitions; we take the opinions of those who are foremost in their day and generation. A large number of Petitions have been presented to this House in favour of the Motion. I call to witness hon. Members near me who know that amongst that class which would be affected, if this Resolution were passed, there is a very great consensus of opinion in favour of it. If I were asked for evidence of the thoughtful opinion of women upon this question, I should take the pamphlet with which the hon. Member for Cambridge University (Mr. Beresford Hope) has made merry as an authentic statement of what the views of the most eminent women in the country are. This is a document in which the deliberate opinion of 108 living women is clearly expressed, and the opinion of eight or nine of the most illustrious women who have passed away is left for us. This is no production of what is known as the screaming sisterhood, or of those societies to whom objection is so often taken. I have here the opinion of almost every woman who is conspicuous in this generation, whether in her endeavours to do public work or in art or literature. The class of ladies who have given their evidence are women engaged in literature, and women following scientific or professional pursuits, women engaged in philanthrophic work; and as allusion is always made to the name of Florence Nightingale, I am glad to say that her name is not the least conspicuous among my witnesses. Of those who have passed away, we find such names as Mrs. Grote, Mrs. Jameson, Mrs. Nassau Senior, Mrs. Somerville, and Miss Martineau. Are we not entitled to say that the opinion and evidence of these ladies far outweigh those of the ladies whom hon. Gentlemen adverse to this measure continually bring forward as objecting to the measure, but who, as they refer to them, they admit to know little and to care less about it.

Question put.

The House *divided*:—Ayes 217; Noes 103: Majority 114.

AYES.

Agnew, R. V.
Allsopp, C.
Arbuthnot, Lt.-Col. G.
Arkwright, A. P.
Astley, Sir J. D.
Bagge, Sir W.
Baring, T. C.
Barrington, Viscount
Barttelot, Sir W. B.
Bass, A.
Bass, H.
Bates, E.
Baxter, rt. hon. W. E.
Beach, rt. hn. Sir M. H.
Beaumont, W. B.
Bentinck, rt. hn. G. C.
Bentinck, G. W. P.
Beresford, Lord C.
Blackburne, Col. J. I.
Bourke, hon. R.
Bowyer, Sir G.
Brady, J.
Bright, rt. hon. J.
Bristowe, S. B.
Bruce, Lord C.
Bruen, H.
Bulwer, J. R.
Campbell, Lord C.
Campbell-Bannerman, H.
Cartwright, F.
Cartwright, W. C.
Castlereagh, Viscount
Cavendish, Lord F. C.
Cecil, Lord E. H. B. G.
Chaplin, Colonel E.
Chaplin, H.
Childers, rt. hn. H. C. E.
Clive, Col. hon. G. W.
Close, M. C.
Clowes, S. W.
Cochrane, A. D. W. R. B.
Cole, Col. hon. H. A.
Colebrooke, Sir T. E.
Colthurst, Colonel
Cordes, T.
Corry, hon. H. W. L.
Corry, J. P.
Cotes, C. C.
Cross, rt. hon. R. A.
Dalkeith, Earl of
Dalrymple, C.
Davenport, W. B.
Davies, R.
Deedes, W.
Denison, W. E.
Digby, Col. hon. E.
Dodson, rt. hon. J. G.
Duff, M. E. G.
Eaton, H. W.
Edmonstone, Admiral Sir W.
Edwards, H.
Egerton, hon. A. F.
Egerton, Adm. hon. F.
Elcho, Lord
Emlyn, Viscount
Evans, T. W.
Finch, G. H.
Floyer, J.
Folkestone, Viscount
Forster, rt. hon. W. E.
Fremantle, hon. T. F.
Garnier, J. C.
Gathorne-Hardy, hn. A.
Gibson, rt. hon. E.
Giles, A.
Gladstone, W. H.
Goldney, G.
Goldsmid, Sir J.
Gordon, Lord D.
Gordon, Sir A.
Gordon, W.
Goschen, rt. hon. G. J.
Gower, hon. E. F. L.
Grantham, W.
Gregory, G. B.
Grosvenor, Lord R.
Hall, A. W.
Hamilton, Lord C. J.
Hamilton, I. T.
Hamilton, rt. hn. Lord G.
Hamilton, Marquess of
Hanbury, R. W.
Hankey, T.
Harcourt, Sir W. V.
Hardcastle, E.
Havelock, Sir H.
Hay, rt. hn. Sir J. C. D.
Hayter, Sir A. D.
Helmsley, Viscount
Herbert, hon. S.
Herschell, F.
Hicks, E.
Holland, Sir H. T.
Holland, S.
Holms, J.
Home, Captain
Hood, Capt. hn. A. W. A. N.
Hope, A. J. B. B.
Howard, E. S.
Hubbard, E.
James, Sir H.
James, W. H.
Johnstone, Sir F.
Jolliffe, hon. S.
Kavanagh, A. MacM.
Kay-Shuttleworth, Sir U.
Kennard, Col. E. H.
Knowles, T.
Lacon, Sir E. H. K.
Learmonth, A.
Leatham, E. A.
Lefevre, G. J. S.
Legh, W. J.
Leighton, Sir B.
Leighton, S.
Leslie, Sir J.
Lewis, C. E.
Lewis, O.
Lewisham, Viscount
Lindsay, Colonel R. L.
Lindsay, Lord
Lloyd, S.
Lloyd, T. E.
Locke, J.
Lopes, Sir M.
Lowe, rt. hon. R.
Macartney, J. W. E.
Macduff, Viscount
Mac Iver, D.
M'Garel-Hogg, Sir J.
Maitland, W. F.
Makins, Colonel
Marjoribanks, Sir D. C.
Massey, rt. hon. W. N.
Master, T. W. C.
Meldon, C. H.
Merewether, C. G.
Miles, Sir P. J. W.
Mills, Sir C. H.
Monk, C. J.
Montgomerie, R.
Morgan, G. Osborne
Mowbray, rt. hon. J. R.
Mure, Colonel W.
Naghten, Lt.-Col. A. R.
Newdegate, C. N.
Newport, Viscount
Noel, rt. hon. G. J.
Northcote, rt. hn. Sir S. H.
O'Donnell, F. H.
Paget, R. H.
Peel, A. W.
Pell, A.
Pemberton, E. L.
Peploe, Major
Percy, Earl
Philips, R. N.
Plunket, hon. D. R.
Praed, C. T.
Raikes, H. C.
Rashleigh, Sir C.
Ridley, E.
Ridley, Sir M. W.
Rothschild, Sir N. M. de
Russell, Lord A.
Russell, Sir C.
St. Aubyn, Sir J.
Salt, T.
Sclater-Booth, rt. hn. G.
Scott, M. D.
Selwin-Ibbetson, Sir H. J.
Severne, J. E.
Simonds, W. B.
Smith, A.
Smith, F. C.
Smith, S. G.
Smith, rt. hon. W. H.
Smollett, P. B.
Somerset, Lord H. R. C.
Stanhope, hon. E.
Starkie, J. P. C.
Steere, L.
Stevenson, J. C.
Stewart, J.
Storer, G.
Swanston, A.
Sykes, C.
Talbot, J. G.
Tavistock, Marq. of
Taylor, rt. hn. Col. T. E.
Thornhill, T.
Thynne, Lord H. F.
Torr, J.
Tracy, hon. F. S. A. Hanbury-
Tremayne, A.
Tremayne, J.
Vivian, A. P.
Vivian, H. H.
Walker, O. O.
Wallace, Sir R.
Watney, J.
Watson, rt. hon. W.
Whitbread, S.
Wilmot, Sir H.
Wilson, W.
Woodd, B. T.
Yarmouth, Earl of

TELLERS.

Crichton, Viscount
Winn, R.

NOES.

Allen, W. S.
Anderson, G.
Barran, J.
Bateson, Sir T.
Biggar, J. G.
Birley, H.
Blake, T.
Blennerhassett, R. P.
Boord, T. W.
Bowen, J. B.
Bright, Jacob
Brooks, M.
Burt, T.
Cameron, C.
Charley, W. T.
Clifford, C. C.
Collins, E.
Courtauld, G.
Cowan, J.
Cowen, J.
Delahunty, J.
Dilke, Sir C. W.
Dillwyn, L. L.
Dundas, hon. J. C.
Edge, S. R.
Ewart, W.
Ewing, A. O.
Fawcett, H.
Fletcher, I.
Forster, Sir C.
Forsyth, W.
Fry, L.
Gardner, J. T. Agg-
Gorst, J. E.
Gourley, E. T.
Hamond, C. F.
Harrison, C.
Hervey, Lord F.
Heygate, W. U.
Hibbert, J. T.
Hick, J.
Hill, T. R.

Holms, W.
Hopwood, C. H.
Hutchinson, J. D.
Ingram, W. J.
Jackson, Sir H. M.
Jenkins, D. J.
Jenkins, E.
Johnson, J. G.
Johnstone, Sir H.
Jones, J.
Laverton, A.
Lawson, Sir W.
Leith, J. F.
Lloyd, M.
Lusk, Sir A.
Mackintosh, C. F.
M‘Arthur, A.
M‘Clure, Sir T.
M‘Kenna, Sir J. N.
M‘Lagan, P.
M‘Laren, D.
Marten, A. G.
Mellor, T. W.
Milbank, F. A.
Nolan, Major
O'Beirne, Major F.
O'Byrne, W. R.
O'Gorman, P.
Palmer, G.
Parnell, C. S.
Pender, J.
Pennington, F.
Perkins, Sir F.
Phipps, P.
Polhill-Turner, Capt. F. C.
Potter, T. B.
Price, W. E.
Puleston, J. H.
Richard, H.
Ripley, H. W.
Round, J.
Rylands, P.
Samuelson, H.
Sanderson, T. K.
Shute, General C. C.
Simon, Serjeant J.
Smith, E.
Spinks, Serjeant F. L.
Stansfeld, rt. hon. J.
Stewart, M. J.
Sullivan, A. M.
Taylor, D.
Torrens, W. T. M‘C.
Trevelyan, G. O.
Wedderburn, Sir D.
Wheelhouse, W. S. J.
Whitworth, B.
Williams, B. T.
Wilson, I.
Yeaman, J.
Yorke, J. R.

TELLERS.
Courtney, L. H.
Legard, Sir C.

Main Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair."

Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Committee *deferred* till *Monday* next.

SUPPLY.—REPORT.

Resolutions [6th March] *reported.*

Resolutions 1 to 12 *agreed to.*

Resolution 13.

SIR HENRY SELWIN-IBBETSON said, he promised to ascertain, as far as he could, what was the control which the Stationery Office had over the books purchased for the use of the House. He found that a subscription might be paid to Mr. Henry Hansard of £16 16*s.* per Session; but the money was not accounted for in the Stationery Office, and that Office had no control over it. The Stationery Office, also, had no knowledge whether copies of Parliamentary Papers were supplied to the newspapers before they were distributed to Members; but he imagined they were not, except in such an instance as that quoted, where the Paper was obtained on a Saturday, while it was not issued to Members till the Monday. With regard to the Report which was mentioned—that on the *Thunderer*—it often happened that Papers were circulated to a Commission sitting on some subject before they were absolutely circulated; and it might be from the Commission the Papers found their way to some outside person or to the Press. No control could be exercised by the Stationery Office over Papers issued from the office of Mr. Hansard; and with regard to Papers issued from the Stationery Office itself, the control there was limited by the fact that some Papers were supplied to sitting Commissions. The amount spent for printing for the House of Commons was £64,301, and of that £24,507 represented that part of the printing for which the Stationery Office was responsible to Parliament. With regard to the number of copies printed, on what was called the short delivery, which were those Papers left for Members who applied for them, 200 copies of each Paper were in general printed for the use of the House of Lords and 200 for the House of Commons. Of the full delivery, or Papers sent to each Member, 500 were printed for the House of Lords and 880 for the House of Commons. Of course, a certain number of copies were produced for purchase by the general public, and a certain number were, no doubt, printed by the Office or by Mr. Hansard's department for that purpose; but they themselves were the judges, when the Paper was issued, what the probable number would be which the general public might be expected to take. No doubt, a very large mass of old Papers was stored away at the Stationery Office; but they were not the property of the Office, and the officials did not even keep the key. The keys and the Papers were in the custody of, and belonged to, the officers of the House of Commons, and the Stationery Office had no control over them, except that they knew they were so stored away and numbered. In calculating the cost of the production of Papers, it was divided between composition, or setting up the type, press work, and paper, and the whole three were charged as against the public accounts for works issued; but hon. Members who would consult the general published accounts would see that the amount for composition, which was much the heaviest, was not charged to the general public. It remained with Mr. Speaker to decide the question of the number printed, and Mr. Speaker was, he believed, considering changes in the whole system of the printing of the House. It might form part of their consideration that a further supply of public Papers should be printed for distribution to the public libraries. It could be done without serious expense, and he thought the proposal might be carried out by a system which he would venture to propose. As to the books sold in the Education Department in Ireland, the Stationery Office did not supply those books at all. The Education Office in Dublin had the control of that supply. The amount asked for in the Estimate was £34,480, and the amount calculated as to be received for the sale of books was £30,000, or thereabouts. Of course, there must be more printed than would be sold in one year, which would account for the great difference between the two sides of the account.

MAJOR NOLAN said, the explanation just given showed that with regard to the Irish Education Vote there was no fault to be found with the Department of the hon. Baronet; but the fault found on the previous evening by his hon. and learned Friend the Member for Limerick (Mr. O'Shaughnessy) was that the Government undertook the work of booksellers in Ireland, sold books, and did the work very badly. Other booksellers in Ireland were anxious to be allowed to sell educational books at a cheaper rate; but the National teachers were forbidden to sell any but the Government printed books, and, consequently, pupils had to pay extra prices for the books, and more than they would have to pay if the matter were open to competition. He would refer to this matter more fully, however, when the Vote for the Irish Education came up for discussion. As to the issue of Papers, what he complained of had occurred, not once, but three or four times in the year, and it was not always a case of a Saturday or a Monday. The *Thunderer* Report appeared in *The Observer;* but hon. Members did not get the Paper till Thursday. If the Stationery Office had no control over Mr. Henry Hansard, they should not give the Papers to him until they were issued to hon. Members.

SIR HENRY SELWIN-IBBETSON said, the hon. and gallant Gentleman misunderstood him. He said that a certain number of copies were always issued to a Commission, and in that way it might often happen that the papers got them before they were circulated to hon. Members; but the Stationery Office never circulated them to anybody until they were in the possession of Members.

MAJOR NOLAN said, he understood that in some cases Papers did reach Mr. Henry Hansard before they reached Members, so that in future——

SIR HENRY SELWIN-IBBETSON said, it was from Mr. Hansard, not the Office.

MAJOR NOLAN said, the Stationery Office must have some control——

SIR HENRY SELWIN-IBBETSON said, none whatever.

MAJOR NOLAN said, they paid Mr. Hansard. If they paid him they must have some control over him.

SIR HENRY SELWIN-IBBETSON said, none whatever.

MAJOR NOLAN asked where, in that case, were they to seek a remedy, if Mr. Hansard were under no control?

SIR HENRY SELWIN-IBBETSON said, he explained, on the discussion of the Vote, that he was under the control of the House and of Mr. Speaker.

MAJOR NOLAN said, he might have fallen into some mistake as to that portion of the subject. But in the case of the *Thunderer*, that was not a case of Mr. Hansard's Papers, nor was it a case of a Commission, for he did not remember that there was a Commission sitting at the time. Further, he did not think that was the case, and that the Report was obtained in that way, for the papers evidently fancied it was a Parliamentary Paper issued in the usual way, and spoke of it as a Parliamentary Paper issued that morning. In consequence, he looked among his Papers very carefully for it, fancying from what he read that the Report must have been issued to the Members; but it had not been sent. This sort of thing occurred so very often, and always in the case of very interesting Papers, that he thought there should be some look-out kept that these Papers were not issued to the newspapers before they reached hon. Members. A few hints would easily remove the evil; and it certainly was an evil for these questions to be removed from their control and handed over to the newspapers. Hon. Members ought certainly, he thought, to be on a level with the newspapers.

Resolution *agreed to.*

Resolutions 14 to 16 *agreed to.*

MOTIONS.

POOR REMOVAL.

Select Committee *appointed,* "to inquire into the operation of the existing Laws in the United Kingdom relating to the settlement and irremovability of Paupers, with special reference to the case of removals to Ireland, and with power to make any proposals for the alteration, repeal, or assimilation of such Laws:"—Power to send for persons, papers, and records; Five to be the quorum.—(*Mr. Salt.*)

PARLIAMENTARY BURGHS (SCOTLAND) BILL.

On Motion of Mr. JAMES COWAN, Bill to empower Parliamentary Burghs in Scotland to become members of the Convention of Royal Burghs, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. JAMES COWAN, Mr. M'LAREN, Mr. TREVELYAN, and Mr. JOHN HOLMS.

Bill *presented,* and read the first time. [Bill 97.]

House adjourned at One o'clock till Monday next.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Monday, 10*th March,* 1879.

MINUTES.]—PUBLIC BILLS—*First Reading*—Local Government Provisional Order (Ireland) Confirmation (Downpatrick) * (21); Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders (Cashel, &c.) * (22); Consolidated Fund (No. 1) *.

AFGHANISTAN—FURTHER PAPERS—GENERAL ROBERTS' PROCLAMATION.

QUESTIONS. OBSERVATIONS.

EARL GRANVILLE: May I ask the noble Viscount the Secretary of State for India a Question—of which I have given him private Notice—Whether he has any further Papers to lay on the Table with reference to the war in Afghanistan; and, if so, whether, when laying them on the Table, he will be prepared to make a statement on the part of the Government as to the objects of that war? Perhaps, also, the noble Viscount will state when it is likely he will produce such additional Papers, if there are any?

VISCOUNT CRANBROOK: My Lords, the Papers relating to Afghanistan are principally military, and have been for the most part already published in *The Gazette,* and, if desired, can be laid upon the Table. There are at present no others which can be produced, nor has the time arrived for discussion. I can, however, inform the noble Earl that no time will be lost by me in making them known to Parliament when the proper time for so doing arrives, or in communicating anything which I think interesting to your Lordships.

THE MARQUESS OF RIPON said, that a Paper, which was lately laid upon the Table and circulated among their Lordships, contained an address of General Roberts, dated the 26th December last, to the Chiefs of the Khost and Kuram Valleys. In that document, General Roberts informed the people practically that those districts would be annexed to our Indian Empire. He could not for a moment imagine that General Roberts would have taken such a step without authority on the part of Her Majesty's Government, and he wished to ask the noble Viscount, If such authority was given; and, if so, whether it issued from the Home Government or the Government of India; and, whether he was prepared to lay the instructions to General Roberts on the Table?

VISCOUNT CRANBROOK: When I was first asked about this address, it had only appeared in one or two newspapers, and I did not know whether it was authentic or not. I therefore inquired of the Government in India whether such a speech had been made, and if so that it might be sent to me *in extenso.* It has just reached me, and I have already laid it on the Table. I am not aware that any authority was given to General Roberts to make that particular speech; but, no doubt, authority was given to him, as it was to other Generals in like circumstances, that they should endeavour to withdraw the allegiance of tribes in the districts through which they have to advance; and in order to detach those tribes, it is necessary to give them an assurance that they would not again fall under the old dominion. No doubt, that was the object of General Roberts had in view when making the speech. It was an assurance to those Tribes that they would not be again brought under the old dominion of the Ruler from whom he had detached them. And, without saying what form of government may be adopted for that district, it is the intention of the Government that they should not return under the dominion of the Ameer.

LORD LAWRENCE said, that, as he understood the address of General Roberts, that gallant General gave an assurance that the district was to be annexed to the British Empire. If that were so, it meant that Her Majesty's Government had decided to extend the Frontier of British India considerably beyond its original limits, probably not less than 70 or 80 miles. That appeared to him to be a very serious matter. It was customary, he did not deny, for a General in command of troops to issue addresses and proclamations, on passing events and the like, to the people of the country. He had, however, never known a case in which the General commanding our troops had told the people that their country would be taken from the Ruler who had hitherto governed it and be annexed to the British Empire; orders to that effect had always, when determined on, been given by the Governor General himself. If, in this case, those orders had been issued, the country to be annexed would extend, at least, up to the Peiwar Pass, and bring us to within five or six days' march of Cabul. Under such circumstances, it would appear that we waged war with the people of the country, and not, as was set forth in the late Ultimatum, with Shere Ali, and with the view of obtaining "a scientific Frontier," and not simply of avenging an insult. It would also become necessary for us, in order to secure a continuous and connected boundary, to carry out an annexation to the extent of probably 60,000 or 70,000 square miles. The Premier had stated in December last that the meaning of the term "a scientific Frontier" was one which could be defended by few instead of many troops. He had no hesitation in saying that to make such a Frontier as the one proposed secure would require a greater number of troops than the present boundary demanded. In a Memorandum drawn up in 1867 by Lieutenant-Colonel Peter Lumsden, now Adjutant-General of the Army in India, and lately printed by order of the House of Commons, which seemed to be the authority on which this particular extension of the Frontier was advocated, it was estimated that this extension would involve the additional employment of some 4,000 or 5,000 troops. If the Frontier generally was advanced westward to a similar extent, the number of troops required for its occupation would have to be very considerably increased. He submitted that this was a very serious consideration for Her Majesty's Government and the country.

LORD NAPIER OF MAGDALA: My Lords, I think it incumbent on me to say a few words on this subject. The question of the war with Afghanistan has arisen upon a very small point, but it has a very broad basis. In my opinion, a war with Afghanistan has long been inevitable. Whatever our treatment of the Ameer has been, or may have been, my firm opinion is that the result would have been the same as that which has now happened. Had we complied with all his demands, they would have grown to such an extent that there must have come a period at which we must have fixed a limit, and our first refusal would have made him our enemy. Much has been said on the question of a Frontier for India. It would not have been expedient to draw up the plan of a campaign; but no one having military experience can have studied the Frontier in India itself without being aware that it is a weak Frontier, and that the Power that holds India cannot defend it on the Frontier line against a strong attack. It has always happened, and I venture to think will happen again, that the Power defending India against an attack from without must retire from the Frontier line and fight its battles on the plains of India, surrendering valuable territories to the occupation of the enemy. Formerly, the invaders were always joined by some of the discontented Native States, and therefore it is for the interest of the Empire that when the danger arises the struggle should be fought out beyond the mountain barrier. I therefore consider that the interest and the necessity of Great Britain require her to advance beyond that Frontier, and to prepare for the day when the battle of India may be fought, and to fight it outside and not inside India. India is surrounded and hemmed in by an almost impassable barrier of hostile Tribes. For 30 years we have been confronted with them, and for a long time closely in contact with them. The difference between that time and the present is very slight. There is some difference. They are still hostile, and no European can enter their hills without incurring grave risks. Those hills are the very nursery of barbarism; and if ever we have to pass the barrier of those hills, whether we do it now or hereafter, we shall have the same battles to fight as heretofore, except that it will be many times more severe. I therefore consider that it is for the interest of the Empire to place our Frontier beyond that barrier. When those Tribes which have hitherto been so hostile shall have ceased to have a hostile Power to back them, they will no longer be hostile, but will come under our civilizing influence as hostile Tribes have done before. It is our reproach that a people like the Afreedees should remain so long in their present condition, closing the country to the light of civilization, and shutting themselves out from it, and making it unsafe for any stranger to be an hour in their country. It is a disgrace that this state of things should have continued so long; and now, as we are forced by the necessities of the case to extend our Frontier, the result will be that civilization and improvement will be carried to those Tribes, that commerce, to which the country has been almost closed, will be introduced, and we shall then be placed in a position to defend India in case it should be hereafter attacked. Of course, there are those who say that this is unnecessary; but we can hardly refuse to give credit to positive evidence of the advance of a strong Power to the Indian Frontier. By our advancing beyond the wall which confines us in ignorance and helplessness—by advancing beyond that, I say, we should protract and postpone the day when two great European Powers who divide Asia may meet. In my view, it is necessary that we should rule the district of Candahar. If we can hold it by amicable agreement with the Ameer, so much the better; and we could give him the net revenue derived from those Provinces, so that he would be no poorer than he is now, and we should govern those Provinces well, and from that position we should be able to defend him and ourselves much better than we can now.

EARL GRANVILLE: My Lords, I need hardly point out that the conversation which has taken place, and which arose out of a Question as to a matter of fact, put by my noble Friend behind me, shows how exceedingly desirable it is that Her Majesty's Government should at the earliest period give us some clear view of what their policy is with respect to Afghanistan.

THE EARL OF BEACONSFIELD: My Lords, I agree with the noble Earl that it is very desirable Parliament should always be furnished by the Government with the best information at the earliest time consistent with the public welfare; but the noble Earl must be conscious that at this very moment it is possible—I would say probable—that negotiations, or rather communications, are going on in Afghanistan which may lead, I trust, to a satisfactory settlement of the differences which at present exist; I think, therefore, it would be very inconvenient to make any statement of the kind to which the noble Earl refers at this particular moment.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT PROVISIONAL ORDER (IRELAND) CONFIRMATION (DOWNPATRICK) BILL [H.L.] (NO. 21.) A Bill for confirming a certain Provisional Order of the Local Government Board for Ireland relating to Waterworks in the Poor Law Union of Downpatrick: And

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (IRELAND) PROVISIONAL ORDERS (CASHEL, &C.) BILL [H.L.] (NO. 22.) A Bill to confirm certain Provisional Orders of the Local Government Board for Ireland relating to the towns of Cashel, Enniscorthy, Holywood, Kells, Templemore, Wicklow, and Youghal:

Were *presented* by The LORD PRESIDENT; read 1^{a}, and *referred* to the Examiners.

House adjourned at half-past Five o'clock,
till To-morrow, a quarter
before Five o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Monday, 10*th March*, 1879.

MINUTES.]—NEW WRIT ISSUED—*For* East Somerset, *v.* Major Ralph Shuttleworth Allen, Manor of Northstead.

SELECT COMMITTEE — Clare County Writ, *re-appointed* and *nominated.*

SUPPLY—*considered in Committee*—NAVY ESTIMATES.

PRIVATE BILLS (*by Order*)—*Second Reading*—Bury Saint Edmunds Gas*; Whitehaven Town and Harbour Trust Extension (Railway, &c.)*.

PUBLIC BILLS—*Second Reading*—Friendly Societies Act (1875) Amendment* [85]; Registration of Births, Deaths, and Marriages (Army)* [95].

Third Reading — Exchequer Bonds (No. 1)* [92], and *passed.*

Withdrawn—Permissive Prohibitory Liquor* [6].

QUESTIONS.

AFGHANISTAN—YAKOOB KHAN.

QUESTIONS.

MR. ONSLOW asked Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Whether Her Majesty's Government have any means of knowing if the people of Afghanistan are prepared to accept Yakoob Khan as Ameer; and, if, before treating with Yakoob Khan, Her Majesty's Government are prepared to recognize him as de facto Ruler of Afghanistan?

THE MARQUESS OF HARTINGTON had also placed the following Notice on the Paper:—To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Whether the Government intend to lay upon the Table any further Papers relating to the War in Afghanistan; and, whether he intends shortly to make any statement on the subject?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: Sir, with regard to the first part of the Question, I am really not able to say that we have any means of information on the point; and, as to the second part, it would not be very possible for me just now to give an answer to it. With respect both to the Question generally, and the one of which the noble Lord opposite (the Marquess of Hartington) has given Notice, I wish to say that we are at the present moment on the eve of communications, which may perhaps have already begun; and it would be impossible for me, without inconvenience, to make any statement at this time. We hope it will not be very long before we are able to do so, and we certainly wish to do it as soon as possible.

THE LAW COURTS—VENTILATION IN THE COURT OF QUEEN'S BENCH.

QUESTION.

MR. J. COWEN asked the First Commissioner of Works, Whether it is true that by order of the Lord Chief Justice all the inlets and outlets for ventilation in the Court of Queen's Bench are kept closed?

MR. GERARD NOEL: Sir, I am informed that what the hon. Member states in his Question is quite correct; but the Lord Chief Justice has himself, on one or two occasions, ordered the windows to be opened.

KHAN OF KHELAT—TREATIES, &c.

QUESTION.

GENERAL SIR GEORGE BALFOUR asked the Under Secretary of State for India, Whether there are any documents in the India Office not yet presented to Parliament relating to the Treaty of 1854, made by General John Jacob with the Khan of Khelat; also the 1855 Treaty made with Dost Mahomed; also relating to the proposal made to Lord Canning in 1856 by General John Jacob to advance beyond the Bolan Pass; and, whether these Papers, or a selection thereof, can be laid upon the Table of the House?

MR. E. STANHOPE: Sir, there are a vast number of documents relating to the period mentioned by the hon. and gallant Member. So far as I have had time to examine them, I have not found any which appear to be of sufficient interest to lay upon the Table, especially as the views and opinions of General John Jacob are already well known.

ALKALI ACTS—REPORT OF INPECTOR.—QUESTIONS.

MR. RATHBONE asked the President of the Local Government Board, Whether there is any sufficient reason why the Report of the Inspector under the Alkali Acts, of his proceedings during the years 1875 and 1876, dated February 1877, should only be published in February, 1879; and, whether he will direct that the Report for 1877 and 1878 should be immediately published?

MR. SCLATER-BOOTH, in reply, said, that the Report for the year 1878 of the Inspector under the Acts in question would be published as soon as possible.

ARMY—EMPLOYMENT OF INDIAN NATIVE TROOPS.—QUESTION.

Sir GEORGE CAMPBELL asked the Secretary of State for War, If it is his intention to propose the re-appointment of the Select Committee on the transport and employment of Indian Native Troops abroad, which recommended that the Committee should be re-appointed at the commencement of the next Session?

Colonel STANLEY, in reply, said, it was proposed to re-appoint the Committee, and he had been in hopes that he would have been able to lay before them certain figures to be obtained from India. That expectation had hitherto been disappointed, but he was now making further inquiries.

BOARD OF TRADE RETURNS.

QUESTION.

Mr. MAC IVER asked the President of the Board of Trade, If his attention has been called to statements repeatedly appearing in the London press to the effect that "the trade of Foreign nations is as depressed as our own;" if the Government is in possession of any and what information tending to support such statements, or whether the figures of the Board of Trade Returns do not point to an entirely different conclusion; and, finally, to inquire if it is substantially accurate (as stated in the statistical abstract) that the value of British imports now amounts to nearly £400,000,000 annually, whilst the exports (other than Foreign and Colonial produce re-exported) are only about £200,000,000?

Mr. J. G. TALBOT: Sir, I hope I need hardly assure my hon. Friend that our attention is constantly directed to all statements of importance which are made in the Press and elsewhere in respect to matters affecting the commercial interests of the country. Without seeing the special statements to which my hon. Friend alludes, we cannot be expected to give an opinion upon them, or to say whether the Board of Trade Returns confirm such statements; but I shall be happy to show him any Returns we have in the Office which he may desire to see as throwing light upon this important subject. I ought, however, to state that the published statistical Reports show that the value of imports into the United Kingdom amounted in the year 1877, the last year given in the statistical abstract, to £394,419,682, and the exports to £252,346,020. Of the last amount, foreign and colonial produce re-exported amounted to £53,452,955. It will be remembered that the same re-exported produce is included in the above amount of imports.

THE ABERCARNE COLLIERY EXPLOSION.—QUESTION.

Mr. MACDONALD asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, If the whole of the evidence taken before the coroner's jury at the Abercarne inquest is to be published, and when; and, if the Report of the gentleman appointed by the Government has been sent in, and when it is likely to be published?

Mr. ASSHETON CROSS, in reply, said, the hon. Member could have copies of the Papers in question on moving for them.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON PARLIAMENTARY REPORTING.—QUESTION.

Dr. CAMERON asked the First Lord of the Admiralty, If it is a fact that a deputation, representing the views and interests of certain provincial newspapers, within the last few days waited upon him as Chairman of the Select Committee on Parliamentary Reporting; and, whether he received them and listened to what they had to urge; and, if so, whether it would not be more regular for the Committee to openly hear whatever further evidence might be deemed desirable?

Mr. W. H. SMITH, in reply, said, he was rather surprised when he found the Notice of this Question on the Paper. It was not the fact that any deputation professing to represent the views and interests of certain provincial newspapers had done him the honour of waiting upon him. But certain hon. Members of the House had requested him to hear the opinions they entertained in regard to newspaper reporting, and he had thought it was not irregular or improper for him to listen to their views. He was not, however, aware that they represented any particular section of provincial newspapers or had any private interest whatever to serve, and if he had committed any irregularity in listening to what those hon. Gentlemen had to say, it was one which he had committed ever since he had a seat in the House, for whenever any hon. Member wished to speak to him on the subject of Public Business, he always thought it right to listen. Whether it might not have been more regular for the Committee to have received them, he was not prepared to say; but the Committee had come to the conclusion that they had heard all the evidence that could be brought before them with advantage, and that it was not to the interest of the public that they should take further evidence. He (Mr. Smith) was only Chairman of the Committee, and if the Committee thought differently, he should be very glad to sit and hear any further witnesses that might be produced.

INLAND REVENUE—LEGACY AND SUCCESSION DUTY.—QUESTION.

Mr. O'CLERY asked Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, When the new scheme for the collection of the Legacy and Succession Duty in the country came into operation; whether since its adoption the revenue from that Duty has not declined to the extent of £350,000; and, whether the scheme was approved of by the Commissioners of Inland Revenue, or was carried out by the heads of the Department on their own responsibility?

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER: Sir, the change in the manner of collecting the Legacy and Succession Duty in the country came into operation at the beginning of the present financial year—that is the 1st of April, 1878—and it was approved by the Commissioners of Inland Revenue and by the Treasury. It is perfectly true that the revenue on the Duty has declined within this year to the extent of something like £350,000, and the other day I mentioned several causes to account for that, and I do not think it is necessary to make any further change.

MERCANTILE MARINE—BUOYAGE. QUESTION.

Mr. GOURLEY asked the President of the Board of Trade, If he can state how far the Corporation of the Trinity House have succeeded (as promised about six months ago) in establishing a uniform Code of Buoyage for the Harbours and Coasts under their control, and what measures they have adopted with the view of coming to an arrangement with the Northern Commissioners of Scotland and Ballast Board of Ireland for the purpose of laying down a system for national adoption; and, further, if he has considered how far it is possible to illuminate Coast Buoys at night with some description of artificial light?

Mr. J. G. TALBOT: Sir, in the absence of my noble Friend, I will answer the Question. The Trinity House inform the Board of Trade that in the year 1860 they commenced a general system of buoyage, which was gradually applied, and at last completely established throughout the harbours and coasts under their jurisdiction in the year 1870; that the Ballast Board of Ireland agreed to the adoption of this system in 1860; but that the Northern Commissioners of Scotland have not done so. With regard to the second part of the hon. Member's Question, I have pleasure in stating that a project for illuminating buoys with gas has been for some months under consideration, and very interesting experiments are now being made by the Trinity House in the matter. It is hoped that specially constructed buoys will be ready for trial during the ensuing summer.

CIVIL SERVICE (INDIA)—ADMISSION OF NATIVES.—QUESTION.

Mr. FAWCETT asked the Under Secretary of State for India, What steps have lately been taken for the admission of a larger number of Natives of India to appointments in the public service; and, whether, if there has been any Correspondence on the subject, he will lay it upon the Table?

Mr. E. STANHOPE: Sir, the House is probably aware that the admission of a larger number of Natives to the Civil Service in India has engaged the special consideration of the present Viceroy, and proposals were received last year from the Government of India for the admission of Natives to a higher class of offices than they have hitherto filled. My noble Friend (Viscount Cranbrook) has expressed his hearty approval of the principle, and has made various suggestions for carrying it out. As the Correspondence is still going on, I think it would be premature to lay it on the Table; but I can assure the hon. Member that no time will be lost in endeavouring to give effect to the decision.

EGYPT—FINANCE.—QUESTION.

Mr. PULESTON asked Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Whether there is any foundation in fact for the statements repeatedly made in public prints

> "That Mr. H. C. Vivian, the English Consul General in Egypt, has been working against Mr. Rivers Wilson in the plans the latter has formed for the revival of Egypt," "that Mr. Vivian has repeatedly and openly expressed, not merely officially but also unofficially to unofficial persons, his conviction that neither Mr. Rivers Wilson or any other could put the finances of Egypt on a satisfactory footing, and that the only thing to be done was to proclaim immediate bankruptcy?"

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER: Sir, Egypt seems to me to be land of gossip, for I frequently see numerous statements repeatedly made in the public Press for which, as far as I can see, there is no foundation at all. Certainly, the policy of Her Majesty's Government, which is that which Mr. Vivian, our Consul General, would be bound to pursue, has been to support, in every way that is proper for them, the proceedings of the Egyptian Government in its plans for the reconstruction of the finances of the country. I can only say, with regard to this Question, that Mr. Vivian has never communicated to us any sentiments of the sort therein attributed to him. Mr. Vivian is the person from whom we receive official intelligence, and he has never officially informed us of anything of the kind.

ENGLISH SUBJECTS IN FRANCE—CONSULAR CONVENTION.

QUESTION.

Colonel ARBUTHNOT asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether he will lay upon the Table any Correspondence which has passed between Mr. Wilson, late of Nantes, Mr. Clipperton, Her Britannic Majesty's Consul at that place, Her Britannic Majesty's Ambassador in France, and the Foreign Office relative to frauds committed on the French Government by one Ferrand, in conjunction with a Swiss firm trading in Threadneedle Street; whether the Foreign Office has considered that part of the Report of Consul Clipperton, issued in the Blue Book of 1877, concerning

> "The Law relating to general liberty and freedom of action which can be exercised against any Englishman going to France;"

and, whether any action has or will be taken, as recommended by Consul Clipperton, for the establishment of a Consular Convention similar to that concluded between France and the United States in 1873, for the better protection of English subjects against arbitrary arrests and other inconveniences?

Mr. BOURKE, in reply, said, he did not think any useful purpose would be gained by laying on the Table the Correspondence, seeing that there were no reasons whatever for any diplomatic interference on the part of Her Majesty's Government. As to the Report of Consul Clipperton, he had seen it; but it was dated 1833, and the substance of it given in the Question of the hon. and gallant Member was not accurate. He could not say at present that the advice of Consul Clipperton, that action should be taken for the establishment of the Consular Convention referred to, would be followed.

Colonel ARBUTHNOT said, he had copied the words which appeared in the Question from the Blue Book.

NAVY—OFFICERS OF THE ROYAL MARINES.—QUESTION.

Mr. SAMPSON LLOYD asked the First Lord of the Admiralty, Whether the hope held out by him (that the position of officers in the Royal Marines would be assimilated to that of officers in the Army when the Army Retirement Scheme came out) is likely to be realised, so that Royal Marine officers who joined prior to 1st April 1870 may be permitted to retire on gratuities after twelve, fifteen, eighteen, or twenty years' service, as is the case with officers in the Army?

Mr. W. H. SMITH, in reply, said, he could not admit that the inference which might be drawn from the Question of his hon. Friend was a fair one—that the retirement scheme of the Royal Marines was not as favourable to the

Marines as the retirement scheme of the Army was to the Army. His own belief was that it was more favourable. Officers of Marines who joined before 1870 had certain advantages in terms of retirement, and it was considered that it would not be fair to deprive them of those advantages. It would not be consistent, however, that they should also reap the advantages of the 12, 15, 18, and 20 years' retirement, as well as the old advantages which had been preserved to them.

EDUCATION DEPARTMENT — THE LONDON SCHOOL BOARD.

QUESTION.

Mr. HEYGATE asked the Vice President of the Council of Education, Whether the sum of £1 12*s.* 2*d.*, stated in the "Return relating to Elementary Schools, Feb. 29, 1879," as the cost per child in London School Board Schools defrayed by rates, as compared with the sum of 8*s.* 10¾*d.* given in the same Return as the cost per child in London Voluntary Schools defrayed by voluntary contributions, includes or excludes interest on loans for buildings, and expenses of School Board Office and staff other than the teaching staff?

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: Sir, the sum alluded to only includes the maintenance of schools. The total London School Board expenditure for the year, exclusive of loans and capital expenditure, was £624,500, of which £426,800 only was applied to maintenance of schools.

THE NEW NATIONAL GALLERY—INJURY TO THE PICTURES.

QUESTION.

Mr. RITCHIE asked the First Commissioner of Works, Whether his attention has been called to the blistering of several of the paintings in the new rooms of the National Gallery; and, whether he can state the cause, and what steps are being taken to prevent further injury?

Mr. GERARD NOEL: Sir, during the recent severe frosts considerable difficulty was experienced in maintaining an even temperature in the large rooms in the building, and perhaps on one or two occasions the heating apparatus was rather overheated, so that the hot air admitted through the gratings might have caused the blistering alluded to; but I am informed that this is a damage to which old pictures or panels are specially liable in all galleries, owing to the material being subject to expansion and contraction. The gratings have now been removed and placed elsewhere, and I am happy to inform my hon. Friend that Mr. Burton, the Director of the National Gallery, considers that the damage done to the pictures is not irreparable.

TRINITY COLLEGE, DUBLIN — THE DIVINITY SCHOOL.—QUESTION.

Mr. PLUNKET asked the Chief Secretary for Ireland, Whether, having regard to the Report of the Dublin University Commission (1878), Her Majesty's Government is prepared to make any proposals with a view to the future management and support of the Divinity School, connected with Trinity College and the University of Dublin.

Mr. J. LOWTHER: Sir, this is a subject with respect to which, I am aware, very great interest is felt in Ireland; but I am afraid that, considering the demands on the time at the disposal of the Government, it would not be justified in undertaking to introduce a Bill during the present Sesston, especially as the result of holding out any such expectations, with a very uncertain prospect of being able to carry them into effect, might very probably throw obstacles in the way of those who might otherwise be prepared to move in the matter themselves. I think, therefore, it may be left to them.

SOUTH AFRICA—THE ZULU WAR—THE MARINES.—QUESTIONS.

Mr. GOSCHEN asked the First Lord of the Admiralty, Whether the question of employing a force of Marines in the Zulu War has been considered by the Government; and, if so, whether he will state the reason why this body of seasoned troops, ready for service at the shortest notice, had not been utilised?

Mr. W. H. SMITH: Sir, the question of employing the Marines in the Zulu War was considered by the Government; but, on the whole, the military authorities were of opinion that the selection actually made was the best in the circumstances of the case. Individually, I may say that I regret that the gallant corps of Royal Marines have not had an opportunity of distinguishing themselves, for I am sure they would have distinguished themselves if an opportunity had been given to them of serving at the Cape, seeing that they fully merit the appellation of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for the City of London, who speaks of them as a "body of seasoned troops ready for service at the shortest notice." If, unfortunately, further reinforcements should be required for the Cape, I have reason to believe that the Marines will be the first battalion sent out. No further information has been received to day, either by the Secretary of State for War or at the Colonial Office.

Mr. A. MILLS: I wish to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty a Question, of which I have given him private Notice—namely, Which of Her Majesty's vessels are in Delagoa Bay co-operating with the Portugese Government in preventing the landing of arms and ammunition? I ask the Question in consequence of the statement in this morning's papers.

Mr. W. H. SMITH: Sir, unfortunately, the *Tenedos* is for the present disabled; but the *Boadicea*, a large vessel, is on that coast, and the *Encounter*, a corvette going to China, will call at Simon's Bay, and she will be placed at the disposal of the Commodore in case she is required there. We have also heard to-day that the *Shah*, on her way home from the Pacific, called at St. Helena, and having there heard of the disaster which had befallen Her Majesty's troops at the Cape, the officer in command embarked 156 men at St. Helena, and sailed on the 14th of February for Cape Town. The *Shah* has a crew of more than 700 men on board, and therefore she could easily land a naval brigade of 300 or 400 men in addition to the troops. In these circumstances, I think the Commodore will find he has a sufficient force on the coast to prevent the landing of any arms or ammunition.

Mr. GOSCHEN: Will the right hon. Gentleman state the name of the gallant officer in command of the *Shah*, who acted so promptly, and took the responsibility on himself?

Mr. W. H. SMITH: I have great pleasure in stating that it is Captain Bradshaw, an officer who is well known to many of us, and in whose discretion everyone will trust.

THE COLONIAL MARRIAGES BILL.

QUESTION.

Mr. BERESFORD HOPE asked the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Sandwich, What he intends to do next Wednesday with the Bill standing in his name with reference to Colonial Marriages?

Mr. KNATCHBULL-HUGESSEN, in reply, said, that during the present Parliament the House of Commons had twice decided in favour of the Bill referred to by majorities not inconsiderable; but the facilities given to private Members for forwarding their Bills was so small that, even if he were to be successful on Wednesday, he should have but little chance of passing the measure that Session. In such circumstances, he was unwilling to put hon. Members to the inconvenience of coming down again and again with no certainty that the Bill would come on; and, after consultation with the promoters of the Bill, he thought the course most respectful to the House would be to move on Wednesday next that the Order be discharged.

EAST INDIA FREIGHT.—QUESTION.

In reply to Mr. E. Jenkins,

Mr. E. STANHOPE: Sir, the Return for which the hon. Member asks would be voluminous, and would hardly give all the information requisite for arriving at the merits of the case. But as the subject is one of considerable importance, about which it is desirable that no misapprehension should prevail, my noble Friend (Viscount Cranbrook) proposes to appoint a small departmental Committee to make a thorough inquiry into it. I will lay their Report, when received, upon the Table.

ORDERS OF THE DAY.

SUPPLY.—COMMITTEE.

Order for Committee read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair."

NAVY—EXPLOSION ON BOARD H.M.S. "THUNDERER."

QUESTIONS. OBSERVATIONS.

MR. GOURLEY, in rising to call attention to the circumstances in which the inquiry into the causes of the late explosion on board H.M.S. *Thunderer*, by which two officers and 11 men were killed, and 35 men injured, had been held, and to ask Questions relating to it, said, that the investigation of the Committee had been conducted without the assistance of men accustomed to the manufacture of guns. As far as he could see, the conclusion arrived at was a mere assumption. He wished to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty, what course he intended to adopt for the purpose of discovering, by practical experiment, whether the gun was perfect when leaving the manufacturer? Some satisfaction must be given beyond that contained in the Report. The Committee, he found, too, commenced the inquiry on the assumption that the construction of the gun was perfect, and that because one gun had missed fire therefore the other had done the same. He therefore asked the First Lord of the Admiralty, what method he had adopted for the purpose of testing the material of which our large guns were manufactured, and whether the right hon. Gentleman intended, in accordance with the recommendation of the Committee, to have the remains of the exploded gun, and also the gun which was still perfect on board the *Thunderer*, brought to England, in order that a further inquiry might be held into the cause of the explosion? If that course were taken, he suggested that it would be desirable that representatives of all the leading gun manufacturing firms in the Kingdom should be called in, as well as naval and military officials. He wished to know, also, how the men on board Her Majesty's ships were exercised in the use of these large guns; and, further, what was the opinion of the First Lord of the Admiralty with reference to breech-loading as compared with muzzle-loading guns? He put a Question last Session with the view of ascertaining whether officers and men on board Her Majesty's ships were regularly trained in gun drill. Officers and men in the Army were practically exercised in what would be required of them in actual war. He found from the Report of the Committee that the whole system of working the large guns was extremely defective. The question of breech-loaders for ships as compared with muzzle-loaders was also a very important one, and in his opinion the adoption of the former would be of great advantage, as many operations which were necessary in connection with muzzle-loaders would become unnecessary. He trusted that both the Admiralty and the War Office would learn a useful lesson on this point from the disastrous explosion.

NAVY—SHIP CARPENTERS.

OBSERVATIONS.

MR. SAMUDA, in rising to call attention to the duties and increased responsibilities of ship carpenters, and to suggest that their designation be varied and pay improved to meet the increased responsibilities which had devolved upon them since the general introduction of steam, said, that the changes which had been made in the substitution of iron for wood, of steam for sails, and in the elaborate system which iron-clads had introduced, required a totally different description of officers from those formerly employed as ship carpenters. Their duties formerly were very simple; all that was required was that the men should be good working shipwrights; they had only to do with wood structures. But now iron vessels were divided into a large number of compartments, which were fitted with sluices and bulkheads and doors, not of cabinet work, but engineering work, all fitted with the greatest accuracy. The whole of the pumping arrangements, too, had to be laid on in the most elaborate manner. The hull of the vessel itself had to be observed and treated with an amount of knowledge and skill altogether different from what was required in wooden ships, and the shipwrights of the present day, whilst being compelled by the Admiralty to come up to a certain standard, were not remunerated in a corresponding degree. It was not deemed advisable, indeed, to leave them wholly in charge of elaborate vessels, and he quite agreed with the Government in this, when a ship's carpenter at the present moment, after 10 or 12 years' service, only received pay at the rate of 9*s.*

a day. Yet their responsibility was such that if not properly exercised the result might be the loss of the ship. Although their duties were so important, their position was inferior to that of ordinary workmen in a ship-builder's yard. Their pay was only 5*s*. 6*d*. a-day after five years' service, and a chief carpenter, after 10 or 12 years' service, had only 9*s*. a-day. That rate of pay was wholly inadequate, and in consequence the Admiralty could not obtain a sufficient number of suitable ship carpenters, and those they had were obliged to work either in conjunction with the engineers, or under their direction. In this way there was a divided responsibility, and the engineer was taken away from his duty at the very time when his most earnest attention was necessary in the machinery department. Again, in the Navy there were only 12 men who held the rank of chief carpenter; all the other ship carpenters were of the inferior class he had described. He thought it would be advantageous if a totally different class of men could be secured to carry out the duties; but that could not be done without offering a better position and better pay, with the prospect of becoming chief in their department as the result of their services, instead of waiting for dead men's shoes, as was the case now. With respect to the rate of pay which, in his opinion, the carpenters ought to receive, he was inclined to suggest the adoption of something between that which they had at present and that which was now given to the engineer officers. Whilst the carpenters had from 5*s*. 6*d*. to 9*s*. a-day, the engineers had from 10*s*. to 21*s*.; and his proposal was that in regard to the former class of public servants, a sum of between 8*s*. and 15*s*. daily should be fixed upon. The latter rate of pay would, of course, be paid only to those who, after a certain number of years' service, had acquired valuable experience, and he would suggest those should be raised to the rank of chief officers, and be designated chief shipwrights. He would also propose that the men of whom he had been speaking should mess differently from the way they did at the present moment; that, instead of messing with warrant officers and able seamen, the chief, at all events, should mess with the engineers. In that way skilled artizans, who had hitherto worked in wood, would be encouraged to work in iron also. He believed that the whole matter was one of even greater importance to the Navy than to the ship carpenters themselves. It was scarcely possible to overrate the amount of advantage which would result from our having a class of men on board our vessels who would be perfectly capable, independent of other departments, of dealing with an emergency to the hull of the vessel when it arose. He hoped that the First Lord of the Admiralty would take one of two courses in connection with this subject—that he would either, by personal observation, inquire into the question, or refer the matter to a departmental Committee for investigation. Should he do so, he (Mr. Samuda) thought the right hon. Gentleman would come to the conclusion that a condition of things out of which disaster might arise was capable of being remedied with advantage to the Public Service.

Mr. NORWOOD said, he had given the subject some little attention; and he felt that it would not only be for the benefit of the Public Service, but an act of justice to the men themselves, that some change and some improvement should be made in the position of ships' carpenters, as suggested and desired by the hon. Gentleman who had just spoken (Mr. Samuda). He would, therefore, press the matter most earnestly upon the consideration of the Admiralty. It was a misnomer to call the men in question carpenters, for, owing to the revolution which had taken place in shipbuilding, they were rather artificers in metal than in wood, and would be more correctly described as shipwrights. Not only should their position, so far as status was concerned, be improved; but it should also be improved in the direction of additional pay. The carpenters were almost the only class of officers in connection with the Royal Navy whose position in recent years had not been improved.

Mr. GORST took the same view. What had been quite truly said in regard to the carpenters applied with equal force to the engineers and other mechanics and artificers on board our ships. It was really part of a very large question, for as our ships of war and their machinery became more complicated and valuable, and more likely to get out of order, it would be true economy for the Government to endeavour to produce such an improvement in the existing state of affairs as would secure for the country at all times the best men available for the Service. There was one point which had not been touched upon, but to which he desired to refer, and that was the position of warrant officers. These officers received less pay when they were not at sea than they did when they were at sea, and yet their duties were more onerous and important in the former instance than in the latter. This anomaly did not prevail in connection with the other officers, and he hoped the First Lord of the Admiralty would give the matter his attention, and remove the sense of injustice under which a most deserving class of officers were at present labouring.

NAVY PROMOTION.—RESOLUTION.

MR. VANS AGNEW, in rising to call attention to the state of the lists of Officers on the Active List of the Royal Navy, and to move—

> "That the present and progressively increasing stagnation of promotion in the Royal Navy is injurious to the public service, and that the present system of retirement has failed to secure a sufficient amount of promotion, and ought to be extended,"

said, he referred to the subject with some diffidence, as he had not had the honour of serving in the Navy; but he found that the present system created a serious evil which was increasing year by year. Its effect was to discourage all, but especially the younger officers, who, finding promotion getting gradually slower, and seeing a forced retirement at a fixed age before them, despaired of rising to the higher ranks of their Profession. Hence their zeal was being quenched, and they were asking themselves why they should work and slave in a Profession in which they had no reasonable hope of rising, within anything like reasonable time, to the higher grades? In many cases, men whom it was desirable to retain in the Service were leaving it to seek other positions. Of course, all officers could not rise to be Admirals any more than all barristers to be Judges, or all clergymen to be Bishops; but there ought to be no rule in the Service to prevent them entertaining the hope of being Admirals. Yet, in the Royal Navy, the rule made it almost impossible for an officer to escape superannuation, unless he had been specially lucky, and had been selected for promotion above a great many of his fellows. To prove this, he would take the case of a lieutenant of any recent year—say 1870—he being then of the average age of 23. Of the lieutenants promoted in 1875 and 1876, the service was nearly 11 years; in 1877-8, it was 13 years; and in 1885 it would be at least 15 years; and the lieutenant of 1870 would have a prospect of his step when he was 38. The average number of years commanders served before they were made post-captains was, in 1875, 7 years and 4 months; in 1876, 7 years and 10 months; in 1877, 9 years and 5 months; in 1878, something more; so that it might be expected that a man promoted to commander's rank in 1885 would serve at least 10 years in that rank, and would then be 48 years of age. But commanders were compulsorily retired at 50, and captains at 55; and it took more than 15 years for a captain to become a rear-admiral. It seemed evident that, as matters now stood, unless the younger officers were specially placed over the heads of others, they must, at the average rate of promotion, be necessarily superannuated. The evil was, no doubt, tempered by selection, against which he had nothing to say further than that the selections that were made ought to be such as would convince those over whose heads the advances had taken place that they were fairly earned; but the system of selection, although it was attended with satisfactory results in the case of men of exceptional merit, afforded no appreciable relief to the general body of officers. He did not object to compulsory retirement at a stated age, for it was of importance that the officers of the Royal Navy should be active men of full strength and vigour of mind and body, and he thought the age fixed for commanders and lieutenants—namely, 50 and 45, was too high. But it was by retirements in the higher ranks that promotion would be made to flow through the whole Service. By the scheme of 1870 very liberal terms were offered in money, and accepted to the extent anticipated by lieutenants and commanders; but owing to a refusal to allow all captains, who had not completed their sea time, to take the rank of rear-admiral when they reached the top of the list, only a small proportion of those expected to retire did do so, and thus a great part of the relief that scheme was intended to give was not given. The point then refused had since been conceded. In 1870 the active list was largely reduced; but, while death vacancies were filled up, only one in four of those caused by retirement were filled up. In 1872 it was found necessary to promote 10 commanders and 10 lieutenants, and to rule that one in two retirement vacancies should be filled up; and in 1875 and 1876 there were further modifications of the stringency of the rules. The Committee of the House of Commons, which sat in 1863, recommended an active list of 1,800 officers, exclusive of sub-lieutenants. The Admiralty in 1870 fixed the number at 1,000, but afterwards added 68. Till the excess had been absorbed, promotion must be retarded, and the hands of the Admiralty were still tied to such an extent that men, no matter how deserving or promising they might be, were of necessity kept waiting in the junior rank, while they might, if they had a better opportunity of displaying their abilities, really be rendering excellent service to their country. In connection with the Naval College, there was an injustice which was well deserving the attention of the First Lord. It was this—that there ought to be more rewards than at present for those who after some service passed with distinction, for while a sub-lieutenant who obtained three first-class certificates gained three years in rank, a lieutenant who was equally meritorious obtained no practical advantage at all. A letter was placed opposite his name in *The Navy List;* but the circumstance of his obtaining three first-class certificates did not insure his promotion in any way. He trusted that some scheme of retirement would be adopted which would be willingly accepted by the higher ranks of the Navy, and which would thus facilitate promotion throughout the entire Service. He begged, in conclusion, to move the Amendment of which he had given Notice.

Mr. Serjeant SIMON seconded the Amendment, observing that the want of promotion was of serious importance to the Service, inasmuch as it did not offer wealth but rank to those who entered it. Dignity and rank were the chief part of the remuneration. Under the existing system a check had been given to retirement in the upper ranks, and the result was that a young man entering the Service did not obtain his lieutenancy probably until he was 28 years of age, with the prospect that he would have to retire with that rank, instead of that of commander. The matter was one which should be taken into the serious consideration of the Department, and he trusted that the right hon. Gentleman would see his way to removing the existing obstacles to promotion.

Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "the present and progressively increasing stagnation of promotion in the Royal Navy is injurious to the public service, and that the present system of retirement has failed to secure a sufficient amount of promotion, and ought to be extended,"—(*Mr. Vans Agnew,*)

—instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

Sir MASSEY LOPES, who was nearly inaudible in the Gallery, was understood to say that in September, 1875, the pay and position of the warrant officers was improved to the extent of £6,500. Subsequently the distinction as to pay between sea-going and harbour ships was abolished in regard to these officers, and this change involved an additional expenditure of £800 a-year. It was, he thought, a question if the responsibilities of ships carpenters' had increased. He thought the engineers had very much relieved them; but the difficulty in dealing with this matter was to avoid invidious distinction. The Government, having so recently increased the pay of these officers, could not entertain the suggestion of the hon. Member opposite (Mr. Samuda).

Sir JOHN HAY agreed with the hon. Member for Wigtonshire (Mr. Vans Agnew) that some change was imperatively needed in the system of promotion. At present the stagnation in promotion was so great as to render it impossible for many officers to take that interest in their Profession which was most desirable. In his opinion, the matter should be taken into the hands of the House again. It was too late now to introduce the subject in a substantial form into the

House this Session; but if he had the honour of being in the House next Session, he should certainly bring forward a Motion on the subject. It was now 16 years since a Committee sat on the subject of promotion and retirement in the Navy. Had the recommendations of that Committee been carried into effect, a reasonable amount of promotion would have been the result; but as it was, the changes that had been made, having been in opposition to those recommendations, had failed to give the relief desired. As matters stood, it was impossible that any considerable number of the officers in the Navy could hope to attain the higher ranks in their Profession. At the present time the hands of the First Lord of the Admiralty were tied with respect to promotion, even in cases where he ought to have the power to advance an officer for exceptional services. Taking the case of Commander H. Fletcher Campbell, who was leading the Naval Brigade in the Zulu War—that gentleman merely held the rank of commander, equivalent to that of a major in the Army, though he had under his orders a force in discipline, and efficiency, and numbers superior to that commanded there by colonels in the Army; and, though gazetted for gallant service and recommended by his superiors, it was absolutely out of the power of the First Lord of the Admiralty to promote him for his distinguished services until a vacancy occurred. Then there was a noble Lord, a Member of the House, to whom, even in his presence, he (Sir John Hay) would venture to allude (Lord Charles Beresford), whose services and acknowledged ability qualified him for promotion; but who could not, under the present system, hope to be a flag officer until long after he was 50 years of age. When they had cases of that sort before them, he thought it showed that the hands of the Admiralty were tied by a system of red tapeism in a way which could not be advantageous to the Public Service.

MR. W. H. SMITH said, the hon. Member for Sunderland (Mr. Gourley), in raising the questions with regard to the explosion on board the *Thunderer*, had a great advantage over him (Mr. Smith) in having read the evidence given before the Committee. He had not yet had time to do so. He therefore felt bound to exercise some reticence with regard to the Report which had been placed in his hands, until he had most carefully considered it, together with the diagrams which had led the Committee to the conclusion at which they had arrived. He attached very great value to that Report, and he thought it must be admitted to be the work of gentlemen admirably adapted for the discharge of the duty. The Committee did not simply consist of naval and artillery officers, but it was assisted by an eminent civil engineer, who was well qualified to give an opinion on the subject. He thought they owed a debt of gratitude to the Committee for the manner in which they conducted the investigation, and for the care they displayed in arriving at a conclusion which, whatever might be the ultimate result, would, he was sure, carry great weight with those who had special knowledge on the subject, or who investigated explosive forces. He hoped his hon. Friend would forgive him if he failed to follow him through all the statements he made in support of his views. It would hardly be proper to do so in present circumstances. With regard to the bringing home of the gun for the purpose of making a further investigation, he could only say that it would be their duty to give the subject their most careful consideration. He was in communication with his right hon. and gallant Friend the Secretary of State for War with a view to having the whole question of ships' armaments most thoroughly and carefully investigated. The hon. Gentleman might be assured that his right hon. and gallant Friend was not less anxious than he (Mr. Smith) was to secure the most perfect and safe armament that could possibly be put on Her Majesty's ships. They were far from saying that their present guns were not good guns. But if it was possible to get a better gun, without depreciating unduly that which they at present possessed, they would undoubtedly do so. The uninjured gun was coming home. They had determined to bring it home at once, to repair the *Thunderer* at Malta, and to send out two 12½-inch guns to place in the turret without delay. They would decide what should be done with the gun that was coming home when they had conferred together and studied the evidence. He was also asked whether the men were exercised at the guns? He regretted if he failed to convey a proper impression last year in the answer he gave to the hon. Gentleman. What he meant to say was this — they had confidence in the Admiral commanding in the Mediterranean that he would see that all the proper exercises of officers and men were carried out. Gun drill was undoubtedly one of the most important duties which could be required of a ship's company. He could not at the present moment state how frequently they were drilled. He could only say, from his own observation, that he had seen them at drill constantly, and he believed it was carried out with very great regularity and care. He deplored as much as any man could do this most unfortunate accident. It was a very sad occurrence in every respect. The men were dead, and if there had been any carelessness surely they had suffered most severely by the circumstances of the accident itself. He would be extremely loth to cast the slightest suspicion upon any of those men. He believed they were exercising the guns rapidly, and no doubt they believed that what they were doing was perfectly safe. Sailors were accustomed to the handling of extremely dangerous explosive missiles with a confidence which sometimes became the cause of accident. He trusted it was not so in this case. They had every reason to believe that the care and judgment and knowledge of the officers and men in charge of these guns were all that could be desired. He deeply deplored the accident, and he trusted no aspersion of any kind would be allowed to rest on the names of the men who had fallen. The Question bearing on the position of ships' carpenters had received an answer from his hon. Friend the Member for South Devon (Sir Massey Lopes). He would, however, state the following facts:—In 1874 the minimum pay was 4*s*. The minimum harbour pay was 5*s*., and the maximum 6*s*., while the maximum sea pay was 7*s*. In 1877 the minimum pay in harbour was raised to 5*s*. 6*d*., and the maximum to 7*s*. 3*d*., while the sea pay was raised to 8*s*. 3*d*. There had, therefore, been a considerable amelioration of their condition. He admitted the importance of securing the best psssible mechanics for the duties this class of men had to discharge; but, as the hon. and learned Member for Chatham (Mr. Gorst) had reminded them, a large question was involved in raising any single rating in the Service. It was part of a very large question which affected all other warrant officers. This made it necessary for him to be exceedingly careful how he held out hopes to one class by itself; and he must therefore be excused for saying that he could not at the present moment hold out any expectation as to greatly improving the condition of ships' carpenters. He was most desirous to secure really capable men for this position, and he thought they had them at the present time. They had very little difficulty in obtaining them, and he believed they were contented. A much larger question had been raised by the hon. Member for Wigtonshire (Mr. Vans Agnew). He was sure every First Lord of the Admiralty must have wished it were in his power to promote officers much more rapidly than he was able to do; but there was much about the present system which was inevitable. So far as the Navy was concerned they had been passing through a time of peace, there had been no casualties, and there had been no opportunity for men to distinguish themselves on active service, and the consequence was that men who had grown old died almost at their posts. Their difficulty was that they required only a limited number of officers. In 1870, the right hon. Gentleman opposite (Mr. Childers) fixed the number at 600; and he (Mr. Smith) believed that there were now 641 lieutenants employed, while the number actually on the list was 827. He did not think the present list was greatly in excess of the number required. If the commissioning of a large number of ships were suddenly required, they would use a considerable number of the lieutenants who were now unemployed. As to the higher lists, he might say that at the present moment they did not require to have a larger number of commanders and captains than that at which the list was fixed. Therefore, if they promoted lieutenants to be commanders, they would have to place them on the half-pay list. They would remain at the bottom of the list for two or three years, instead of being placed at the top of the lieutenants' list and being employed. He found, on referring to the list, that there were now 141 lieutenants of over 10 years' seniority. Out of these 141 lieutenants, 103 were receiving extra pay in one shape or another, and if they were taken from this and placed on commander's half-pay they would not like it. He could assure the House that he was quite as conscious as the hon. Member who had moved the Amendment of the necessity of securing a sufficient supply of competent officers, and he knew that it was most desirable to have young men in the position of commanders. There was no alternative but to exercise the liberty of selection somewhat widely. His own endeavour had always been to select officers for promotion simply and solely on account of good or distinguished service. His hon. Friend the Member for Wigtonshire had spoken of the fact that some lieutenants, when they distinguished themselves at the Naval College, were promoted within a year; but he (Mr. Smith) thought that was exceedingly useful. It was said, on the other hand, that lieutenants who had distinguished themselves had not that advantage; but they were open to many good things, and he hoped before long they would be able to offer them still stronger inducements to go to the Naval College after they had been promoted, for very often they did not spend their time at all so advantageously for the public as if they were in the College. The hon. and learned Member for Dewsbury (Mr. Serjeant Simon) had referred to the circumstances of the sub-lieutenants. The fact of the case was that the Order of 1872 had untied rather than tied the hands of the Admiralty. The Order in Council in 1870 with reference to sub-lieutenants was that until the list was reduced to 600 there should be only promotion in the case of death vacancies, and at the rate of one in four in the case of vacancies caused by promotion and retirement from the Service; but in 1872 it was provided that till the list was reduced to 250 the Admiralty should have the power to promote such officers as they thought deserving, notwithstanding the other regulations respecting the list. At the present moment the list had fallen below the specified number, so that the power the Admiralty possessed before had been taken from them by the very wording of the Order, and it was not now possible to promote except to death vacancies and to the proportion of other vacancies that he had mentioned. It was his opinion, however, that the requirements of the Service would oblige them to maintain a larger list of lieutenants and to make provision for their promotion. Probably 800 would not be an excessive number. He fully concurred with the hon. and learned Member for Dewsbury that it was not desirable to keep young men too long in the lowest rank, and he supposed that at 23 a subordinate officer would be fit for promotion, if his capacity was ever likely to qualify him for it. He must ask that the proposal of his hon. Friend (Mr. Vans Agnew) should be negatived, as it would, he feared, pledge the House to proposals of a too indefinite character; and, besides causing considerable trouble to the Department, might entail all the inconveniences of a much larger list of officers than they would know what to do with. At present, except in the case of lieutenants, the active service list was sufficient for all requirements, and he could not wish, in the interests of the Service, to see the commanders' or captains' list much increased. The only effect of an undue increase of the list would be that a large number of men would be unemployed and on half-pay. That result would be decidedly injurious to the Public Service, and it would have the only result of a system by which men would be allowed to get rusty. He altogether objected to increase the half-pay list of commanders and captains, many of whom would remain so long ashore that they need not necessarily even see the sea for whole years together. These were matters which did not escape the attention of the Admiralty, and there were many other points, no doubt, which called for consideration; but as regarded the Motion, he hoped the House would see that it was not one which at present it would be desirable to entertain.

MR. CHILDERS wished to corroborate what had been said by the First Lord of the Admiralty, and to express his satisfaction that his right hon. Friend so firmly adopted the principle of the Order in Council, by which it was sought to make the lists of officers commensurate with the work they had to do. Subject to the general principle that the number in each rank should be fixed with reference to the work to be done, and not with a view to give promotion which should be secured in another way, the numbers settled in 1870 were tentative, and fixed only with reference to the information the Admiralty had at the time, and they could be varied or maintained only as the results of periods of considerable experience. He thought it quite right that the First Lord should revise the number on the principle stated by the right hon. Gentleman. The abolition of the navigating list had made an addition to the lieutenants' list absolutely necessary; and he thought that the First Lord had adopted a very wise course in stating at once that 600 was not a sufficient number of lieutenants at the present time. But as to the other points which had been mentioned in the discussion, he was confident that there could be no more injurious policy than to return to the old system, under which officers were often left for five or six years on shore unemployed, and the enormous lists had to be spasmodically cleared by inefficient contrivances of retirement. When the Order of 1870 was issued, the lists of the Navy were nearly twice as large as they ought to have been, and there was the double difficulty of both reducing them to proper dimensions, and providing in the future for continuous promotion in both respects. They had succeeded far beyond his utmost expectations. But if they were to begin again to swell one list after another, so as to provide promotion from the rank below, they would be landed where they were before at an enormous cost, and with universal discontent.

Major NOLAN said, he was afraid that some inconvenience would be caused by the unnecessary precaution of the First Lord with respect to the inquiry on board the *Thunderer*. He believed that the Report of the Committee was decisive; but it had been neither accepted nor rejected by the Government.

Mr. W. H. SMITH said, he should be sorry if it were supposed from his remarks that he reserved his opinion as to the Report. He accepted the Report, but did not feel prepared to discuss, without full knowledge of the evidence, the conclusions to which the Committee had come. He considered that such a course would be unwise.

Question put, and *agreed to.*

NAVY.—MEN-OF-WAR'S MEN.

OBSERVATIONS.

Lord CHARLES BERESFORD, in rising to call attention to the present system of paying off men-of-war's men into receiving ships, and to suggest that barrack accommodation should be provided for men-of-war's men in lieu of receiving ships, said, it might appear a waste of time to bring forward the subject of building naval barracks when a sum of money was put down in the Naval Estimates towards the construction of "seaman's barracks;" but he believed the great importance of getting these barracks finished as soon as possible to be so under-estimated, that he should like to point out two most dangerously weak points in the efficiency of Her Majesty's Navy. The system at present used for disposable men at home who were held in readiness to man newly-commissioned ships, or to fill vacancies on foreign stations, was as follows:—On a man-of-war paying off the ship's company, the marines went off to their barracks, the blue-jackets, excepting a certain proportion who were composed of the smartest men with the best characters, who were allowed to volunteer for the gunnery ships, went to the receiving ships; A.B.'s, ordinaries, and what were known as "excused" and working idlers went to the *Duke of Wellington*, or to the *Royal Adelaide*, the stokers went to the *Indus* or *Asia*. The above-mentioned men might then remain in these home-receiving ships for different periods of time, varying from six weeks to two years. His object in bringing forward this subject was to show—firstly, that during this time, from a service point of view, these men deteriorated, and much valuable time was lost which might be utilized in making them efficient; secondly, that the very large increase of "non-combatants" in our first-class ships, who were totally untrained to arms, and, he might say, undisciplined, was most undesirable. The total number of men—seamen class—in the Navy, not including officers, marines, and boys, was 30,887; that included all classes—petty officers A.B.'s, ordinary seamen, idlers, "excused" idlers, and stokers. Of this number 8,581 were serving in the eight receiving ships, the two gunnery ships, one torpedo ship, and in the naval barracks at Sheerness.

From the 8,581 he must deduct 1,954 men who were most usefully employed, with much benefit to the Service, in perfecting themselves as seamen gunners and as gunnery and torpedo instructors in the *Excellent*, *Cambridge*, and *Vernon;* that left 6,627 men who were doing nothing towards re-qualifying themselves or being got ready for commissioning ships. From the 6,627 he must take the number of "non-combatants," which amounted to 3,012; that left 3,615 pure blue-jackets in the home ports. Now, how were these 3,615 employed? Firstly, a large ship like our old liners—taking the *Duke of Wellington* as an example—required a large number of men to keep it clean and a large number to man the boats, who must do nothing else while so employed towards making themselves efficient in drills, ready for any ship newly commissioned; then two hours each day were wasted in pulling from the ship to the dockyard, as it took half-an-hour to do the distance. And when they did get on shore a large proportion of men were employed at work which was certainly not instructive in either seamanship or gunnery, and which was called by the men "Doin' a 'orse," that was, hauling carts and timber about the yards. When they had barracks all that time would be saved. It would give the Admiralty a chance of making all pure blue-jackets seamen gunners, instead of, as was now the case, only the smartest and "best-charactered" men being allowed to volunteer for the gunnery ships on a ship paying off; the remainder, which comprised men not so intelligent, or young men who might have got into trouble, kicking over the traces a bit from exuberance of spirits, but still often very good men if wanted, went to the receiving ships. If the men were in barracks instead of on board these ships, they would be ready-drilled when called on to man a ship newly commissioned, instead of being, as is now the case, deteriorated, having forgotten what they were taught even in their last sea-going vessel. Under the present system, the smartest captain could not get his ship in order for fighting under three or four months—that was, as he would like to have her, and as she ought to be on going into action, every man thoroughly acquainted with the duties of his station, and with the ordinary drills and routines of a sea-going man-of-war. Another very weak point, notably in the *Duke of Wellington*, was the large number of prisoners awaiting court martial or completion of sentence, sometimes as many as 60 at a time. Knowing a ship was to know the bad effect so many prisoners must have on the ship's company, more particularly as he had mentioned that they were not our very best men; also, having of necessity to keep the 60 prisoners cooped up together was as bad as it could be, the only possible place to keep them being in the fore part of the orlop deck, which was railed off like a cage. There was also the point of expense. The *Duke of Wellington* last year cost £2,600 to repair her—that was merely to keep her rotten timbers efficient. If they allowed £1,000 for each of the remaining ships a-year, always excepting the gunnery ships, it would take £7,000 more, making a total of £9,600, or, say, £10,000 a-year to keep them floating in a liveable condition. That sum, of course, would be saved by having barracks. Now let him turn to what he called the dangerously weak point at present existing in Her Majesty's Navy. Of the 30,887 seamen class—these did not include, as he said before, officers, marines, or boys—11,300 were "non-combatants"—namely, stokers, who numbered 4,985; artificers, who included carpenters' mates, carpenters, calkers, blacksmiths, armourers, plumbers, plumbers' mates, and armourers' crews, 2,310; petty officers, non-seamen class, which included schoolmaster, sick-berth steward, attendants, writers, bandmasters, and musicians, 994; and the domestics and bandsmen, which included stewards, cooks, and servants, 3,044. These men were totally untrained to arms, and were undisciplined. By undisciplined, he meant that they knew nothing about "squad" drill, and any orders other than those connected with their respective duties they did not know how to obey. In our present first-class fighting ships the proportion of "non-combatants" was enormous; it was quite unavoidable owing to the number of things that were now done by machinery that were formerly done by manual labour, but still it formed a dangerous element. In the *Marlborough*, 20 years ago, the non-combatants were in a proportion of about 9 or 10 per cent. The present proportion, taking three different classes, was as follows:—*Minotaur*, total complement, 700; non-combatants, 192. *Thunderer*, total complement, 359; non-combatants, 161. *Hotspur*, total complement, 210; non-combatants, 92;—rendering the last-named about 45 per cent. This large proportion existed in our best ships, the very ships that would do all the fighting if war were declared —blockading and duties in the performance of which they would be most liable to be attacked by torpedo boats. In that case our own boats would be away rowing guard, manned and armed, and who would then be left to defend the ship? If a ship were to be rammed, no doubt boarders ought to be called. With a small ship's company every man ought to be trained to arms—servants, stokers, idlers—all ought to be able to assist in defending the ship. Again, the commanding officer of a turret-ship ought to be able to man and arm boats, and to be quite happy with the "non-combatants" left to defend the ship; but it was not so. In a ship of the *Thunderer* class, if the boats were to be manned and armed, it would take every fighting blue-jacket out of the ship, and nearly all the marines, leaving the "non-combatants," about six petty officers, and 12 marines, to defend a ship worth over £500,000. When they had barracks, he most earnestly hoped that every man might be trained to arms, particularly in these days of small ship's companies and costly ships, and large percentages of non-combatants. He had no desire to make the work tedious to the men. They ought, however, to be taught how to fire a rifle and fix a sword-bayonet. With barracks this would be simple enough; much time would be gained; a routine would be made out to enable each man to have a fair spell at his drill, as also at his ordinary work. It was impossible, or almost impossible, to drill "non-combatants" on board a commissioned vessel, as their time was entirely taken up with the duties for which they were engaged by the Service, besides which there was very properly an Admiralty Order against employing stokers, particularly in duties other than their own. He had endeavoured to point out the very faulty system of "receiving ships;" they were nearly all worn out, and the country, of course, would not vote for building obsolete line-of-battle ships merely as receiving ships for paid-off men-of-war's men, and also the imperative necessity of having every man on board, whether he was combatant or non-combatant, trained, so that he might be able to help or defend the ship in those cases of emergency which were so certain to occur in our next naval war. We had our servants, now, Marines, and very well they answered. Being old soldiers, they were always available to fall into a company or work a gun. Why should we not require this to be done by all non-combatants when we get the barracks? He hoped the First Lord of the Admiralty would not think this was hostile criticism. He wanted to strengthen the hands of the right hon. Gentleman in so that the barracks might be built as soon as possible.

Mr. GOSCHEN said, he thought that the noble Lord had done good service in calling attention to this matter. The speech of the noble Lord touched mainly on two heads—one was the building of barracks, and the other the training and employment of the non-combatants. The First Lord of the Admiralty would no doubt feel that nothing could have been in better taste, or better tone, than the observations which had been made by the noble Lord, and he hoped that many of his suggestions would be found practicable. With regard to the building of naval barracks, that subject occupied his (Mr. Goschen's) attention, and the attention of his Colleagues when he was at the Admiralty. Preliminary inquiries were made, and it was thought that, as a question of money, the system of receiving ships incurred a great deal of waste; that it was a costly system, and notwithstanding the first cost of barracks, it was considered that they would be cheaper in the end. But there was one weak point in the speech of the noble Lord, and that was that there was no reference made to the naval barracks at Sheerness. When he was at the Admiralty, it was not the opinion of naval officers generally that they had been a success. He had risen to call attention to the point, in order that the First Lord of the Admiralty might deal with it, if he replied to the observations of the noble Lord the Member for Waterford. However, he (Mr. Goschen) did not think that the non-success at Sheerness ought to be regarded as conclusive against the scheme. If he was not mistaken, the barracks at Sheerness were distinctly unpopular with the sailors, and more desertions took place from that port than from any other; but whether that was owing to the men being kept under stricter discipline there, or some other cause, he did not know; at any rate, he would have liked to have heard from the noble Lord whether the sailors who were turned out from the naval barracks and came on board ship formed better characters than those who were taken from the receiving ships at Portsmouth and Plymouth. If the noble Lord was right in saying that the men in barracks were kept in better discipline, then the ships' crews coming from Sheerness ought to be better than those from the receiving ships. Perhaps the system at the barracks was not carried to the perfection it might have been, and it might be worthy of consideration whether something could not be done to make them more popular and more efficient. Nothwithstanding what had been said about Sheerness, he would not shrink from incurring the expense of erecting naval barracks elsewhere, if it could be shown that a better system could be introduced, and which would give greater satisfaction to the Navy.

NAVY—NAVAL DISCIPLINE ACT, 1866.

OBSERVATIONS.

MR. HOPWOOD said, that he wished to call the attention of the House to certain objectionable provisions in the Naval Discipline Act, 1866; and he should seek to prove to the satisfaction of the House that, in the interests of the Navy and the country, the Act required speedy amendment. The Act of 1866 formed the Naval Criminal Code which was first collected in the Act of 1661, and after being amended several times, but especially in 1749, was brought down to the shape of the Act of 1866; but the whole body of that Act might be said to rest mainly upon the Act of 1749. There were some 50,000 or 60,000 persons in the Navy of various grades and positions who could be tried under this Code, and under it every year some thousands of offences were dealt with. This showed that the law ought to be exceedingly plain and clear, administered as it was not by trained lawyers, but it was expected to be mastered by every officer who had served Her Majesty for a certain number of years, and who was liable to serve on courts martial. He, however, made bold to say that the Act was not what it ought to be, and that there were many persons in the Navy who would agree with him in this view. The language of the Act was antiquated, for throughout various ages articles had been added from time to time, the consequence being that there was a striking inequality in the punishments awarded for different offences. Although there were great numbers of courts martial held during the year, the proceedings were not, as he understood, read by any law officer connected with the Admiralty; and he would ask whether all the proceedings at those courts were so well done that they required no watching? Upon this subject he had put a Question to the First Lord of the Admiralty last Session and had received for answer that the proceedings were not, as a rule, laid before any legal officer. In the Army they had a Judge Advocate General, and he believed there was not a court martial whose proceedings were not laid before that gentleman. Why should it not be so in the Navy? There was, or used to be, a Judge Advocate of the Fleet. What was his function in this respect? There were, under every system of justice, instances where men were wrongly convicted; and it was a monstrous thing that matters of great complication, in which sentences of 10 or 12 years' penal servitude could be given, should be carried out without a guarantee that the sentence was proper, and without knowing who was responsible for it. He demanded that the Office of Judge Advocate of the Fleet should no longer be a sham in this respect but a reality, and that the person holding that post should be the Adviser of the Admiralty in all courts martial. He would now address himself to the text of the Act. The wholesale way of making death the penalty for offences was a very easy mode of getting rid of the difficulties in the Navy at one time; but it was time there was a reform. Matters with regard to the Army were about to be simplified, and why should there not be a reformed Code for the Navy, as was proposed for the Army? The Act was, in many respects, inconsistent and insufficient. For instance, by Section 2, it provided that the punishment of death should be inflicted upon the officer who failed to do certain things when in sight of an enemy afloat; but there was no punishment provided in cases where the enemy, though not in sight, was close at hand, hidden behind a neighbouring cape, or in a land-locked harbour, or even on shore and firing his guns at our ships afloat. Again, there was no provision for a mutineer standing alone, such an offender being always treated by the Act as a ringleader. The punishment for mutineers other than ringleaders under Section 11 was less than that for persons guilty, under Section 14, of "uttering words of mutiny;" and he asked which it was intended to constitute the higher offence? Then, why should there not be a different scale of punishment for striking, or striking at, an officer during the course of active operations in the presence of an enemy, and when those active operations were not going on? There ought to be power to award a punishment according to the greater or less enormity of the offence. Now, whereas death was stated to be the punishment in all cases for striking, or striking at, an officer, it was a remarkable thing that as regarded the person of the Sovereign herself it was, by the Statute 5 & 6 *Vict.* c. 51, enacted that the punishment for such an offence should be transportation for seven years, or imprisonment for three years, with the addition of whipping. The Act, whilst professing to be a perfect Naval Code, was faulty in not providing any punishment for a number of offences, some of which must have been in the minds of the framers of the measure, although they were not expressed in the Act. His contention also was that the Act was to a considerable extent involved, complicated, and inconsistent, and therefore likely to throw difficulty in the way of those who had to expound it in distant parts of the world away from books or legal assistance, or anything, in fact, which could throw light upon so confused and confusing an enactment. Another section of the Act to which he wished to call attention was Section 29, that which awarded "dismissal with disgrace" from Her Majesty's Service as a punishment for designedly or negligently, or by any default

> "Losing, stranding, or hazarding, or suffering to be lost, stranded, or hazarded any ship of Her Majesty or in Her Majesty's Service."

Let the House compare the punishment thus provided with that to which the skipper of a merchant vessel would be subject. Some few years since a merchant captain losing his ship designedly would have had to suffer death. Under the present law his punishment would be penal servitude for life. It was, of course, absurd to suppose that any of Her Majesty's naval officers would designedly lose their ships; but the Act applied to "any person" in the Service doing so, and for so doing he was to suffer, not death or penal servitude for life, but dismissal from the Service, with disgrace, "or suffer such other punishment," &c., which, by Section 55, must be one inferior in degree to that specified. Surely a law, so inconsistent and unsupportable, ought at once to be amended? Then Section 33 dealt with the offence of "wasteful expenditure" of powder or other stores; but with what crime did the House think that offence was bracketed? With "embezzlement of, or the fraudulent buying or selling of, ammunition, provisions, or other public stores." Was it not manifestly absurd to join together and place on the same level offences so widely different in their nature? Then, again, Section 34 dealt with the crime of setting fire to any dockyard, magazine, stores, or to any ship, vessel, barge, or other craft not being the property of an enemy, for which the penalty of death was awarded; but it was not enacted that the vessel set on fire should be the property of Her Majesty, so that, for ordinary arson, a man subject to this Act might be condemned to death. He now came to the question of courts martial, to which the 53rd section applied. Where the number of the court did not exceed five, it required the verdict of four of the five to render the sentence of death lawful, and in other cases a majority of not less than two-thirds of the officers present must concur in the sentence; but the number of the members of the court might be five or any greater number up to nine. Now, how, he asked, could a majority of two-thirds be obtained if the number of the court happened to be eight? In such case it would require five and one-third to concur in the sentence of death, or of four and two-thirds if the number was seven. Here, too, it was clear that an amendment of the Act was called for. The 45th section of the Act showed what offences might come before a court martial; it was headed—"Offences punishable by the ordinary law." It said that every person subject to that Act who was guilty of murder should suffer death, and it specially provided for certain well-known crimes. Then came the provision that if he was

> "guilty of any other criminal offence, which if committed in England would be punishable by the law of England, he should be punished, whether the offence was committed in England or not, either under the first part of this Act, or as by any ordinary criminal tribunal competent to try the offence if committed in England."

Thus they fell back on the first part of the Statute, and called every offence, not otherwise specified, an "act to the prejudice of good order and naval discipline." That seemed to be a very vague and monstrous clause to throw bodily at the heads of gentlemen not trained in the law. Very valuable suggestions might be offered if the subject were referred to a Committee. Among them would be this one—that there ought to be an officer of the Marines on a court martial which sat to try a marine. Then, the power exercised by courts martial of punishing men by penal servitude was excessive, and ought to be subject to some limitation. It was shocking that a man could be sent into penal servitude for 10 years with no more inquiry into his case than was furnished by a hasty court martial. Justice could not be rightly administered in a hurry; and even Judges and juries occasionally made lamentable mistakes, which could only be set right afterwards by the exercise of the Royal Prerogative. But penal servitude was dispensed by courts martial with an absence of proper safeguard. The farce was gone through of getting a Judge of the Court of Queen's Bench, the Exchequer, or the Common Pleas to endorse the order of the court martial which awarded penal servitude. He should like very much to know who was the Judge they employed to perform that unpleasant office. He understood that one Judge, when applied to in that matter, used to ask such inconvenient questions that the Admiralty ceased to trouble him about that business. In conclusion, he urged that the liberty of the Navy and the interests of the country imperatively demanded a speedy amendment of that branch of the law.

Mr. A. F. EGERTON said, that the hon. and learned Member for Stockport had complained of the method which was pursued with regard to the decisions of courts martial, and in particular that they were referred to no legal authority. But the practice was as follows:—When they came to the Admiralty they were referred, in the first instance, to a gentleman who had been considering the decisions of courts martial during the whole of his life, and who was thoroughly competent to deal with the subject. If a legal point of importance arose, it was referred to the Solicitor to the Admiralty or to the Law Officers of the Crown; but, in fact, it very rarely happened that points of law arose which it was necessary to refer to any legal authority. When the hon. and learned Member complained that the Admiralty were not treating this question as the War Office was treating the question of Army discipline, he (Mr. A. F. Egerton) must point out that the circumstances were quite different. The Army was devising a Code under the Army Discipline Act; but there was already such a Code for the Navy, and nothing further was required. With regard to the Naval Discipline Act, he admitted that there was some strange phraseology in the 29th clause; but the object of the enactment was clear—namely, that a person who lost a ship negligently should be subject to a certain punishment. He confessed that "designedly" was a strange word to use in such a clause, although he was by no means certain that the use of that word made it necessary to revise the whole Act. With regard to the supposed difficulty of defining mutiny, the ordinary cases of mutiny were so clear that there was never any difficulty about it. The real objection to revising the Act was that practically it formed a Code that naval officers very well understood. They had been accustomed to it for years, and administered it without injustice; and if they were to alter the Act, they might shake the basis of discipline in Her Majesty's Navy. He held that it was unwise to meddle with an Act mainly because its phraseology was slightly antiquated. It was sometimes absolutely necessary that offences which otherwise would be tried by Civil Courts at home should be tried by Naval courts martial. Take the case of a sailor committing manslaughter as he went out of some English port. The ship sailed, and the only mode of trying him was by court martial at the station where the vessel arrived. If the law were otherwise, the commander of a ship who had started for the discharge of important duties might find it necessary to put back into the port from which he had started. The hon. and learned Member had suggested that warrant officers should be placed on courts martial. That would be a very grave and startling change which would affect the whole economy of the Navy, and he did not think that at present either the Lords of the Admiralty or the naval officers generally throughout the Fleet would accept such a change with equanimity. The hon. and learned Gentleman concluded his speech by adverting to the question of penal servitude. He himself was of opinion that it would be desirable to make a distinction between civilians who had been sentenced to penal servitude for degrading crimes and men in Her Majesty's Service, who were subjected to the same punishment for some grave dereliction of naval or military duty. In fact, it had long been under consideration whether such a distinction should not be made either by means of the erection of new prisons or by a classification of prisoners in those already existing. He did not intend to refer to all the matters which had been mentioned; but he thought he should have been wanting in courtesy to the hon. and learned Gentleman opposite if he had not answered several of the objections which had been raised.

Mr. GOSCHEN said, he must express regret that the hon. Gentleman who had just sat down should have said that an examination of the Act with the object of ascertaining whether it contained any obsolete clauses would shake the whole basis of naval discipline. His opinion of the capacity of naval officers was far too high to allow him to admit for a moment the validity of such an argument. It was, indeed, very possible that this Act required to be looked into. He should have been very glad if the hon. Member who last addressed the House had fully described the great pains taken at the Admiralty to insure perfect justice to prisoners. The whole matter was, undoubtedly, one of great importance, and he thought the hon. and learned Member for Stockport (Mr. Hopwood) was perfectly entitled to call attention to it. It startled the civilian mind to see the way in which under naval discipline some cases had to be dealt with; but he could testify to the extraordinary care with which the decisions of courts martial were reviewed at the Admiralty during the time he was in Office. At that time the Secretary to the Admiralty was a trained lawyer, who was particularly conversant with martial law, and he thought that the practice of appointing legal gentlemen to the post, such as Mr. Romaine, and subsequently, Mr. Vernon Lushington, was a good one. He trusted whenever there was the slightest difficulty with regard to the law of evidence or matters of that kind, the question would be laid before competent legal advisers. Of course, there was no suggestion on his part that justice was not done at present.

Mr. W. H. SMITH: I quite concur in the observations of the right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Goschen), as to the necessity of securing not only that justice is done, but also that legal justice is done in all cases; and I can assure him that the practice of the Admiralty is to secure the object he has so strongly enforced upon us. In the first place, as my hon. Friend (Mr. A. F. Egerton) has stated, the papers are carefully minuted by a gentleman who is known by the right hon. Gentleman himself to be one of the most experienced officers in martial law. He was the assistant to Mr. Romaine and Mr. Vernon Lushington. But these minutes of the head of the branch are most carefully considered, and if there is any legal question, no attempt is made on the part of the Admiralty to decide it; it is referred to the Judge Advocate General of the Fleet, and to the Legal Advisers of the Crown; so that every care is taken to secure justice.

Main Question, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair," put, and *agreed to*.

SUPPLY—NAVY ESTIMATES.

Supply—*considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

DEPARTMENTAL STATEMENT.

Mr. W. H. SMITH: The Estimates which I have now the honour and the duty to submit to the attention of the Committee have been framed, as I daresay the Committee will see, with a very considerable regard, though I trust not an undue regard, to economy. We have been able to effect alterations which will make a considerable reduction on the charges proposed in the Committee of Supply in 1878. The first Estimate of that year was £11,053,901, and there were Supplementary Estimates occasioned by the circumstances of the year, but which I need not now go into. The sum we now ask for is £10,586,894, thus showing a decrease on the whole of £467,000. I must, however, say with reference to this Estimate, that it does not include any abnormal charge for transport, which may be occasioned by the Zulu War. The Estimates were framed before we had any reason to believe that it would be necessary to incur a large expenditure on that account, and the provision that has been made for the transport of troops to the Cape of Good Hope, and for bringing them back, as I hope before long, is not included in the Estimate, but will form the subject of a Supplementary charge. The charge, therefore, under this head is a normal charge. I need hardly say this—that the reductions have been effected without any sacrifice of efficiency; indeed, I should be inclined to contend that any real sacrifice of efficiency was not true economy in the conduct of the affairs of the Navy. It is of the highest importance that the Navy of this country, which has always been looked upon as the first line of defence, should be maintained in all respects in an efficient and serviceable condition. It is my object, as it has been that of my Predecessor, to maintain Her Majesty's ships in a serviceable state, fit for sea, and ready to do their work at any moment. It has also been my object to build such ships as experience and science has shown on the whole to be the most formidable, and the most suitable for the work which they have to do. Remarks have been made, I may say not without apparent foundation, that a very large portion of our expenditure goes on in repairs. Well, Sir, it must be borne in mind, as has been forcibly described not many years ago by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for the City of London (Mr. Goschen), that we have ships in all parts of the world discharging duties of every conceivable kind. On the 1st of January, 1879, there were no less than 164 effective ships and vessels armoured and unarmoured in commission. There were 125 fighting sea-going and non-sea-going ships, and 39 unarmoured non-fighting vessels, comprising troop-ships, store-ships, despatch vessels, and boats for special service. It is necessary to maintain, either in commission, or in a fit service for work, all these vessels, and that alone is a task which entails a large expenditure. I propose to take the Estimates, as I think it will be most convenient for the Committee that I should do, in the order in which they stand. In the first place, I will refer to Vote 1, for men. The Committee will see that there has been a reduction in the number of men as compared with previous years, while there is a small increase in the amount necessary to pay these men. The decrease on the whole is 1,200, the aggregate number voted last year being 60,000 men, while this year we only ask a Vote on Account of 58,800 men. But if hon. Members will refer to the Estimates, they will find that there is an increase in the continuous-service seamen class of 950; that is partly due to the fact that the waste of seamen is less than before, and partly to boys being rated as men, owing to the age at which they have arrived. More men, I am happy to say, have entered the continuous service, and there has been some slight increase owing to the employment of more engine-room artificers, stokers, and other continuous-service men. Engine-room artificers are a class which we have found to be exceedingly necessary in increased numbers, owing to the multiplication of torpedo boats and the lighter class of tenders to sea-going fighting ships, which materially increase the usefulness and power of such vessels. There is also a decrease, as hon. Members will perceive, in the number of boys. Last year the number of boys was

6,300; this year we only propose to take a Vote for 5,300. The decrease in the boys under instruction in the training ships is only 300, and the decrease in the number of boys in the service of the Fleet is due to the fact that the boys having become men have been taken as continuous-service seamen in increased numbers. The boys under training are 2,400 this year, instead of 2,700, at which number they stood last year. I had the calculations as to the waste of the Reserve carefully examined, and I am under the impression that it will be found that 2,400 boys will be amply sufficient to supply the full number of the seamen class which we require at the present time. We take 133 boys per annum, and we calculate that, allowing for 8 per cent waste, they will produce an annual increase to the permanent Force of 100 men, and thus we shall require annually to enter 2,394 boys, in order to keep up our permanent Force of 18,000 blue jackets. But whether these calculations are correct or not, the fact remains that at the present moment we have a larger number of disposable boys for ordinary seamen than we really require, and an interval of two months will not cause serious loss to the country even if we find it ultimately necessary to increase the number to 2,700; but, as I said before, I am under the impression that 2,400 will be found sufficient to keep up our Establishment of 18,000 seamen. I am speaking, of course, of the number of blue-jackets, irrespective of stokers and engine-room artificers. With respect to the Coastguard, it will be found that there is a reduction in the provision for it. The Coastguard has not been full for some time, and we have thought it best to reduce it to the numbers which we estimate will keep it under any excess of what will be required. There is also a reduction in the number of Marines. Last year there were 14,000 Marines voted, whereas this year we only ask for 13,000. Hon. Gentlemen are probably aware that it is not an uncommon circumstance for the Marines to be some 400 or 500 below their strength, and they are now some 650 below it. I may say, however, that there is no intention to reduce the number of officers or of non-commissioned officers; but simply to refrain from recruiting until we get down to a Force of 13,000 men. If it should become necessary to increase the Marines, experience has shown that there will be no difficulty in obtaining recruits up to the full number required. There is at the present moment a considerable force of Marines on shore, well able to furnish a battalion for service abroad, if it should be desirable to send them out. Therefore, with the reduction I have proposed, I am fully justified in asking the Committee to accept the charges which are the result of that reduction. The Committee will perceive, and the country will be anxious to know, that we have a Reserve of seamen and gunners upon which to fall back in the event of any sudden emergency which might require the ships to be commissioned and filled with trained seamen and gunners. We have, first of all, a real Reserve of Marines of between 4,000 and 5,000 men on shore, who could be employed either on the land defences or with the Fleet. Undoubtedly, a considerable number would be required for reliefs. Men would be landed from the Fleet, and it would be necessary to provide about 1,000 men for the purpose of relieving them. It should be remembered, however, that we have a considerable force available. There is the Coastguard Force, which may be taken at about 4,150, and there are also 995 enrolled seamen pensioners available for service. In consequence of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Pontefract (Mr. Childers) having drawn my attention last year to the liability of seamen pensioners for service, I may state that I have satisfied myself that every seaman pensioner up to the age of 55 is liable to serve in time of emergency. Formerly, the limit of age was 50, but now it has been extended to the age of 55. Every seaman who accepts his pension is liable for duty when called upon up to that age; and not only does he forfeit his pension if he fails to serve, but he becomes a deserter, and can be charged as such. It is right that this should be understood, because although the Force may have become somewhat rusty, yet it is composed of trained men, and would be undoubtedly of very great value to the country in time of real emergency, if it unfortunately should arise. In addition to the 995 enrolled seamen pensioners, there are 9,000 men under the age of

55 years who are liable to serve. There is also the Royal Naval Reserve of 11,579 first-class, 5,331 second-class men, and 44 boys. Putting all these together, we have, therefore, a very large force upon which we could fall back in time of emergency; and I think that the provision that thus exists for manning the Fleet is in excess of any demand that is ever likely to be made. I have thought it right to state these figures to the Committee, in order that there may be no anxiety or concern at what might appear to be a retrograde policy in the reduction of the Effective Force of the Fleet at the present moment. It might be as well if I were to inform the House what the actual numbers of the several classes were on the 1st of February, 1879. They were—Seaman class, 20,054; artificers, 2,310; stokers, 4,985; servants or idlers, 4,038; and Kroomen, 409. The numbers voted in 1879-80 will be—Seamen class, 19,254; artificers, 2,260; stokers, 4,935; servants, 2,938; and Kroomen, 500. The totals show a reduction of 1,000 men. I now come to the question of expenditure on Vote 2, for victuals and clothing, on which there is a reduction of £142,817. Some portion of this is due to a reduction in prices; but part of the reduction is also due to the fact that we provide for 1,200 fewer men than we provided for last year. Generally, we have gone through the provisions that have been made for the different classes with as much care as possible, and I believe that we have provided for everything that will be really required, at the same time guarding ourselves from making provision for anything in excess of the real necessities of the case. I think the Committee will feel that it is our duty to estimate carefully, and not to estimate—as has been done in some cases—for the purpose of producing a surplus. The next Vote with which I have to deal is that for the Admiralty Office (Vote 3), and some explanation is required with regard to it. There has been a considerable reduction in the cost of the Accountant General's Department, and a saving in salaries has been made of £18,800. This has been accomplished by giving pensions and gratuities which will last for 10 years, and will amount to an annual charge of £16,000, so that there has not been any very great saving in the actual cost of the Establishment. It would be wrong to suppose that economy is the only advantage which can be gained by arrangements of this kind. Hon. Gentlemen familiar with the Department will know that it is one which stood as much in need of re-organization as any in the Public Service. The work was not done so efficiently as it is now, and we shall go on with a contented, vigorous, and, I think, a very useful staff. Some changes of the same kind may be necessary in other Departments of the Admiralty; powers to effect them were obtained last year, and under these, steps will be taken which I have no doubt will much advantage the Public Service. On Vote 4, which is for the Coastguard and the Reserve, the reduction is due to the fact that the Estimate has been carefully made for the probable charge of the Service that will be required. There will be no reduction in the Royal Naval Reserve, and the Estimate is based upon the number of men whom we expect to obtain. No check has been put upon the number of men, although I may say that they have not come forward so freely as was expected. Therefore we have not thought it right to estimate for a number of men in excess of that which we shall probably get. With respect to Vote 5, I only wish to say one word. That Vote is in respect of the Scientific branch of the Service, with regard to which there is no change; but a considerable one has been made in the arrangements of the Naval College. We have thought it right to provide that the examinations shall be conducted by an independent Board of University Examiners, and not by the College authorities themselves. I think the Committee will agree with me that the Director of Studies, and the other officers, of whom I desire to speak in the highest terms, are not the proper persons to conduct examinations into the results of their own labour, and a system which depended upon the efficiency of such examinations must some time or other break down. Therefore, with the full concurrence of my Colleagues and the President of the College, I have thought it right to institute this independent examination. As I said in an earlier part of the evening, I hope we shall be able to make provision for the attendance of lieutenants at the College

during the time which they now usually occupy in their own purposes. It will, I think, be a desirable change for them to spend nine months at the College instead of wasting the time on shore. I am not in a position to tell the House the manner in which I propose to carry out that arrangement, but must defer giving particulars until I have more complete materials. I now come to Vote 6, one which is always a matter of interest to the Committee—that relating to Dockyards and Naval Yards at Home and Abroad. The Committee will see that there has been no reduction in the number of men to be employed in the Dockyards, nor has anything been done to affect the efficiency of the work performed there. The numbers and the Vote this year are substantially the same as last year. No doubt, there appears to be a decrease; but when the Supplementary Estimate of last year is taken into consideration, that will not be found to be so. The policy which I have kept in view with regard to the employment of men is that their employment shall be continuous and steady. I do not think that it is advisable suddenly, either largely to increase or to diminish the number of men employed. The experience gained by the men is found of very great value, for it takes some time to make good workmen. It has very often happened that a man who has served for five or six months has become most useful at the time that it is necessary to discharge him. The object which I wish to keep steadily in view is to make the greatest possible use of the men we have in hand, and to work them well. The only thing to which I will call attention is with regard to a slight increase in the staff at Malta Dockyard. The Committee will feel that it is a matter of the highest importance that our Dockyards abroad should be capable of doing the work likely to be assigned to them. Malta has proved to be a most useful Dockyard, and has rendered very good service. The work is not costly, and it is a great economy that many of our ships, not requiring repairs of an extensive character, should be repaired there rather than brought home. Hong-Kong is also a Yard in which there has been some slight increase, and there, again, we have very good results for our money. I know that there are great objections amongst officers against work being done abroad; but I believe the work done at Hong-Kong has been exceedingly satisfactory, and the results are most economical and good in every respect. At Malta we expect to be in a position to repair the *Thunderer*, only sending out some fitters from England to assist in the work that is to be carried out. One permanent subordinate officer has been appointed to that Yard, and with their assistance the work there will be done. There is also a change, to which I will draw attention, in the position of Chief Constructor and Chief Engineer at Chatham. Considering the importance of that Yard, we think it right that it should be made a first-class Yard, and placed on the same footing, as regards the Chief Constructor and Chief Engineer, as Portsmouth and Devonport. Provision has also been made for a small advance in the wages and position of the leading men of shipwrights and caulkers in Dockyards. That will involve a present expenditure of £1,200 a-year, and will fairly recompense the good service rendered by those men. We fully recognize the value of the work done by those men, and are desirous that they should be encouraged. I may state that the present rate of pay of these men is 6*s*. 6*d*. a-day for the first seven years, and 7*s*. a-day afterwards. The new rates will be 6*s*. 6*d*. a-day for the first four years, 7*s*. for the next three years, and 7*s*. 6*d*. afterwards. I now come to the programme of the work done as compared with the programme proposed to be accomplished in the coming year. Taking the tonnage of last year, we had intended to build, under the formula laid down by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for the City of London, when at the Admiralty, 8,578 tons of iron-clads, and on the basis of previous Estimates we completed 7,533 tons of iron-clads, so that there is a nominal loss of 1,045 tons of iron-clads. We proposed to build of unarmoured ships 4,830 tons, and we have completed on the basis of the Estimate of the right hon. Gentleman 5,346, or a gain of 516 tons. The fact is, however, that the work which we are now carrying out in the Dockyards is more costly in labour than it has been before; it is more costly because the construction is more intricate; there are more cellular compartments, more fittings, and more mechanical complications of various kinds than were originally estimated; and it is impossible fully and entirely to provide for them beforehand under the formula to which I have referred. Including the contract work, we intended to produce 13,408 tons in the Dockyards of armoured and unarmoured vessels, and 4,699 to be done by contract. We actually produced 11,968 tons in the Dockyards, 4,422 by contract, and 1,661 by purchase, making in all 18,051 tons. I explained partly how it was that this occurred when I took the Vote of Credit. There has been a delay in the construction of the large armoured ships, due to my own decision as to the *Ajax* and *Agamemnon*. In the course of last year representations were made to me that it was desirable that the question of larger and more powerful guns should be considered. The *Ajax* and the *Agamemnon* were far advanced, and other ships—the *Majestic*, the *Colossus*, and the *Conqueror* —were about to be commenced; and it appeared to me to be necessary to examine most carefully the conditions under which it might be possible to put larger and more powerful guns into these ships. The result was a delay in the progress of the *Ajax* and the *Agamemnon*, and a delay in the preparation of the designs for the *Majestic*, the *Colossus*, and the *Conqueror*, for which I am responsible, and in respect of which I consider I acted wisely in taking the responsibility, looking at the very great importance of the subject involved. We decided eventually upon proceeding with the *Ajax* and the *Agamemnon*, as originally intended, and we prepared the *Colossus*, the *Majestic*, and the *Conqueror*, so that they might receive either breech-loading or muzzle-loading guns; but, as I have said, such a decision is not now necessary, and will not be so until about a year from the present time. I may also mention another point—the experiments with compound steel-faced armour for the turrets of the *Inflexible*. A difference of opinion has existed as to whether compound steel-faced armour was not the best armour. Experiments were made, and I have come to the conclusion that it is necessary to clothe the turrets of the *Inflexible* with compound steel plates. A great many objections were made to this proposal; but the conclusion appears to me to be well established, that what would pass through the heaviest iron armour would be resisted by compound steel-faced plates. Although compound steel-faced plates might be cracked by shot, yet they would still do their duty, and enable the vessel of which they were the armour to remain an efficient fighting ship during the remainder of the engagement; while iron plates might get perforated, and render the iron-clad useless. Great care has been taken to secure proper tests for these steel-faced plates, and every steel-faced plate will be tested, a piece being cut off from the finished plate, which will be fired at, so as to ascertain its power of resistance, and whether it will act in the way in which people say it will. It is not possible at present to give the relative resisting power. We must wait patiently the result of careful and more extended experiments. All we know at present is that compound plates of the same thickness are expected to resist where iron plates would be perforated. But, on a balance of the evidence presented to me, I am satisfied that it is my duty to adopt compound steel-faced plates as external armour for the turrets of the *Inflexible;* and I think the result will show that a much greater amount of resistance has been given to those turrets. Still, as the Committee will understand, this decision was taken after very grave deliberation, and after much evidence had been investigated, and a very considerable time had been spent in making experiments. The delay in the *Inflexible* and other ships is thus accounted for. But if there has been delay, we have something to show for it; we have had something for the delay. The energy which would have been employed in advancing those ships has been directed to preparing others, some new, and some repaired for sea. Of iron-clad vessels we have now four ready for sea—the *Dreadnought*, the *Northampton*, the *Nelson*, and the *Northumberland*. In the course of the year nine others will be ready—the *Devastation*, for a three years' commission; the *Neptune*, the *Sultan*, the *Repulse*, the *Superb*, the *Hotspur*, the *Wivern*, the *Orion*, and the *Swiftsure*. Then, four large first-class unarmoured vessels are ready for sea, and other vessels have been ordered home to be put in a state of efficiency. In the course of the year the whole of the *Comus* class, six in number, will be ready for sea. I think, therefore, that if we have failed to produce quite so large an amount of armoured tonnage in the course of the past year as previously, yet we can, at least, give a good account of the way in which the funds placed at the disposal of the Admiralty have been employed, the Fleet being, at the present moment, certainly not inferior to any hitherto seen in English waters. There is another point to which I am anxious to direct the attention of the Committee—namely, the flotilla of torpedo boats. We have given great attention during the past year to that class of vessels; they constitute a most formidable and, I may say, a most dreadful mode of offence. We have thought it necessary to fit several of our first-class ships with torpedo boats, and with facilities for getting them in and out. And I do not much doubt that these boats will fully realize the expectations formed respecting them. The first-class torpedo boats have realized a speed of 18 knots per hour. The second-class boats have attained to a speed of 16 knots, although 14¾ knots was the contract figure. The performances of both classes of boats have been exceedingly satisfactory. We have thought it necessary not to confine ourselves to English manufacturers and builders in this matter. The other day I saw tried an American boat, which promised exceedingly well. Steam was got up in it within a period of six minutes, and the boat was actually moving under steam in that time. It takes a much longer time than that to get up speed in the old-fashioned boilers.

Mr. T. BRASSEY inquired what number of torpedo boats it was intended to build this year?

Mr. W. H. SMITH: We intend to build a considerable number of torpedo boats; but the exact number I do not think it desirable to mention, as the manufacture is in a very few hands. I now wish to refer to the work we contemplate doing in the course of this year. The boilers constructed in the Dockyards during the past year amounted to 30,948 indicated horse-power, and that was 507 indicated horse-power more than it was intended to construct. As regards shipbuilding work in the Dockyards during the year 1879-80, we contemplate advancing nine armour-plated ships by 7,493 tons, and eight steel and iron corvettes and other ships, amounting altogether to 4,658 tons, showing a total of 12,151 tons of work to be done in the Dockyards. Of shipbuilding work by contract, we propose to advance iron-clads by 239 tons, and unarmoured ships, gunboats, torpedo boats, &c., by 2,888 tons. The total number of vessels under contract is 35, independent of the increase to the torpedo flotilla. Altogether, we propose to build during the year 1879-80 a total weight of hull of 15,278 tons, with an indicated horse-power of 28,397. We expect to construct in the Dockyards this year about the same quantity of boilers as in the last year, when we produced about 30,000 indicated horse-power. I do not know, Sir, that I need occupy further time upon this question of shipbuilding; but will only say that I shall be prepared to answer any questions which hon. Gentlemen may put to me at a later period of the evening. I may, however, again state that it is most distinctly the policy of the present Board of Admiralty—a policy which I hope will never be departed from—to take every ship in hand for repair and put it in a fit condition for sea, if it be economical and desirable to repair that ship. In that way we are able to count upon having efficient ships, so far as repairs and seaworthiness are concerned. It is most desirable, no doubt, that new ships should be added to the Service, and that vessels of the most powerful type should be constructed; but it is wasteful in the last degree to allow really valuable ships, which it would be economical to repair—I lay great stress upon that point, for there are many ships which it would not be economical or right to repair—to deteriorate largely and become useless by remaining in the Reserve uncared for. I now come to Vote 7, the Vote for the Victualling Yards. Here, again, I am glad to be able to show a reduction of a not inconsiderable amount. Votes 8 and 9 (Medical Establishments and Marine Divisions) call for no remark. Vote 10 (Naval Stores and Machinery) is one which is always looked to with considerable interest, and the Committee will observe that it shows a somewhat large reduction. As we propose to build a smaller number of ships during the present year than the last year, a smaller provision for them is required. The Admiralty, moreover, have had the advantage of a slight fall in prices. The reduction in Section 1 (Naval Stores) is £169,051, and that notwithstanding the fact that there has been a somewhat abnormal charge of £25,000 for new moorings for the Bermuda Dock. No reduction in real serviceable stores has been made; but all the stores have been maintained at the amount fixed and arrived at as the result of careful experiment and study, and I believe that it will be found that our stock of stores is amply sufficient for all the demands that may be made upon it. Section 2 of Vote 10 (Machinery and Ships built by Contract) shows a reduction of £200,000. With reference to this, the Committee will see that we are building less ships by contract, and therefore we require smaller provision to meet the charge. The amount of reduction is, no doubt, considerable, and the amount, it is true, might have been expended in adding considerably to the Fleet; but, looking to the expenditure last year on armoured, and also, to some extent, on unarmoured vessels, I do not think that I should be justified this year in asking for the full amount usually spent on shipbuilding by contract. I now come, Sir, to Vote 11, the Vote for Works and Buildings, and this will give me a fair opportunity of referring to some observations which fell from the right hon. Gentleman opposite (Mr. Goschen), and the noble Lord behind me (Lord Charles Beresford), with regard to seamen's barracks. A very small provision is made here for barracks both at Portsmouth and at Devonport. That provision has only been made in order to enable us to provide such accommodation for the men as was absolutely necessary; and had we not expended the money on the barracks it would have had to be expended in other ways. I agree with what has been said, that barrack accommodation would be greatly to the advantage of the men, and that it would increase their comfort and respectability, and, therefore, be a great benefit to the Service. The right hon. Gentleman opposite has expressed some doubt as to whether the barracks at Sheerness are altogether popular with seamen. I have the strongest reason for believing that these barracks are very popular, although it is only fair to state that the barracks at Sheerness are by no means a favourable specimen. They are simply an old store, in an inconvenient position, and without proper accommodation, converted into sailors' barracks; and, moreover, Sheerness is not the most desirable part of the world to live in. Notwithstanding all these drawbacks, the barracks at Sheerness are always full, and the sailors, of their own accord, volunteer to go there. I cannot say that the desertions at Sheerness are not more numerous than at other places, although I do not think they are; but it should be remembered that the proximity of Sheerness to London affords facilities to those who are disposed to desert which does not exist in other places. I am satisfied that the barracks which we intend to build, both at Portsmouth and Devonport, are absolute necessities for the Service. The vessels used for receiving ships are rapidly wearing out, and the discomfort inflicted upon the men in having to go to and fro has not been at all exaggerated by the noble Lord behind me. Besides, the amount of labour which can be given by the men is very unsatisfactory; and, altogether, the practice of keeping them in receiving ships is about as inconvenient as and unpracticable and irrational an arrangement as it is possible to conceive. It only exists because it has been handed down to us, and because the idea of barracks for seamen was never thought of until recently. I have to say that the expenditure which will have to be incurred under this head will, on the whole, be a great saving. A ship will hold from 600 to 800 men, and the first cost of a ship is greater than that of a barracks for the same number of men. The cost also of maintaining the men there is greatly in excess of the cost of maintaining them in barracks. Before the end of the Session, I shall hope to lay on the Table of the House Estimates of the cost of building the first block of barracks at Portsmouth and Devonport. We contemplate lodging in those barracks not only the men now in the receiving ships, but also the gunnery men in the *Cambridge*, at Devonport, and the *Excellent*, at Portsmouth. The other day we had to make up our minds whether we should provide another gunnery ship in the place of the *Excellent*. It was intended to utilize the *Lord Clyde*; but it was found that it would cost a great deal more to fit up and repair that vessel than to erect an entirely new battery. I have no doubt that the battery which we propose to build on Whale Island will be a much more satisfactory means for training men for gunnery than a very old ship, which can hardly bear the vibration of heavy guns. I trust the Committee will sanction the expenditure, for which we have made provision, and will approve the course intended to be pursued. The only other large increase is due to the Engineer Students' quarters at Keyham, which are rendered necessary by the new conditions under which engineer students are taken. There may be some slight charges in this Vote which may excite attention during the course of the evening. Schools have been provided for the Marines at Chatham; the necessity of building them arose from the fact that we had, at last, to put up a permanent building in place of a temporary wooden one, which was always causing expense. I am glad to say that the Extension Works, both at Chatham and at Portsmouth, are very rapidly approaching completion. At Chatham great progress has been made, and I think the Committee will agree with me that it is undesirable to put a check upon the progress of ordinary work of this character, which ought to be carried out persistently and steadily according to the original plan. The work is larger than I myself should have proposed; but it will afford great facilities for the protection of the country, if necessity should arise. In the same way, progress has been made at Portsmouth; but here we do not intend to carry out all the work that was contemplated, and which would cost a sum of £215,000, to be provided for in future years. We do not intend to carry out those works, but only to complete those actually in hand. I hope, therefore, that before very long, probably at the end of three years, we shall see an end of these costly undertakings, which, however, will certainly add greatly to the strength of the country, and afford very great facilities for the transaction of the business of the Department. With respect to Votes 12, 13, 14, and 15, for Medicine, Medical Stores, Martial Law, and Miscellaneous Services, I have no special observation to make, but shall be glad to answer any questions that may occur to hon. Members with regard to them. Upon Vote 16 there is, as hon. Members will have seen, another considerable increase. This is the Vote for Military and Civil Pensions and Allowances. I have called attention to the fact that the increase here is practically beyond the control of the Department. It is not in the power of any First Lord of the Admiralty to lessen these pensions or allowances to the widows of officers and men of the Seamen and Marines, because they are based upon contract engagements made with the men 20 years ago, and which must be carefully and religiously observed. No doubt the amount of these pensions is now very great. We have a Vote of £803,000 for Military pensions, and £300,000 for Naval. With regard to the Civil pensions, I may say that the increase is partly due to the arrangement, to which I have referred, in the Accountant General's Department of the Admiralty. We have got rid of a number of clerks, and our work is much better done; and, taking salaries and pensions together, we find that we are paying less than we paid before. The only other Vote which I have now to deal with is Vote 17—that for the Transport and Conveyance of Troops. Upon that I have no more to say than that the Estimate is framed upon information given to us by the War Department of their probable demands for the service of the year. It is based upon the presumption that the work to be done would be what has been performed in former years, and excludes altogether provision for the war in South Africa. Having now come to an end of the observations I have to make, I trust the Committee will forgive me for having made so very short, and, I am afraid, so uninteresting, a Statement; but I have thought it much better, since we have already had a naval discussion this evening, to make this Statement short and practical, rather than to enter into a number of extraneous details. I trust the provision asked for by the Government will be granted by the House; and I am sure that it will result in a sufficient, if not superfluous, acting Force for the service of the country. In conclusion, I beg to move the first Vote of £2,708,695, for Wages of Seamen and Marines.

(1.) Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That 58,000 men and boys be employed for the Sea and Coast Guard Services for the year ending on the 31st day of March 1880, including 13,000 Royal Marines."—(*Mr. W. H. Smith.*)

Mr. T. BRASSEY said, he was gratified to be able, before entering into other topics, to be able to pay a well-earned and cordial tribute of praise to the Royal Navy for the very valuable services rendered to the country during the past year. They had seen their admirable Coastguard Reserve tested with very satisfactory results in the Special Service Squadron assembled under Admiral Key; and the work undertaken by Lord John Hay's Squadron at Cyprus, which was of a most laborious character, had been most cheerfully performed. As to the efficiency of the Squadron under Admiral Hornby, that had been recognized by every person competent to speak on the subject. During a recent cruise, he had had an opportunity of seeing the ships under Admiral Hornby's command; and, although a civilian, it was impossible for him not to be impressed with the conviction that every officer and man was determined to do all the country required of him. He did not know whether to admire most the fighting spirit which evidently existed in the Fleet, or the admirable discipline by which it was kept under control. He now asked leave to make a few remarks on the Vote for the pay of Seamen and Marines. He held, in common with the noble Lord (Lord Charles Beresford), the hon. Member for Reading (Mr. Shaw Lefevre), and others, who had from time to time addressed the House on the subject, that the pay of the seamen and marines of our Navy was insufficient as compared with that of the Merchant Service. The pay of an able seaman was 1*s.* 7*d.* per day, while all seamen sailing from the South American ports received from £5 to £6 per month; those from the Australian ports receiving higher rates still; and the pay of merchant seamen in the United Kingdom was but little inferior to that of the United States. No doubt, the Royal Navy offered many advantages, especially the advantage of a pension, which were not presented by the Merchant Service; but, on the other hand, young seamen set little value upon merely prospective advantages, and the consequence was that in certain parts, and on certain stations, they deserted in considerable numbers. He had noticed in the professional journals lately allusion made to this subject; and Captain Wilson, now Commander on the Australian Station, who had given great attention to the matter, had estimated the annual loss by desertion at 500 men. Captain Wilson further estimated the cost of training a seaman at £300 to £400, so that, by this large amount of desertion, they lost between £200,000 to £300,000 a-year. Captain Wilson proposed an addition to the pay of the seamen at the rate of 2*d.* per day for every five years of service on a rating not lower than that of able seamen, and 3*d.* for each rank above that of able seamen. For his own part, he should be very sorry to press any particular proposal on this subject upon the Admiralty; he hoped he had done sufficient in drawing their attention to the matter. Whatever the increase of pay might be, he would suggest that it might properly be confined to sea-going ships, and perhaps even to certain foreign stations. Under the existing Regulations, married men were considerable losers by serving in a sea-going ship as compared with a harbour-ship. All the circumstances being taken into view, there was a very strong argument in favour of giving a somewhat higher rate of pay to the men on foreign stations. Desertions were comparatively rare on the home stations, while in the Mediterranean, East Indies, China, and other parts of the world, desertion was causing great anxiety. Only the other day he received a long and able letter on this subject from an Admiral holding a command on one of these stations where the Navy suffered most from desertion. A few reforms such as he had mentioned would, he thought, go far to check the evil. The next remark he desired to make was that it appeared to him the flag list was too small, and did not give sufficient choice of officers for many of the high and responsible offices which had to be filled. He now passed from the *personnel* to the *matériel* of the Navy; and the experience of the past year lent especial importance to the subject. There were the Special Service Fleets under Admiral Hornby and Admiral Key; and while no one could doubt that both these Squadrons were well able to meet with any combination of naval power now existing in foreign nations, yet it did not follow that all the ships composing these Fleets were faultless, and that they had no deficiencies which it was not desirable to make good. In the Special Service Squadron commanded by Admiral Key, the coast-defence ships were a prominent feature, and the *Glatton*, the *Gorgon*, and their sister ships had formed the subject of some rather unfavourable discussion at the United Service Institution, where it was said that no vessel could be accepted as efficient for the defence of the stormy coasts of Great Britain which was not absolutely seaworthy. It was admitted that the *Gorgon* and her sister ships of the same type did not fulfil that essential condition. The defects of that class of ship, and the comparatively inexpensive remedies which might be applied to make those defects good, were matters which had been suggested by the Committee on Designs, and it was their unanimous Report that unless a certain superstructure, extending along a considerable portion of each side, was put on, these vessels would be fit to go from port to port in fine weather only. Admiral Ryder, who was a Member of that Committee, had said that was rather a startling statement to make with respect to a ship of war. Yet nothing had been done with a view to carry out the suggestion of the Committee on Designs, though their Report was made at least five years ago. With the superstructure proposed by the Committee, the *Gorgon* and her sister ships would present a considerable resemblance, of course with differences in point of size, to the *Dreadnought*, which, he ventured to say, was one of the most formidable and successful fighting ships at present in the Navy of this country. The buoyancy and stability of these ships would have been so much improved that they might have been sent, without misgiving and anxiety, to join the Fleet of Admiral Hornby in the Sea of Marmora; and there could be no question that in the narrow waters of the Dardanelles and the Bosphorus, vessels of this kind would have been exceedingly valuable. He admired the noble iron-clads assembled in the Sea of Marmora; but they were designed for a very different kind of service to that in which they were now employed. They were designed for ocean service, and they wanted such vessels in the Service; but they also wanted a flotilla of the coast defence class and of the *Monitor* class, and he hoped that deficiency would soon be supplied. He would now turn from our own vessels to what was going on in foreign dockyards. There were four Navies for which there were at the present time armoured vessels being built; and these were France, Italy, the United States, and Germany, and he invited the Committee to compare the programme of shipbuilding of our Admiralty with that of the countries he had just named—first, as to relative progress; and, secondly, as to the types adopted. He had compiled from the best sources a list of the armoured vessels in course of construction; and it showed that the tonnage in construction in Germany and Italy was about equal—namely, 27,000 tons each; while in the French Navy it was 67,000 tons; for the United States, 19,000 tons; and for our own Navy, 53,000 tons. The French, no doubt, very nearly approximated to our own strength of construction; but he was willing to accept the proposal of the right hon. Gentleman the First Lord of the Admiralty for the ensuing year as, upon the whole, not inadequate, having regard to the expenditure on the Vote of Credit during the past year. At the same time, he was bound to express his regret that there should have been any dismissal of dockyard workmen from any of the Establishments. He felt persuaded that fluctuations in numbers not only occasioned inconvenience to the workmen themselves, but that it involved a considerable additional expense to the country, because they could not engage labour as cheaply for temporary as for permanent employment; and when they considered the growing importance of our Colonial Empire, and the immense extent of our merchant shipping; and also looking to the fact that a considerable portion of our population were dependent upon imported food; and, further, looking to the naval expenditure which was incurred by other Powers with whom it was a spirit of national vanity rather than of necessity, he said, if our naval expenditure was maintained at £12,000,000, it would not be an extravagant charge to be imposed on the taxpayers of the British nation. Now, as to the types of vessels which were in construction for foreign nations — of armoured ships the French were building one turret ship of 10,000 or 12,000 tons, two centre battery ships of less cost, three corvettes, and four coast defence vessels, two of 5,500 tons, and two of 4,500 tons. The Germans were building three armoured corvettes of about 7,400 tons, and four armoured gunboats of 1,000 tons each. The United States were building five "monitors," three of them being of considerable power. It would be observed that in Italy—and in Italy alone—designs of what he might call colossal dimensions had been adopted, and he believed they were approved of only to a limited extent by the officers of the Italian Navy. No vessels of anything like the dimensions of our *Inflexible* were being built, either for France, Germany, or the United States. With regard to the *Italia*, which he had seen at Castellamare, the right hon. Gentleman had kindly permitted him (Mr. Brassey) to go through the Dockyards, and perhaps he might be allowed to repay his kindness by stating what were the arguments against introducing a ship of the same class into their own Navy. He was aware that there was no proposal for a ship of that class at the present time; yet he could not forget the manner in which public opinion became excited on this matter, with the probable result of bringing pressure to bear on a future occasion, and therefore a few remarks on the subject might not be superfluous. There was much to admire in the details of the *Italia;* but, considering that the abandonment of side-armour was her essential and characteristic point, and remembering that her great dimensions were only accepted in order to allow of a great weight of armour to be carried on the side, he could not think that the Italians were right in carying out their design in such large dimensions. It had been advocated on the ground that, by adopting this immense tonnage, great superiority in regard to coal endurance was gained; but it was admitted that a ship of 8,000 tons could be built with equal speed to the *Italia*, and it was certain that a ship of 8,000 tons would be of more conspicuous superiority in evolutionary movements than a ship of 14,000 tons; and when the ram was resorted to, it would be an advantage of two to one. It appeared to him that, with an equal expenditure on building ships of the *Ajax* type, more advantage was obtained than by going to the dimensions of the *Italia*. He had heard it argued, however, with regard to the coal-endurance qualities of such a vessel, that in warfare it might decline an engagement, or escape from the pursuit of smaller vessels, by steaming away. In other words, the *Italia* was to be reduced to the position of a vessel like the *Alabama*, which, perhaps, cost one-twentieth part of the amount in construction. He need not comment further upon that point, except to express his satisfaction that the right hon. Gentleman had not been beguiled into expending the money of this country on a vessel of the same colossal character. With regard to the general policy which should guide the acts of the Construction Department, he thought a most valuable opinion had been expressed in an Essay by Captain Collins, read at the United Service Institution. He said—

> "Looking at the Fleet as a movable force, the great object should be to combine the power of concentration and dispersion in the greatest possible degree."

Applying that to the *Italia*, it might be asked—"Does such an accumulation of expenditure on a single ship represent the greatest possible power of concentration and dispersion over the area which our Naval Forces have to get?" He could only express his satisfaction that these principles had prevailed with the Admiralty, and that the four latest ships now in construction were under 5,000 tons. It seemed to him that a vessel like the *Conqueror* expressly met the objections urged by Mr. King, the Chief Constructor to the United States Navy, against the principles of the *Italia;* and they could not have a better example of the great aim of Naval power than was afforded by the *Belleisle* or the *Orion*, bought last year with the Vote of Credit. He need only say, in conclusion, that the advocates of moderation in regard to tonnage had no desire to cut down Estimates. Their aim was to defend the Navy from the inevitable great risks of naval war, by urging that they should have an advantage in point of numbers.

SIR WALTER B. BARTTELOT said, he wished to ask one question as regarded the Royal Marines. He agreed with every word that had been said by his hon. Friend the Member for Hastings (Mr. T. Brassey) with regard to the efficiency of the Fleet. Englishmen looked with pride and with pleasure to the manner in which the Fleet had maintained the honour and credit of this country in face of great dangers, and had shown an example of discipline which had been the admiration of all nations, It had been suggested to him that the Marines—than whom no more gallant or distinguished corps existed—were suffering at that moment under a sense of wrong, or even, as he hoped, misapprehension, or any other term which might be more properly applied. They felt that they had been treated in a manner which neither their own Regulations or the Admiralty instructions would permit. His point was, that in more than one instance—nay, on several occasions—the Regulations had been disregarded, and the Executive word of command had been given by Naval officers to the detriment of the officers of the Marines. He need not say how necessary it was, that in all duties performed by the Marines as Marines—which, in fact, were duties performed as soldiers—they should be commanded by their own officers. He was informed that the right hon. Gentleman had made inquiries of the different divisions, and that one and all complained of what they believed to be a grievance. He believed he was also correct in stating that the right hon. Gentleman had promised to issue a Memorandum, to show that no alteration in the Rules, as laid down for the Services, was intended. That Memorandum, though some months had passed, had not been issued. He believed he was not incorrect in stating that was so; and he felt assured that in asking the right hon. Gentleman that those regulations which had hitherto been in force should be maintained, that he would state distinctly and emphatically that such was his full determination. He believed, if a public statement of that kind were made by the right hon. Gentleman, it would do everything that was required to stay the feeling, which he would not say was one of dissatisfaction, but which was one, nevertheless, which ought not to exist between two gallant branches of Her Majesty's Service.

Mr. SHAW LEFEVRE said, he thought it would be admitted, by all who followed the Navy Estimates, that it had become increasingly difficult in the last few years to understand them in respect of one of the most important items—namely, the shipbuilding programme. Just as they now had normal Budgets, followed by supplementary Búdgets, so they had normal Navy Estimates, followed rapidly by Votes of Credit and Supplementary Estimates, so that comparison year by year became almost impossible, and it was difficult to follow out the programme of work. The normal Estimates for the year 1877-8 were just short of £11,000,000; but within a very few weeks of the close of the financial year the Vote of Credit for £6,000,000 was taken, and although the Secretary of State for War assured the House that only a small portion of the Vote would be spent within the year, no sooner was it voted than the Departments set to work to spend as much as they could within the limited time. Ships were bought in great haste, and altogether it was found possible to spend about £2,000,000 for Naval purposes in about three weeks. This acted as a relief to the Navy Estimates for the next year; and last year the right hon. Gentleman the First Lord of the Admiralty came down to the House and proposed what he called normal and unambitious Estimates, amounting to just over £11,000,000. These normal and unambitious Estimates were followed in the course of the Session by two Supplementary Estimates, amounting to nearly £1,000,000 more, of which about £300,000 was to be spent on the Dockyards. Yet, notwithstanding this great addition of Supplementary Estimates, the programme of work in shipbuilding was again most seriously in arrear. There was a deficiency in the ships promised in the programme of 2,600 tons, which was mainly in respect of iron-clads. Five new iron-clads were to be commenced in the Yards, and advanced from 500 to 800 tons each. Three of these were not yet begun; two of them had been advanced by a few tons only. The *Inflexible,* which had been six years on the stocks, and which ought to be finished as soon as possible, was 1,000 tons in arrear, and her completion was delayed another year. The *Ajax* and *Agamemnon* were each about 1,000 tons in arrear. So far as he could understand, this grave deficiency in iron-clads had been supplemented by building unarmoured vessels and the converting of the armaments of the *Superb* and the *Neptune;* but he could hardly suppose that these were to be put against the building of the *Inflexible.* This, he observed, was a most serious state of things, and was only another proof of what he had often said before, that the more money spent in Dockyards the less was spent in shipbuilding. The normal Estimates for the coming year provided for an even less programme in shipbuilding in the Dockyards than those of last year—namely, 12,000 tons instead of 13,500; while the same number of hands were to be employed in the Yards. That seemed to him to be a very small amount of work to be performed by so large an expenditure. There was to be a reduction of 1,000 men in the Marines, a reduction in the Coastguard, a reduction of 1,000 boys, and also a number of men in the Naval Reserve. Therefore, there was to be a reduction in the *personnel* of the Fleet in almost every respect. Though there was a reduction of £500,000 in the Estimates, he hoped they might be able to get through the next year without another Supplementary Estimate; but, looking to the war in South Africa, which would undoubtedly involve additional expense in transport service, they could hardly believe that would be the case. No one could say what other pleasant surprises might be in store for them. The principle of mixing up the normal with the Supplementary Estimates made it necessary, in order to understand the programme of work, to look back over a series of years. The present Government had now been five full years in Office, and it was possible to compare their expenditure on new ships, and on the repairs of ships, with that of the previous Administration. He had not himself made any objection to the increased expenditure on the Navy during the last five years. He had felt that a spirited policy involved a spirited expenditure. Being under the belief that the increased expenditure was mainly devoted to the building of new ships, he had thought that it would add to the plant of the Navy, and was not therefore money thrown away. Gentlemen opposite, who had been connected with the Admiralty, had no reason to complain of the spirit in which they had been treated by those on that side of the House, or of captious or Party criticism. He could not say that the Opposition had been met outside this House in quite the same spirit. Let him take the present Secretary to the Admiralty as an example. In a speech which he had made in Lancashire, in the course of the Recess, he had been reported to say—

> "When the Government took over the Navy from their Predecessors it was in a very bad state. Mr. Ward Hunt did not like to say all he knew about it. There was bad administration, and if the Liberals said it was economy, he said it was bad economy, for it was a bad thing to leave the world unprotected to save a shilling or two at home. There was a great deal of discontent, for everything was stinted; not that the First Lord of the Admiralty wished that it should be stinted, but he could not get the money out of the Treasury or from Mr. Gladstone, who was very close-fisted, and the consequence was that the Navy was wanting in efficiency, not only in ships, but in men, and in the civil branches of the Admiralty, which was a very important matter. The present Government had thought fit, however, to strengthen the Navy, and they placed a sum of money at the disposal of the First Lord of the Admiralty, and that money was remarkably well spent."

That was an extraordinary statement for the Secretary to the Admiralty to make, and it had been repeated again and again, and had become a main part of the Tory capital. It was sufficient answer to point out, so far as the ships were concerned, that of the magnificent fleets collected in the Channel and in the Mediterranean last year, for public service in the event of war, with one exception, every vessel was built or completed—or nearly completed—by the Predecessors of the present Government, and not one of those laid down by them was sufficiently advanced to take part in any service last year. The excess in expenditure in the last five years, as compared with the previous five years, had been exactly £8,000,000; and, taking into account the extraordinary fall in the price of stores and shipbuilding materials, he might say more. With that immense increase, they had not the addition of a single man or officer to the *personnel* of the Navy. If it were true, as had been said by the Secretary to the Admiralty, that the present Government found the Navy inefficient as regarded men, they had not removed that inefficiency in any way. But it was not true, and the best evidence of that was that the present Government were now proposing to reduce the *personnel* of the Navy. The number of men and of Reserves, as fixed by his right hon. Friend the Member for Pontefract (Mr. Childers) in 1869, had stood the test of experience. When, last year, war was imminent, it was satisfactory to find that all the available ships of war were manned without difficulty, without even calling out the Naval Reserve. Neither had it been found necessary to increase the Civil Departments of the Admiralty. On the contrary, the present First Lord had been able to carry the reductions of clerks, which were so much complained of, still further, and to pension off some 60 clerks in the Accountant General's Department. As he had already said, the main cause of the increased expenditure during the past five years came under three heads—namely, the Dockyard Vote, the Stores Vote, the Votes for Machinery and Ships built by contract. It was under those heads that the House must look for the excess of expenditure over the previous five years, amounting to nearly £5,000,000, on the normal Votes only, and exclusive of the Vote of Credit and Supplementary Votes, and exclusive of the advantages derived from the enormous fall of prices within the last four years, which must, or should have, increased the savings of the Admiralty by, at least, another £1,000,000. What, then, had they got for their £5,000,000 or £6,000,000? If expended in new ships, it might have produced for us 16 to 19 vessels like the *Devastation*, complete with engines on board; or 20 to 24 vessels like the *Shannon;* or, if spent on unarmoured vessels, might have built for us 120,000 tons of cruisers with their machinery on board — a tonnage more than equal to all the unarmoured vessels we had in commission at the present time. What had it been spent on? Two Returns had lately been laid on the Table of the House which threw much light on the expenditure of the last five or six years. One of those Papers was laid upon the Table by the Secretary to the Admiralty, and it showed the expenditure upon the ships built by contract or in the Dockyards during the past 10 years, and the tonnage, and the amount expended in each year. The other Return, which was moved for by the right hon. Member for the City of London (Mr. Goschen), showed the expenditure in detail in the repair of every ship in the Dockyards during the past four years. With the aid of those two Returns, they were able to form a very accurate opinion as to how the money voted by Parliament during the last five years had been expended. What struck him first with regard to those two Returns, when he examined them carefully, was surprise at the little results that had been attained. He was under the impression that a large proportion of the excess of expenditure during the last five years had been caused by adding to the number of ships, or building an increased amount of tonnage, either in the Dockyards or by contract. But, on looking closely at the Returns, it would be found that the amount of tonnage built during the last five years was not in excess of the amount of tonnage built during the previous five years. His right hon. Friend the Member for Pontefract laid it down in 1869, in making a new departure in naval policy, as a maxim, that, in order to provide what was necessary to maintain the Navy and to supply the place of vessels becoming obsolete or vessels being condemned in each year as not worth repairing, it was necessary to build annually between 19,000 and 20,000 tons of new ships, of which about one-half should be iron-clads, and the other half unarmoured vessels. During the five years of the late Administration, this programme was exactly fulfilled. But when he came to the next five years of increased expenditure, he found that, notwithstanding the greatly increased expenditure, the aggregate tonnage of the ships was practically the same as in the previous five years. During the five years last past, the aggregate tonnage had been about 103,000 tons, with a cost of £4,800,000, excluding those bought out of the Vote of Credit. But there was this further fact, that in the 100,000 tons built during the last five years, the proportion of iron-clads was very much less than in the previous five years, only 40,000 tons of iron-clads and 60,000 tons of unarmoured vessels had been built during the last five years, as compared with 50,000 tons of iron-clads and 50,000 tons of unarmoured vessels in the previous five years. There was, therefore, a deficiency of 10,000 tons of iron-clads. What he would venture to say, therefore, was this—that, notwithstanding the increased expenditure of £5,000,000 during the past five years, at the rate of £1,000,000 a-year, yet there had been no practical increase of force in the Navy, and there was actually a deficiency of 10,000 tons of iron-clads. It, no doubt, would be said that this was more than made up for out of the Vote of Credit; but he was now speaking only of the normal expenditure on shipbuilding. He would later refer to the ships bought under the Vote of Credit; but would first allude to the question of repairs, and other matters contained in the Return moved for by his right hon. Friend the Member for the City of London, which showed features no less extraordinary than those he had previously alluded to. After all that was said five years ago about the condition of our iron-clads, he expected to find a very greatly increased expenditure upon them. Comparing the average of the four years of the present Administration with the five years of the past, he found that there had been an increase, on an average, of about £100,000 a-year in the expenditure on the repairs of iron-clads in commission and reserve; a sum which, curiously enough, was about the amount which it was calculated five years ago that it was necessary to provide for the increased repair of iron-clads, due to recent experience. That sum would account for the repair of two iron-clads a-year, and would amount in five years to £500,000; but it was a very small proportion of the increased expenditure of £5,000,000. When he looked over the other part of the Return—that relating to the repair of unarmoured vessels—there was little in the Return which justified the enormously increased expenditure. There was a very great deal of very questionable work in the repair of vessels which were not worth repair—such as depôt ships, store ships, receiving ships, and repairs of all kinds, which he thought were open to great objection. He would remind the Committee that it was in this direction that there was danger of waste of Naval expenditure taking place. It required the greatest possible care and watchfulness to prevent expenditure in that direction, which did not really add to the efficiency of the Navy. He must venture to point out to the Committee the way in which money had been thrown away during the last four years on these matters. He found from the Return that the *Harpy*, an old vessel, built in 1862, at a cost of £16,000, was repaired in 1877, at the cost of £13,000. The *Jackal*, a vessel built, in 1844, at a cost of £12,000, was repaired, in 1875, at a cost of £10,000. The *Industry*, a vessel built, in 1854, at an expenditure of £20,000, was repaired, in 1877, at a cost of £14,000. The *Enchantress*, the Admiralty yacht, built in 1862, at a cost of £44,000, was repaired, in 1877, at a cost of £29,000. The *Salamis*, built in 1863, at an expenditure of £42,000, was repaired in 1876 for £23,000. The *Fawn*, which cost £28,000 in 1856, was repaired at a cost of £16,000; and the *Plover*, which cost £34,000, was repaired for £20,000. The *Lord Warden*, one of the old wooden vessels, plated with armour, was repaired, about three years ago, at an expenditure of £34,000. He ventured at the time to enter a protest against this expenditure, as it did not provide for the removal of a broad belt of rotten timbers at her water-line. Many such vessels had been repaired in the way he had mentioned. The *Liffey* was repaired, at a cost of £17,000, in order to be sent out to Coquimbo, on the coast of South America, for a store ship. The *Urgent* was repaired, at a cost of £22,000, and sent out to Jamaica as a depôt ship. Both these cases were instances of most useless and unnecessary extravagance. Then the *Orontes*, a troop-ship, was lengthened 60 feet by contract, at a schedule of prices, a very undesirable method for the Admiralty to adopt. The total cost of lengthening her, including new boilers and engines, was £137,000. He believed that a new vessel might have been built for a somewhat less sum. Such cases as these were frequently brought before them in former days when it was proposed to repair such vessels. The late Administration had always declined to do so unless positive benefit could be shown. In his opinion, it would have been better to have sold the *Orontes*, and to have bought another vessel. Then, again, the expenditure on hulks had increased from an average of £5,100 a-year to £16,700 a-year; while that upon steam-tugs and yard-craft had risen from £38,000 to £70,000 a-year. Coming to the vessels which had been bought under the Vote of Credit, as he had already pointed out, £2,000,000 of the sum voted by Parliament last year was expended for naval purposes. Four iron-clads were bought, and those vessels were, no doubt, of a very useful and valuable character, and he had no objection to make to their purchase. Still, he could not but think that the purchase was effected very hastily, for he found in one case that a very exorbitant price was paid. The *Independencia,* now called the *Neptune,* was bought from the Brazilian Government for £614,000, including her armament; that appeared to him a very large price, notwithstanding that the armament was worth £41,000. No sooner, however, was the vessel purchased, than the Naval officers of the Admiralty, who were responsible for the Naval armaments, considered it necessary to alter her armament; they considered that they could not be responsible for it, if her armament of Whitworth guns were admitted into the Service. That circumstance was the cause of very great delay, and no less than eight months elapsed before she received her new armament. Then, other Naval officers condemned her fittings—others her masts and rigging. Last year £37,000 was spent upon her conversion, and in the present year it was proposed to spend upon her another £17,000, besides the cost of her new armament. So that £54,000 would be spent in converting this vessel—in re-arming her, altering her masts and rigging, and re-fitting her—and her total cost to the country would amount to nearly £700,000—about twice the cost of the *Devastation* or the *Monarch.* He believed he was correct in saying that the *Devastation,* with her engines, cost £350,000; whereas the *Neptune,* late the *Independencia,* would cost altogether £700,000. He had quoted these matters as illustrations of the way in which money had been spent on the repair of vessels during the last five years. They were, many of them, matters known by experience to him; but he was sure that if he could pick out these particular cases from the Return, there must be at least 10 times the number of cases upon which he could form no opinion where money had been laid out in an equally wasteful and unnecessary manner. He would now call attention to a question of steam boilers for Her Majesty's ships; and, in doing so, he need hardly remind the House that the question of boilers for Her Majesty's ships had been a most fruitful cause of expenditure. Of late years it had become known how very short a time the boilers of Her Majesty's ships lasted compared with the boilers of the Merchant Service. Not only was this a very important matter as regarded expenditure, but it was more so as regarded the efficiency of Her Majesty's vessels; because taking out old boilers and putting in new was not only an enormously expensive process, but it involved a great length of time during which the ships were taken from service. Frequently from eight to ten months were taken up in putting in new boilers, and during that period the ironclad, perhaps, when most wanted, was practically withdrawn from service. The putting in of boilers into the *Black Prince* cost £79,000, and occupied a year; for the *Minotaur* £60,000; and for the *Hercules* £55,000. If, therefore, anything could be done to lengthen the duration of the boilers, great economy would be effected, and the efficiency of the ships in the Navy would be much increased. The subject was a serious one, for the average duration of boilers in the Royal Navy was a little over five years; whereas in the Merchant Service it was nine to ten. During the last year of the late Administration it came to the knowledge of the right hon. Member for the City of London (Mr. Goschen) that boilers in the Merchant Service lasted much longer than boilers in the Royal Navy, and he determined to appoint a Committee to inquire into the matter, and to investigate the reason for this apparent anomaly. Before anything was done, Mr. Ward Hunt came into office; he took up the same proposal, and appointed a Committee to inquire into this most important subject. It struck him (Mr. Shaw Lefevre) that that Committee could not have been well selected. It sat for nearly four years, and expended large sums of money. The cost of that Committee had been nearly £17,000, exclusive of printing some bulky volumes of evidence which were perfectly worthless. He had endeavoured to wade through the evidence taken before that Committee, and he ventured to say that it was a mass of nonsense. No experiments were carried out to a conclusion, so far as he could make out, and no results of any kind had been attained. At the end of four years the Committee made its first Report, and recommended that it should be re-appointed; but the right hon. Gentleman opposite had put an end to it, and had appointed a Departmental Committee on the subject, who were carrying on, in a feeble manner, some further investigations. But five years had now elapsed since this was first looked upon as a most important subject, and as one absolutely necessary to be dealt with, and no result had been arrived at, or the problem solved, why boilers in the Navy did not last so long as in the Merchant Service. It was a matter of fact, and not of experiment, that while this futile Committee was sitting a whole generation of boilers had been wearing out. Of all the mass of materials in the Report to which he had referred there were only two pages of the smallest value. One showed the average duration of boilers in the Navy, as illustrated by various ships in it; and the other was a Return, from various SteamShipping Companies in the country, of their boilers. That Return showed that the average duration of boilers of the Royal Navy was five or six years; while in the Merchant Service the boilers lasted nine or ten years. That proved that this was a most serious matter, and one which, as he had already said, involved not only economy, but efficiency. A Return was presented to the House last year, at the instance of his hon. Friend the Member for Hastings (Mr T. Brassey), which showed how important the subject was, and how serious the question of boilers had become. That Return gave him the cases of a number of vessels now under repair in Her Majesty's Dockyards, and of the cost of putting in new boilers. Among the vessels in which new boilers were being placed was the *Encounter*, after four years and four months' commission. New boilers would have to be placed in her at a cost of £32,000. The *Druids* boilers, after a service of four years and ten months, were to be replaced at a cost of £28,000; while the *Briton*, after a service of four years and five months, required new boilers at a cost of £24,000. The *Woodlark*, after four years and four months, required new boilers at an expenditure of £14,000. The Royal Yacht, *Osborne*, was to have new boilers at a cost of £20,000, after three years' service only. He was informed, however, that this was due, not so much to the want of repair in the boilers, but to the fact that it would be necessary to reduce the pressure of steam, which would entail a loss of speed in the vessel of half-a-knot an hour. Therefore, it was thought expedient not to allow the speed of the vessel to be reduced. Last year the right hon. Gentleman the First Lord of the Admiralty said that there was reason to believe that the intermittent use of steam by vessels in Her Majesty's Service was even more damaging than continuous use, as in the Merchant Service. That was an excuse which he had heard before, but had not put any trust in; it was a point not touched upon in the Report or the evidence to which he had alluded. On the contrary, there was much in the evidence taken before the Committee to disprove it. There were reports from a line of steamers from Hamburgh to Calais, which ran under steam and sail, sometimes one and sometimes the other, and got up steam on the average 20 times on a voyage. Yet those boilers lasted on an average 10 years. There could be no reason, therefore, to suppose that the intermittent use of boilers was really the cause of their deterioration. He ventured to think that there was great reason to complain of the way in which the subject had been treated by the present Board of Admiralty. They had practically done nothing in this matter, and five years had been allowed to elapse from the commencement of the Inquiry, and they were still just as far off as ever from any determination. This was only another illustration of the manner in which the Navy was now administered. If the Secretary to the Admiralty, instead of denouncing economy in Lancashire, were to devote his energies to this important subject, and endeavour—as he (Mr. Shaw Lefevre) believed he might—to increase the duration of boilers in Her Majesty's ships, he would not only effect a great economy, but promote the efficiency of Her Majesty's vessels; and he would also be doing something to prevent the money now voted from being spent on the useless objects to which he had called attention, and to see that it was spent in adding to the number of new ships. He would then, with far greater reason, be able to boast of the increased expenditure which had been undertaken by the Conservative Government.

MR. A. F. EGERTON accepted the challenge which had been given at the beginning and close of the speech of the hon. Gentleman who had just sat down (Mr. Shaw Lefevre). He begged to say also that he intended to abide by every word of the speech he had made in Lancashire. Of course, in that House, it was not their object to attack each other so much as to discuss the Estimates; but it was different when they went out into the country, as many of the hon. Member's speeches at Reading would show. In his (Mr. Egerton's) speech at Lancashire, he referred to what was notorious at the time of which he spoke—namely, that there were ships in the Navy which were of no use at all—and that statement had been made in the House in his hearing by the late Mr. Ward Hunt. When he spoke of the state of the *personnel* of the Navy, he had also referred to another fact, which was the dissatisfaction existing on account of the pay; and he would now add that at the time mentioned almost every branch of the Service was, on that account, in a state of chronic discontent. But although he did not propose to go into further details upon that subject, he would say that he was prepared to prove every charge made by him in the speech alluded to by the hon. Member. To come to the questions more immediately before the House—the hon. Member had remarked upon and compared the amount of shipbuilding effected by the present Board and that accomplished by the former during the Administration of the late Government. Upon this point he (Mr. Egerton) confessed that, having at his disposal at the moment neither the necessary time nor figures, he was not prepared to follow the hon. Member into the details of the question raised; but would simply state his belief that the present Board of Admiralty had done very good work both in the building and repairing programmes. Especial stress had also been laid upon the fact that the present Board had devoted more attention to repairs than to shipbuilding. That, he would point out, had been the result of a deliberate policy, for it was considered absolutely necessary and indisputably the right course to repair such ships as were worth repairing. That policy recommended itself upon the ground of cheapness, because, had these ships been set aside, new ones would have been required. With regard to the especial reference made by the hon. Member to the *Jackal*, *Industry*, *Enchantress*, and other vessels repaired at the cost of various sums of money, he wished to state that these vessels and their repairs formed the subjects of anxious discussion, both in the Controller's Office and before the Board, before it was decided that they should be repaired. Those remarks would have a particular application in the case of the *Enchantress*, instanced as not being worth the cost of repair. The Board had very anxiously considered that case, and it had appeared to them better to repair her than pay for an entirely new ship; the result was, that the Admiralty now possessed a very useful vessel for dispatch and other purposes. The hon. Gentleman had assumed, also, that the *Lord Warden* was not in an efficient state, although she had undergone repairs, because she had not joined the Squadron last year. But that opinion was entirely erroneous, for she was certainly efficient, and was one of the first ships of the Reserve. She was, moreover, a vessel of the most useful kind, and, as everybody knew, one of the finest specimens of the old class of wood and iron ships existing. With regard to the *Liffey*, it had been considered necessary that they should have a coal depôt at Coquimbo, and that vessel, having been regarded as suitable for the purpose, was repaired and sent out. In the same way the *Urgent* had been sent to Jamaica, where the old depôt ship had been destroyed. He would point out that the case of the *Orontes*, to which reference had also been made, was under discussion when the last Government quitted Office. It was then a question whether or not she should be lengthened; and the present Board, after a very long and serious discussion, had thought it to be cheaper, and altogether more economical, to improve this vessel than to leave her in a comparative state of inefficiency. Accordingly a large sum of money had been spent upon her, and she had turned out to be a great success. Passing from repairs to the ships purchased under the Vote of Credit, he (Mr. Egerton) said that no doubt the price paid for the *Independencia*—namely, £614,000—was a high one; but he had been informed, by very good authorities, that the Brazilian Government considered that the vessel had cost them upwards of £700,000. In view of the fact that the vessel had come into our possession with a considerable quantity of stores belonging to her, he thought that they had made a very good bargain, especially when the improvements effected upon her were considered. On the question concerning the wearing of boilers dwelt upon by the hon. Gentleman, he was sorry to be obliged to admit that he agreed with him in many of his remarks, although he could not go so far as to say that the Report of the Committee which was appointed to investigate that subject was all nonsense, and that their deliberations had initiated and discovered nothing. Still, he agreed that an unconscionable time had been spent in preparing that Report, and he did not see that much of practical value resulted therefrom. On the other hand, in considering whether the Navy boilers wore out faster than those of the Merchant Service, he could not think that it was altogether right to put aside the one cause given for the more rapid destruction of the former, and that was the intermittent way in which they were worked. He was bound to say that, in his opinion, that cause had a good deal to do with their decay. He thought, also, that their preservation much depended upon the care and attention of the chief engineers, which he hoped would increase with their experience, and produce better results than hitherto.

Mr. RYLANDS: I am desirous, Sir, of saying a word as to the Estimates laid on the Table by the right hon. Gentleman. Of course, upon the statement of those Estimates, there appears to be a reduction, when the Vote of Credit is added to last year's Expenditure; but I do not feel satisfied, and I am sure that the right hon. Gentleman has little ground to believe that those Estimates, which we are now considering, will be maintained during the 12 months of the next financial year. The right hon. Gentleman has carefully guarded himself from leading us to suppose that those Estimates include expenditure which may be incurred in connection with the South African War; and, from what we know—from the way in which first one war and then another is sprung upon us—I am sure that we can hardly rely upon those Estimates not being exceeded; and even at their present amount, I believe that they are Estimates far in excess of what might be fairly spent upon the Naval Service. I do not wish, for one moment, to raise any complaint against the First Lord of the Admiralty. I am sure that the right hon. Gentleman will fill the distinguished Office he now fills with great care and ability, and with great industry, and with great anxiety to promote the Public Service; but the right hon. Gentleman has entered into what I may call a *damnosa hæreditas*. This system of Admiralty administration has been handed down to him; and it is a system which has been admitted on all hands to have led to gigantic blunders, and a very great amount of wasteful expenditure. Hon. Gentlemen may smile; but it is a matter on which there is now no dispute. We may look back at former proceedings in connection with the Admiralty, and throughout there have been these blunders, and these blunders have led to great expenditure. I am not going to view this in a Party light. I am not going to say that this Admiralty Board is worse than previous Admiralty Boards. I do not wish for a moment to say that one Party has been worse than another Party in Admiralty mismanagement, or that the present Government has been one of the most extravagant. What I complain of is that, while it has been proved that former Boards of Admiralty have made very serious blunders, and have continually involved this country in wasteful outlay, we are asked to believe in the perfection of the present Board of Admiralty. Well I, for one, am not prepared to believe that the present Board of Admiralty is in any degree possessed of administrative ability superior to that which has been possessed by previous Boards. I wish to point out to the Committee that the Admiralty management of Her Majesty's Navy is, in its essential characteristics, the same now that it has been for the last 50 years. During those 50 years, there have been a series of efforts made to reform that administration. I dare say hon. Gentlemen will remember that in former years in this House Mr. Cobden, Mr. W. S. Lindsay, the former Member for Sunderland, and Lord Clarence Paget, from time to time, denounced the mismanagement in Admiralty affairs, and complained of the system in which Admiralty business was conducted. In addition to efforts from those Gentlemen, we have had efforts put forth by others. We have had the hon. Gentleman the Member for Pembroke (Mr. E. J. Reed), whose absence, at the present time, we must regret; and we have had my hon. Friend the Member for Lincoln (Mr. Seely), who has, in season and out of season, continually pressed upon the Admiralty the necessity of an entire change in Admiralty administration. Then, we have had other great efforts made in the public Press, in favour of reform of the Admiralty. Some year or two ago there were a series of articles in *The Times*, which were written with remarkable ability, which were written with great knowledge of the subject, and which, in fact, brought under the notice of the public, in very cogent and striking language, the defects which, in the judgment of the writers, attach to Admiralty administration. Notwithstanding all these efforts, continued by men of such eminence, supported by the leading organ of the public Press, I think I may venture to say that these efforts have been almost entirely fruitless, and that there has been no Admiralty reform. It has been impossible to produce any effect upon the Admiralty administration. The Board of Admiralty have been described by *The Times* as "ruling Pashas." It has intrenched itself in the traditions of the Department, and in the powerful class interests by which it is surrounded, and I think I may also say that it has perpetrated very often ignorant errors which are veiled under the assumption of absolute infallibility. Now, Sir, my hon. Friend the Member for Hastings (Mr. Brassey) has spoken about the present expenditure; he seemed to think that expenditure was not sufficient. Well, I think nearly £11,000,000 a-year is very well for Admiralty expenditure. My hon. Friend seemed to be dissatisfied about the sum; he seemed to think there should be £12,000,000 a-year expended. Well, it is a large sum of money to spend, and the difficulty that we meet with is—that any opposition we offer to this large expenditure for the purposes of the Navy is set down as proceeding from a desire to weaken the right hand of England's power. But, Sir, if it is a fact that in £11,000,000 or £12,000,000 there is a waste of £2,000,000 or £3,000,000 a-year—if you could get as powerful a Navy for some millions a-year less, it would be the duty of this Committee and of this House to bring to bear, if it is possible to do so, on the Board of Admiralty the necessity of a change which would secure a more economical and more efficient administration of the Public Service. The difficulty we have in rousing public opinion on this question is simply this—that there is an idea that no man should talk about the administration of the Admiralty unless he has a technical knowledge of the subject. I see hon. and gallant Gentlemen opposite who, no doubt, think it is a very presumptuous thing on my part to say anything about Admiralty matters. I am certain of this—that if I ventured to express any confident opinion about the best construction of a ship, or if I ventured to tell the Admiralty what they ought to do with regard to Naval matters, I should very properly be chargeable with great presumption. I do not, however, attempt anything of the kind. The questions to which I am calling the attention of the Committee are questions which do not require any technical knowledge at all; they are questions which can be considered and decided by the common sense of business men. Now, Sir, the contention that I wish to urge on the Committee is this—that, without any reference to mere technical knowledge or Naval experience, without being connected with Naval service, we may judge of the results of the Admiralty administration—we may judge of the tree by the fruits it bears. What are the fruits of the administration of the Admiralty? I will tell you two or three of them; and I challenge anyone to deny the truth of these charges, which are based on the result of the working of the Admiralty Department. Now, in the first place, I charge them with slowness in adopting improvements. Does any hon. Gentleman deny that the Admiralty has been slow in such matters? This is a matter we can discuss without any technical knowledge. It so happens that I have a good knowledge of compound engines, and I know that they have been in common use for years, and that by their adoption a great saving is effected in fuel. They were in use a very considerable time before the Board of Admiralty would listen to the proposal that they should be adopted in our vessels of war. Does it require any technical knowledge to find out that the Board of Admiralty were remiss in not adopting such an improvement for years before they were induced to adopt it? And yet, so long as they delayed attention to that matter, they were leading to a very largely increased expenditure in the fuel of our ships. There is another charge I wish to bring against them, and it is that when they settle upon the design of a vessel of war, our experience has been that that design has been greatly altered and modified during the time the ship is building. Is that denied? Yet, if that is true, you cannot take a ship which has been laid on certain lines—you cannot alter and carve it without expending a very much larger sum of money than would otherwise be required. It is clear that the proper thing to do is to settle, under the best advice, the type of the vessel, and to refrain from constant interference with that type while it is in process of construction. I make another charge—and hon. Gentlemen will know from their own knowledge that what I am saying is absolutely correct—I say ships have frequently been begun, but by the time they have been completed, the type of them has become obsolete; numbers of vessels, within a very short time after their completion, have been admitted to be of an obsolete type. I take another instance of the maladministration of the Admiralty, and it is that they have adopted a very large and unnecessary variety of types of vessels, and in this matter I shall fortify myself—for I am now approaching a technical branch of the question—by quoting the opinion of the hon. Member for Pembroke, who, two years ago, said in *The Times*—

> "Very many of the differences in our ships arise from fancy, from caprice, from divided counsels, from the competition of influences within the Admiralty—in a word, from maladministration."

If these charges are true—if it is a fact that the Admiralty in their administration have been guilty of results such as those I have described—the Committee will agree with me that I and others have a right to bring them forward. This is not a question of technicality; it is a question of business, which men engaged in large manufacturing operations are entitled to speak upon. What did the hon. Gentleman the Member for West Norfolk say 20 years ago? I will quote from him. I am glad to see him present; and I do not think that at the present moment he would materially modify the words he then uttered. The hon. Gentleman, 20 years ago, said that

> "He had asked many of the most eminent owners of private yards in the country this question—'Supposing you were to carry on your yards upon the system on which Her Majesty's Dockyards are conducted, what would be the result?' And the invariable answer had been—'If we were to approach that system with the Bank of England at our back, we should be ruined in six months.'"—[*Hansard*, cliii. 62.]

I supplement that, for I have spoken to ship-builders; and I say there is not the slightest doubt whatever, notwithstanding what ship-builders may say in this House, that if you talk to them in private they will tell you that the system in force in the Dockyards belonging to the nation is such that, if brought to bear on their own businesses, would lead them to ruin. Just consider for a moment, looking at this as a great manufacturing operation, what means are taken to secure the best type of vessel being selected, and, furthermore, let us ask ourselves the question—"What is the system under which the manufacture or building of vessels is conducted?" Well, now, it appears to me that the Board of Admiralty, to a very great extent, are in the position of private firms carrying on a large business, and the Dockyards are the works in which the manufacturing business, over which these gentlemen preside, is carried on. The first thing I have to say of the gentlemen who conduct this business, turning over several millions a-year, is this — that they know nothing about the work in which they are engaged. That is the first charge I make. They are Naval officers—gallant men no doubt—who will do their duty to their Queen and country when they have to fly their flags on the ocean, and when they command a Squadron of ships, but that is not the point. We put them as a Board of Admiralty to manage a manufacturing business, and I say that these gallant Admirals know nothing of the business they are called upon to manage. They do not even profess to know it; it is not their profession at all, for they have no practical experience. In fact, they just come in and try their "prentice hands," which seems to be a very singular manner of managing one of the greatest businesses in the Kingdom. Then they talk about technical knowledge!—why, these gallant Admirals are in the same position as many of us outside the Board of Admiralty. Well, you say that the Admiralty have advisers. You say—"They carry on this business, no doubt, in entire ignorance, but they have advisers." Let us see who they are. They have a Board of Constructors, and a President to guide that Board. That President is another Admiral, and he knows nothing about it. The Controller of the Navy may be in entire ignorance of the business over which he is placed, and no knowledge of Naval construction is considered necessary for a gallant Admiral to be placed over a Board of Constructors. How do they manage the Dockyards? We find exactly the same system of management carried out. "How not to do it," is the principle of the Board of Admiralty. They place these great shipbuilding Yards—these great manufacturing Establishments—under the control of Naval Superintendents, who have entire management. These Naval Superintendents are Admirals or Naval Captains, who know nothing about the business they are called upon to conduct. They come there for three years at a time, and they come to the Dockyards in entire ignorance. They are there for about three years playing at the business, and then they leave the Dockyards, and another Admiral comes who is equally ignorant. Indeed, the Naval Superintendent of the Dockyards may be entirely destitute of technical knowledge, and yet he can overrule the constructors and engineers—he can interfere with the workmen, upset any arrangement which the constructor or engineer may consider necessary for the good management of the works; and I ask hon. Gentlemen who have experience in the management of a business, is it possible that a manufacturing business can be carried on with any efficiency when you place at the head of it a man utterly ignorant of the business; when you give such a man absolute control over people about the yard who have knowledge? And yet we find this system in force in our Dockyards; we find that it has been in force for the last 50 years, although the entire Navy has changed. We have steam power which was formerly unknown, and we have iron vessels in the place of wooden vessels, and we have large mechanical appliances which in the days of our grandfathers were completely unknown. I suppose that in Dockyard management technical knowledge is absolutely necessary; but where it is most necessary, it is not to be found. Constructors and engineers are subordinated to superiors who are entirely ignorant of the business they control, and this is carried out even still further than that. These constructors and engineers in the Dockyards ought to be able to communicate directly with the authorities at Whitehall, but they are not allowed to do so. They cannot get at the Board of Admiralty, except through the Admiral commanding the Dockyard, and that Admiral sends up to the other Admiral, who is the President of the Board of Constructors; so, in point of fact, there is no independent means by which the Chief Constructors can reach the Admiralty except through the channel of the gallant gentlemen, who may be entirely ignorant of the business they have to carry on. I wish, before I sit down, to quote in connection with these observations a few very pertinent remarks which appeared in *The Times*, about two years ago—a period when *The Times* did excellent service in directing public attention to the administration of the Board of Admiralty. *The Times* said, very truly—

> "Anyone who would reform our naval administration will have a heavy task before him. It requires to be decentralised; but all recent changes have been in the direction of centralisation. Each Dockyard ought to be a separate institution, with a local management, and with a separate body of naval constructors. If a new design for a ship is wanted, each Dockyard ought to be invited to furnish a design. Occasionally the private yards should be invited to compete, and the Admiralty, with the aid of a constructive committee, ought to decide between them. But to insure this, it would be necessary to have skilled management; whereas the present plan is to appoint as manager for two or three years a Rear Admiral in active service, who knows nothing of such matters, and is too old to learn them. In fact, it has been well said, by one who knows, that 'the worse he is the better he is'"—

that is to say, that an Admiral with a little smattering of knowledge is more likely to interfere with the Dockyards in a way which is not calculated to promote their efficiency than a Naval Superintendent who confessedly knows nothing at all. I venture to say this to the First Lord—that if he wishes to get economy and good administration, the first thing he should do is to get rid of the Admirals who know nothing of the business entrusted to them, and substitute in their place the best men he can find, who can bring to the management of this great manufacturing business the highest technical knowledge and skill, ripe experience and first-rate capacity;—get rid of cocked hats, swords and epaulettes, and approach the Dockyards as business institutions, conduct them in an economical manner, afford opportunities for obtaining the best suggestions respecting the construction of vessels of the best type; and I believe, if we could effect such reforms—revolutionary though they may be—the result would be that we should save a very large sum of money every year, and save a very great many of the blunders which have of late arisen, and I am afraid will arise, from maladministration.

MR. BENTINCK observed, that the hon. Member for Burnley (Mr. Rylands) had quoted an opinion uttered by him (Mr. Bentinck) a good many years ago on the management of the affairs of the Admiralty. He still adhered to that opinion; but he totally differed with the hon. Gentleman in his views as to Admiralty maladministration. Indeed, he could conceive nothing more injurious to the good conduct of the Admiralty than what had been suggested by the hon. Member. He had always condemned the practice of having a civilian as First Lord of the Admiralty—not through any disparagement to the right hon. Gentleman, he might be sure. The hon. Gentleman had said that for 50 years the Admiralty had been incapable of improvement. That, he believed, was true. He remembered a story told when he was a young man of Mr. Croker, one of the ablest men that had ever sat in that House, or served the Admiralty. One day Mr. Croker addressed the Board in these words—

> "My Lords, before you proceed to business I think it right to call your attention to the fact that there is an individual, whose name I will place before you, who has upon three separate occasions presumed to offer suggestions to your Lordships."

That was looked upon in those days as the greatest possible offence. No one was allowed to have a different opinion from the Board of Admiralty—not because the nautical element was predominant, but because the civil element was in the ascendant. The hon. Gentleman had instituted a comparison between the cost of work in public yards and in private yards; but he believed it was utterly impossible that business could be conducted on the same economical principles as in private yards. Another thing he would say was that he believed the work done in the public yards was perfection, which could not always be said of that done in the yards of private firms. Every shilling expended there we got the value for. But his chief object in rising was to express his regret at the statement, made with all the usual clearness and ability of the right hon. Gentleman, as to the future policy of the Government, so far as the Admiralty was concerned. And he must say that he thought the time had not arrived when those reductions could be made with safety and advantage to the country. In the first place, we had not been tested by war; and, in the second, we had no reserve of ships in the event of casualties, inevitable in a Naval action. He regretted exceedingly that they heard nothing of proposed arrangements for the construction of a class of ships which, though thoroughly provided with guns and armour, were capable of being handled under canvas, without being wholly dependent upon steam power. He had always endeavoured to impress that point on the Admiralty, but never with success. He could not think that the aspect of European affairs justified any such reductions as were proposed; and he thought that they should profit rather by the experience of the past, and take advantage of what was called a time of peace, for the purpose of being prepared for a possible, if not probable, time of war. In his opinion, the present state of European affairs looked more like an armed truce than a lasting peace; and, under these circumstances, he could not help regretting the reduction of the Naval Force, which must be the mainstay of the honour and interests, if not of the existence, of England. He would much rather the Government had proposed to increase, than to reduce, the Naval Force of the country.

MR. GOSCHEN: The right hon. Gentleman the First Lord of the Admiralty is always so conciliatory, so straightforward, so business-like, and so unaggressive in his Statements, that I cannot remember any occasion on which he has been attacked in the House, and I am not going to attack him to-night. It appears to me that there are three positions filled by hon. Members in this House—hon. Members who are conciliatory in the House and out of the House. The right hon. Gentleman is one of that class. Then there are hon. Members who are ready to attack both in and out of the House. The hon. Member for Reading (Mr. Shaw Lefevre) belongs to that class. And then there is a third class, which has been developed this evening, who are gentle in the House, but ready to go to the Provinces and be aggressive. The Financial Secretary to the Admiralty (Mr. Egerton) is one of that class. I have listened to some portions of the speech of the First Lord with great interest, and to other portions with much pleasure, and I felt during a portion of it a thirst for knowledge which was not gratified. The right hon. Gentleman had said he hoped it was short and business-like; but it might, perhaps, have been shorter and more business-like if the right hon. Gentleman had said to the Committee—"Vote me £10,500,000 for the Navy, and depend upon it I will exercise great vigilance and economy in administering it." There is no indication of general policy in the speech. We have heard nothing in regard to the disposition of the ships or the great services the Navy have performed. He has not told us whether it is necessary to maintain the present large number of ships in commission, nor has he told us whether he intends to organize a Flying Squadron. The right hon. Gentleman places the Estimates on the Table, and explains them; but he does not tell us what type of ships he proposes to build, or what new ships are laid down. I asked a Question in the earlier part of the evening in regard to the employment of Marines at the Cape, and the answer of the right hon. Gentleman was so far satisfactory; but I cannot help thinking that it is greatly to be regretted that the Marines have not been employed when there was the necessity to fill up the other regiments by volunteers. With the Marines no volunteering is necessary, for they are ready to sail at 48 hours' notice, and 5,000 of that distinguished body might have been despatched at once. The Committee may remember that in the case of the Ashantee War a small body of Marines was despatched within 48 hours of the receipt of the news, and the prompt despatch of that body of troops was of the utmost importance. I hope it may not be found necessary to send any more troops to the Cape; but, in future, I trust the Marines will not be forgotten, and that justice will be done to such an able Force. With regard to the *personnel* of the Navy, we see a reduction proposed of 1,000 Marines; and I cannot quite understand the explanation which has been given for that reduction, except that because they were 650 short of the 14,000, therefore the right hon. Gentleman thought it better to reduce the number to 13,000. But is that politic? Many regiments are being called upon to furnish men to other corps; and at this particular moment, of all others, the right hon. Gentleman chooses to reduce the Marines from 14,000 to 13,000. I confess I do not see sufficient reason why the abnormal number which has been maintained for many years past should be altered now. The only argument—and that is not a good one—is, that if you put 13,000 in the Estimates instead of 14,000, there will be a corresponding reduction in the charge for these men. I do not think the right hon. Gentleman can frankly say that 1,000 men can be spared. As to the reduction in the number of boys, I hope the right hon. Gentleman is right; because the number ought to be kept at such a point as to enable us always to keep a Force of 18,000 or 19,000 bluejackets. The Financial Secretary to the Admiralty (Mr. Egerton) says that when he came into Office, five years ago, not only was there inefficiency in ships, but in men also; and, in a very modest way, he says he will stand by every word he has uttered. But during the five years the Conservative Government has been in power, they have not found it necessary to increase the number of men, or Marines, or boys. The fact is, that the disputes and discussions of the past should now be forgotten; but I have noticed that the hon. Member, and others of his Friends, are continually going back on these five years; and when he repeats, in his official capacity, things which his late Chief communicated to him, I think he is scarcely acting fairly, because it is impossible to controvert him. He has the Committee entirely at his mercy; and whatever he chooses to say as regards confidential communications made to him, we are not able to contradict. I hope, therefore, on reflection, the hon. Gentleman will see that he ought not to have made the speech which he has done. I will now pass to another point which has not a personal bearing, and which it is for the interest of the public service that allusion should be made. The hon. Member denounced the economy of the late Government, and praised the expenditure of the present Administration as its Financial Secretary. Now, let me ask him—does he think that statement will strengthen his authority in keeping down expenditure? It is one of the functions of the Financial Secretary of the Admiralty to keep down expenditure, yet he has denounced our economy, and his Party will take its cue from him. I am quite sure the First Lord of the Admiralty will not wish that expenses should be pressed upon him. He knows—as everyone who has been at the Admiralty must know—from all sides there is constant pressure for expenditure; and it requires a very firm hand to resist those appeals. I should have wished, therefore, that the hon. Member would have impressed his Colleagues and his Party with notions of economy; but that does not seem to be the case, after listening to the speech which we have done, and others which he has made to his constituents. We cannot reach his constituents; and I sometimes wish they could come to this House and hear the replies which are made, and then they might be inclined to alter their opinion. As a specimen of the Financial Secretary's mode of handling business, he has given us the case of the *Independencia*. That ship, he says, cost the Brazilian Government £700,000, and we paid less for it; therefore, evidently we had got a good bargain. But, if I am not mistaken, the back of the *Independencia* was broken in the course of her launching, and great expenses were involved. Therefore, I do not think that it can be held that we have got a good bargain, because a ship cost a foreign Government a large sum of money. My hon. Friend the Member for Reading made a valuable statement, which I think it would be well for the Committee to recall. During the five years of each Administration, there have been 100,000 tons of shipping built. The late Government built 50,000 tons of iron-clads, and 50,000 tons of unarmoured vessels; while the present Government has built, at a greater cost, 40,000 tons of armoured vessels, and 60,000 tons of unarmoured vessels. I think that is a fair answer to the charges which have been brought against us. I will now turn to notice a few more of the topics touched upon by the First Lord of the Admiralty; and there is one point upon which I can cordially agree with him, and that is the increased efficiency he is going to give to the Dockyard at Malta. The right hon. Gentleman stated that he had increased the Establishment at Malta, and that it was evident that it was important, in the present state of affairs, that the Dockyard should be strengthened. Upon reference to the Estimates, however, I find the precise increase to the strength of Malta is one artificer, and that is an addition which the right hon. Gentleman has thought it worth while to allude to. The right hon. Gentleman has, I see, increased the salaries of the Instructors at Chatham by £25, and of the Chief Engineer by £20; but, on the other hand, the Assistant Inspector has been reduced by £50, so that the First Lord of the Admiralty has gained a £5 note on the transaction, and he is to be congratulated upon having made such a reform. There is another point upon which my congratulations are most sincere, and that is the reform which the right hon. Gentleman says he is about to make with regard to the Royal Naval College at Greenwich, in having the examinations conducted by authorities taken from outside. That is a very distinct improvement, and one which I trust will add to the efficiency of the College; and I am glad of this proof which the right hon. Gentleman has given of the interest which he takes in the Royal Naval College, which everyone now admits has been doing excellent service. I am also glad to think the right hon. Gentleman intends further to utilize the College by sending the lieutenants there when they first come on half-pay. Every proposal for increase of pay arising from this ground will, I am sure, be treated with the greatest consideration. I think it is a pity, however, that he has not been able to make up his mind, so that the necessary item might have been included in the present Estimates. Perhaps the right hon. Gentleman will tell us whether any sum will be taken this year, or whether it will be deferred to a later period. I have only to say one or two words more on the question of shipbuilding. The right hon. Gentleman says he is going to build less than last year, and he is going to spend less; but why he builds less, and spends less, he has not shown to us, except that because he spent more last year, therefore he ought to spend less this year. What I contend is, that he has not indicated what his Naval policy is. Does he intend to keep the present number of ships in commission? Does he intend to equip and send out a Flying Squadron, and will the Reserve Squadron be sent out in the course of the year? These are questions which are deeply interesting to us, and, therefore, we want an answer to them. I hope the right hon. Gentleman will not think I am unfair in asking them. I wish to see a little more clearly, and to know not only the amount to be spent, but the policy which underlies that expenditure. The right hon. Gentleman has hitherto confined himself to generalities. He says his policy is to keep up a stated number of men in the Dockyards; but that is everybody's policy. I am not thinking of the money to be spent, or how many men are to be employed; but I am thinking of what may be called the efficiency of the Navy, and in what direction the right hon. Gentleman proposes to concentrate his main efforts. He did not tell us, for instance, whether he gives up as impracticable, or inexpedient rather, the construction of such large ships as would match the ambitious designs of the Italian Navy. Is he satisfied with the types of ships which are now being constructed, or is he now engaged upon new types? These are subjects which demand explanation. I may say I do not make these criticisms as personal to the right hon. Gentleman, and they are important, because they involve the interests of the Public Service. I think justice will be done me in this respect—that during the last five years I have never made these Navy Estimates a field for Party conflict. I have supported the Admiralty in many cases; but I frankly say that I have thought it my duty to state this evening the objections which I have done, because I do not think we have had that fulness of statement to which we have been accustomed on these occasions.

Mr. W. H. SMITH: Sir, I have no reason whatever to complain of the manner in which the right hon. Gentleman has dealt with the Statement which I thought it right to make. I admit that it was concise, and I avoided some topics which have been the subject of conversation in this House; but I will now endeavour to satisfy the right hon. Gentleman's thirst for further knowledge. The hon. Member for Reading (Mr. Shaw Lefevre) has to-night shown a capacity for attack, and he has distinctly challenged the policy of the Government during the last five years. I shall not follow him on the present occasion in that attack; such a matter as that must be dealt with on another occasion. I can quite believe the right hon. Gentleman the Member for the City of London (Mr. Goschen) did his best to leave the Navy in a position which would enable it to discharge its important duties; but I appeal to him whether it was not necessary during his period of office to withdraw ships from stations, and whether he was not unable to supply reliefs for those ships, because the repairs of those ships had been neglected? I am not going further into that subject, because I do not think the Navy ought to be made the ground for Party fighting, and it ought not to be made the shuttlecock of Parties in this House. It is a matter of the gravest importance that the Navy of this country should be kept in a state of efficiency. The right hon. Gentleman has spoken of the absence of any statement of policy. I thought it best to simply explain the Estimates before the Committee. The right hon. Gentleman, however, asks for further information, though he must be well aware that there are at this moment circumstances which prohibit me from stating what is the distribution of the Navy. I may say, however, that I hope the Squadron in the Sea of Marmora will be able to leave there in a day or two and go back to the Mediterranean. The difficulty of forecasting the course of events makes it also difficult to say precisely what the future disposition of the Fleet will be. I will take the opportunity which has been afforded me, by the remarks which have fallen from the hon. Gentleman the Member for Hastings (Mr. T. Brassey) and the right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Goschen) to refer to the conduct of the officers and men of the Fleet in the Sea of Marmora. We all feel that no body of officers or men could possibly have behaved better in trying circumstances, and they have never given occasion for the least anxiety or concern on the score of their conduct. Hon. Members will probably know that a long period of watching and waiting in complete inactivity is far more trying to a British Fleet than the dangers of active service. My right hon. Friend referred to the proposed reduction in the number of Marines; and, on this point, I may say that as the efficiency of the corps could be restored within a short period of time, I came to the conclusion that the number of men contemplated in the proposed reduction might very well be spared. They are now 657 under strength, and the effect of the reduction will be that we shall not recruit until their number falls to 13,000. With regard to the purchase of the *Independencia,* I would point out to the Committee that the Brazilian Government paid for the vessel a larger sum than she has cost us. Again, she was a very powerful ship, and was also in a position to go to sea; for which reason I considered that, with her armament and ammunition, it was not desirable that she should pass into other hands. I think the Committee will be of opinion that I have exercised a proper discretion in acquiring that vessel for the nation. As regards her price, I may mention that I consulted an authority often spoken of in this House, by whom I was assured that the ship was worth £650,000. It is one thing to buy a ship under circumstances of emergency such as existed last year, and another to buy a ship when you are not at all anxious to acquire her at a price which might be considered somewhat extravagant. I have been challenged also upon the amount of tonnage which we propose to build this year, and was asked whether it was necessary to propose to the House to spend so large a sum in shipbuilding as before, to which I reply that we have been five years in Office and have built the amount of tonnage which we proposed to build. I will not go back into the question of the expenditure of the two Administrations, but wish to refer to the questions raised by the hon. Member for Burnley (Mr. Rylands), who has spoken rather disparagingly of the Board of Admiralty. I am sure, as far as the Admiralty is concerned, there is no desire to claim the attribute of infallibility. If anyone is infallible it must be the hon. Member for Burnley; but I cannot admit that blame attaches to the Admiralty with regard to the non-adoption of improvements; on the contrary, we are constantly desirous to learn and constantly desirous to improve. Another of the charges brought by the hon. Gentleman against the Admiralty was almost answered by himself; for when he said that the Admiralty was the last to avail itself of any new invention, he added, it had not discovered that compound engines were economical in the matter of fuel, until the fact had been found out by others, and, strangely enough, he has charged the Admiralty with altering the designs of their ships. The *Dreadnought* had been changed two or three times in the course of her construction by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Pontefract (Mr. Childers); and with regard to any other alterations, I will add that no man dare occupy the place occupied by myself if he does not consider questions of improvements necessary to be made in order to maintain the superiority of our Navy. I have explained to-night that when the question of steel armour came before me in a practicable shape, I was bound to consider whether steel or compound armour was not better than iron armour-plate. And with regard to the *Inflexible,* I ask, was it right that I should have allowed the work to go on upon the old design? Upon this point, I think it will be admitted that I have done my duty. The hon. Member for West Norfolk (Mr. Bentinck) has spoken of his concern that there are no Reserves of heavy ships; but I think I may say that, almost for the first time in our history, there are Reserves in heavy ships. I mentioned in the early part of the evening the names of 13 iron-clad ships, which, either new or completely refitted with new boilers, would be ready in the course of this year, in addition to the Fleet which exists in the Channel and the two Fleets in the Mediterranean. We have altogether 34 iron-clads which may be considered to be in a thoroughly efficient state. That is a larger number than we have possessed at any other period. With regard to the observations which fell from my hon. Friend the Member for Hastings (Mr. T. Brassey), respecting the pay of the seamen of the Fleet, I wish to say that I regret he should have felt himself called upon to make those statements, which, as coming from him, will probably have great weight in the country. I confess that to me his speech was a surprise, and I do most earnestly deprecate statements made in this House as to the insufficiency of the pay of any class of public servants. I know it is difficult to withhold statements of the kind referred to; but the mischief done by them is almost incalculable. They raise expectations which it is almost impossible to gratify; and I must say that if you once begin seriously to entertain the question of increased pay with regard to one class of public servants, you open the door to an immense number of others, whom, if you refuse, you render dissatisfied. While I am upon this subject, I will add that, as far as my knowledge goes, the seamen of the Fleet are by no means dissatisfied with their position as regards pay and pensions. A remark has been made as to the number of desertions in the Pacific, which I can answer by a statement made by the captain of the *Liffey*, who took that vessel out to Coquimbo, and called at several ports on the West Coast of South America, and who told me that he had not lost a single man. It is, moreover, to be remembered that the wages of sailors have gone down very much recently; but I do not want to use this as an argument against paying the men of the Navy what they are entitled to, for they are a fine body of men who serve their country well, and therefore deserve to be well paid. Again, they have a position safer than that of the men in the Merchant Service, and are besides sure of a pension after 20 years' service, which is an enormous benefit to them. I have been challenged about building ships like the *Italia*. Well, I and my hon. Friend near me went over the vessel, and I must say that nothing could exceed the kindness and attention shown us by the Italian naval authorities, who have shown that they can build as good ships as can be built in this country; but, without wishing to compare our type of vessels with that of the Italians, I am not prepared to follow their example. I think it would be putting too many eggs into one basket, while I am not at all certain that we cannot get the same speed and powers of defence possessed by that huge ship, by patiently carrying out experiments and watching the development of science, without committing ourselves to such enormous expenditure of material power and steam power also in one ship. I am not prepared to do that as at present advised; but, at the same time, I must say that in view of the progress of naval science, rapid and continuous as it is, I desire to hold myself free to make any proposals which, after due consideration, are thought to be necessary. At the present moment I reserve my opinion. I think I have now answered most of the questions put to me; but there is one which came from the hon. and gallant Baronet the Member for West Sussex (Sir Walter B. Barttelot), which still requires a reply. He spoke of a feeling existing in the Marines, where that corps were jointly concerned with the Navy; and on that point I have to say that I should certainly regret that anything which has fallen from me should occasion pain to the officers of that gallant corps. He asked if it was the intention of the Admiralty to maintain the Queen's Regulations? I wish it to be understood that it is the intention of the Admiralty to maintain those Regulations most strictly. There has been a misunderstanding, which I trust has now been entirely removed by the answer given to the Adjutant General. There is no intention or disposition on the part of the Admiralty to make any change in the status of the officers of that gallant corps as regards the officers of the Navy; on the contrary, it is the intention fully to maintain the force of those Regulations which have existed for so many years. I shall now apologize for taking up the time of the House at so late a period in the evening (12.50), and express my regret if any want of clearness or fulness on my part has rendered it necessary to supplement my former observations. I trust that the Committee will now give us the Vote for the money required.

Mr. SHAW LEFEVRE wished to explain to the Committee, as the right hon. Gentleman the First Lord of the Admiralty seemed to think he had been taken by surprise by the criticisms he (Mr. Shaw Lefevre) had made. He had expressly told the hon. Gentleman the

Under Secretary to the Admiralty (Mr. A.F. Egerton) that he intended to call the attention of the Committee to the two Returns which formed the groundwork of all the observations he had made—namely, the one showing the tonnage of ships built in the last 10 years, and the other the ships repaired during the last four years.

MR. BENTINCK desired to express his cordial concurrence with the remark which had fallen in the course of that discussion—that recrimination between the two front Benches formed a leading feature in a debate upon the Navy Estimates. They had heard that the right hon. Gentleman the Member for the City of London (Mr. Goschen) had devoted his whole time and attention for many years past, with the greatest anxiety, to the efficiency of the British Navy. He (Mr. Bentinck) was, of course, bound to accept any statement which came from the right hon. Gentleman, and he did so fully and frankly; but he did so with some surprise, because it had occurred to him that the very last thing wished for by the right hon. Gentleman was an efficient Navy. The First Lord of the Admiralty had told them that they had 34 iron-clads in perfect order and fit for sea, and that there were others building; but he might be allowed to say that the number mentioned was in itself very much below that said to be required by the highest authorities on the subject. What he wanted to press on the attention of the right hon. Gentleman, and that which he had not thought proper to deal with, was that he (Mr. Bentinck) complained of the shortcomings of the Government generally under the present aspect of European affairs. He had also contended that not only was the position of the Navy as regarded iron-clads not what it ought to have been, but he had further said that the aspect of European affairs did not render this the time for any reduction of our maritime efficiency; but, above all, that the period had arrived when we ought to devote our energies, as well as the men and money required, for the purpose of putting our naval resources in a state of the highest possible efficiency. He had addressed himself to the right hon. Gentleman the First Lord of the Admiralty, and regretted that he had not thought it worth while to refer to the heavy question he had put forward. His own individual opinion was that the country was proceeding in the dark in not taking advantage of the time of peace to put her naval power in a more effective condition than it was in at the present time.

MR. PARNELL wanted to say a few words on the Vote, but would defer them until they came to the Vote for the money. Of course, the Government would give those hon. Members, who had waited without being able to join in the debate, an opportunity of making such remarks as the desired.

THE CHAIRMAN pointed out to the hon. Member for Meath (Mr. Parnell), that the present Vote was for Seamen and Marines, and was that which was open for general discussion, whereas the following Vote was for money only.

MR. PARNELL said, the question he desired to raise was one which he considered would arise, either on one Vote or another.

MR. W. H. SMITH: I trust the hon. Gentleman the Member for Meath (Mr. Parnell) will allow the Vote to be taken now. There will be ample time to put any questions later on. The hon. Member has not been in the House this evening so long as I have.

Question put, and *agreed to.*

(2.) Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That a sum, not exceeding £2,708,695, be granted to Her Majesty, to defray the Expense of Wages, &c. to Seamen and Marines, which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1880."

MR. PARNELL certainly thought the right hon. Gentleman should agree to report Progress under the circumstances. He recollected that last year he did not succeed in getting the Vote for the men, on which occasion he did not finish his own statement; but the right hon. Gentleman had been more fortunate that evening. He begged to move that Progress be reported.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Chairman do report Progress, and ask leave to sit again."—(*Mr. Parnell.*)

MR. GOSCHEN said, that the question had sometimes been compromised by its being understood that questions might be raised on the Vote for Victualling and Provisions. Perhaps, under the circumstances, the right hon. Gentleman would consent to report Progress after the present Vote had been taken. He wished to say a few words in reply to the hon. Member for West Norfolk (Mr. Bentinck). During the long time that discussions had continued in that House, the hon. Gentleman had never ventured to challenge the House with regard to his (Mr. Goschen's) conduct, with the exception of one occasion, when he was in a miserable minority. There was no person but the hon. Member in the House who believed him to be indifferent to the interests of the Navy.

Mr. W. H. SMITH: I hope the hon. Member for Meath (Mr. Parnell) will accept the suggestion that any discussion which he may have to raise upon the Estimates shall be taken on the Victualling Vote.

Mr. RYLANDS said, he knew that some hon. Members who wished to speak had been precluded from so doing, and had left the House in consequence.

The CHAIRMAN pointed out that the practice was to take a general discussion upon the first Vote. The second Vote raised the question of money, and the third Vote raised the same question. It would, therefore, be clearly out of Order to raise any question upon the second or third Vote that might be raised on the subsequent Votes.

Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Original Question put, and *agreed to.*

House *resumed.*

Resolutions to be reported *To-morrow;*

Committee to sit again upon *Wednesday.*

MOTION.

CLARE COUNTY WRIT.

RE-APPOINTMENT OF SELECT COMMITTEE.

On the Motion of Mr. Assheton Cross,

Ordered, That a Select Committee be re-appointed to inquire whether Sir Bryan O'Loghlen, Member for the County of Clare, has, since his election, accepted an office or place of profit under or from the Crown, and that they be directed to report their opinion whether he has vacated his seat by the acceptance of the said office:—Mr. Secretary Cross, Mr. James Lowther, Mr. Attorney General, Mr. Spencer Walpole, Mr. Attorney General for Ireland, Lord Francis Hervey, Sir William Dyke, Mr. William Edward Forster, Sir William Harcourt, Mr. Whitbread, nominated Members of the Committee.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Butt be another Member of the Committee."—(*Mr. Assheton Cross.*)

Major NOLAN very much regretted to say that the hon. and learned Member for Limerick (Mr. Butt) was not likely to be well enough to attend the Committee for some time.

Mr. ASSHETON CROSS said, in that case, he had no objection to the substitution of another person in the place of the hon. and learned Member for Limerick.

Question put, and *negatived.*

Mr. Sullivan, and Mr. Adam nominated other Members of the said Committee:—Power to send for persons, papers, and records; Five to be the quorum.—(*Mr. Assheton Cross.*)

House adjourned at a quarter after One o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Tuesday, 11*th March,* 1879.

MINUTES.]—Public Bills—*First Reading*—Exchequer Bonds (No. 1) *.

Second Reading—Medical Act, 1858, Amendment (16).

Second Reading—Committee negatived—Consolidated Fund (No. 1) *.

WEST DONEGAL RAILWAY BILL.

SECOND READING.

Order of the Day for the Second Reading, read.

Viscount LIFFORD, in moving that the Bill be now read a second time, said: My Lords, I regret extremely that this Motion was not as usual made by the noble Earl the Chairman of Committees. I regret it, because I shall be obliged to do what I have hitherto avoided to the utmost of my power—inflict on your Lordships a speech too long for what will at first sight appear as the consequence of the subject, but not when the real question at issue appears; and above all, I dislike extremely seeming to be at issue on a matter of this kind with the noble Earl, whose experience, ability, diligence, and impartiality are, I know, appreciated by your Lordships in the highest degree, and fully as much by myself as by any Member of the House. But while I acknowledge the claim to your confidence of the noble Earl, and my own vast inferiority, and while I acknowledge to the full the correctness of the principle laid down by the noble Earl, that differences of gauge and consequent break should be avoided, there is one point in which the noble Earl is not conversant, which, in my opinion, compels exceptional legislation in this and other matters—namely, the circumstances of Ireland. The question in Ireland as to railways is not, as it is in England, which gauge is best; but it is whether you will make your line in the cheapest possible way, or whether you will have no line at all? The County of Donegal is one of the largest in Ireland; it is about 85 miles long and 40 wide. It contains 1,197,154 acres. Up to the present date it has contained only two railways of about 13 miles each, not counting a main line which runs along the shore of the River Foyle, the boundary of the county, which is really a Derry line. There was a third line begun in 1860 which is lying unfinished, and to which I shall presently refer. It is proposed by this Bill, the second reading of which I am about to move, to carry on one of these lines which communicates directly with Londonderry, to a small seaport on the west coast, right through the County of Donegal from north-east to south-west. The line already made is on the 5 feet 3 inches gauge, the 3 feet gauge, unfortunately for the shareholders, not having been known when that line was made. Now I come to your Lordships to allow a line with a break of gauge to be made —a line promoted by the City of Derry at one end and by the principal landowners, who have largely contributed to it, at the other—for one main reason, and that is that if your Lordships will not permit it, this and another line cannot be made at all—the County of Donegal will remain unopened. The existing line of 13 miles was opened in 1863. It is a somewhat peculiar concern, with which I am too much mixed up to trouble your Lordships much about it. It is enough to say that it was for a long time the line of cheapest cost in the United Kingdom. It was, moreover, made as well and of as good material as any line in England. It was made with the utmost economy, as an instance of which I may mention that the Chairman and Directors have never asked or received one farthing of remuneration for their services. Should you pass this Bill, I believe the new Board will make their line with equal economy, being, in fact, much the same persons. But, besides the economy, this existing line was made under peculiar circumstances. It was promoted by a considerable amount of English capital; notwithstanding all this, it was made with much difficulty. But whether it is Home Rule agitation, or the general feeling that Irish property is insecure, after five years' patient waiting in the hope that means might be found to make the proposed railway on the Irish gauge, the promoters have found it impossible. The resources are strictly Irish, and the utmost they can hope is to be able to make it with the narrow gauge. I have told your Lordships that this is not the narrow question of a single railway. At the risk of tiring your Lordships, I will mention a still stronger case. In 1860, a line was laid out, of course in the broad gauge, leading from the town of Letterkenny, and the very large district behind it, to the City of Londonderry. Unfortunately, the promoters were not as well aware as we are now that the proportion of third-class passengers in Ireland to first-class is about 100 to 1; and in order to accommodate the latter, they did not perhaps look enough to going straight to the Port of Derry. Be that as it may, in all these 19 years the line has never been made, £82,000 has been expended, and after trying all these years to complete it on the broad gauge, the promoters have come to Parliament for leave to make it on the narrow gauge; and I can assure you that, if not made now, it will probably never be made. There is a third Donegal Railway into which this last is proposed to run, and it is on the broad gauge, and has no fault excetp that it does not pay a farthing of dividend. To remedy this, it is proposed to run the Letterkenny Railway into it, and, when that is done, I have no doubt that the shareholders will receive a dividend. Your Lordships may well by this time ask what are the great advantages of these narrow gauge lines, so that districts can be opened by them which must remain closed under the broad gauge system. In the first place, the construction is much cheaper. On the first railway I have mentioned, of 18 miles, the saving is calculated at £20,000. This is a saving of a fourth. I have seen a calculation which puts it as high as one-half. The reason of this is that sharper curves can be worked in the narrow gauge with safety, a matter most important in a mountainous county such as Donegal, and when most of the mountains are full of granite rock. Second, that on a narrow gauge line the engines and rolling stock are much lighter. I hold in my hand a photograph of a waggon weighing 2 tons 12 cwt., and another of 2 tons 7 cwt., while each carry a load of 6 tons, a load which requires a waggon of 5 tons in the broad gauge. I also hold in my hand a photograph of a first-class carriage, to carry six people in a compartment, just as comfortably as any compartment in the London and North-Western. In short, as to cheapness of working, this is the statement at the half-yearly meeting of the Ballymena and Larne Railway Company, by Mr. Chaine, the Member for Antrim, and the great promoter of these lines—

> "During six months they had carried over 10,000 tons of coal and lime. They had carried also 8,000 tons of general goods, and that almost entirely for Glasgow, notwithstanding the vast commercial disaster which had happened in Glasgow, and to Scotland generally. The passenger traffic in four months was very surprising. They had carried 34,580 passengers in those four months. Considering that this was the first narrow gauge line constructed in Ireland, they might regard these numbers as proof of their success. One of the most striking things in their accounts was the cost of their train mile, or the actual cost of running a loaded train per mile. They would see that that cost was 1*s.* 7*d.* a-mile. If they took the cost of the leading lines of England, Ireland, and Scotland, they would see that the cost of the train mile was about 3*s.*, or somewhat over. This proved that it is possible, when traffic is limited, and the population small, to run a narrow gauge line with profit, and give an amount of accommodation to the public, at rates which would be quite unremunerative on the broader gauges."

And now having stated, as shortly as I could, the advantages of these lines to poor and difficult districts, I will bring your Lordships to balance against them the objections. I know but of two—the inconvenience of the change of carriages at the break of gauge, and the cost of transhipment of goods. Now, as to the first, I have told you that the proportion of third-class passengers to first-class is as 100 to 1. Third-class passengers do not carry much luggage, and it is no great hardship to walk across a platform twice the width of this Table. As to goods, the cost of transhipment is calculated to vary from one farthing to twopence. Now, for these small considerations, will you condemn the great County of Donegal to be almost without railway communication, will you condemn the second of these lines to remain unmade, and the shareholders to have no chance of repayment on their large and hitherto useless expenditure; and will you condemn the shareholders of the third of these lines not to receive any dividend for the term of their natural lives? I appeal to your Lordships, I appeal to the noble Earl the Chairman of Committees himself whether he would do so. No one can doubt the propriety of the noble Earl calling your attention to breaches of an Act of Parliament by Private Bills. But this narrow gauge system was unknown when that Act was passed—even lately its great success had not been established. I would fain hope that the noble Earl will be contented with the principle of these railways having been repeatedly adopted by the Legislature, and the Government having lately refused to condemn it, that he will view with a friendly eye the Letterkenny Bill, which has already passed its second reading; and that he will not oppose the second reading of the best Donegal Bill, which I now move.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2^a."—(*The Viscount Lifford.*)

THE EARL OF REDESDALE (CHAIRMAN of COMMITTEES) said, the question raised by the Bill was one of considerable importance. His position as Chairman of Committees in respect of Private Bills was that he should take care that innovations, such as strange gauges, should not be introduced without the attention of Parliament having been drawn to the matter. The question of broad and narrow gauges was settled by the Act of 1846; and he thought it was his duty to take care that the gauge fixed upon by Parliament should not be altered at the pleasure of anyone who might choose to get up a Company. The proposition before their Lordships was for a narrower gauge than that which Parliament had sanctioned for Ireland; and it must be remembered that to convert a narrow gauge into a wider one was a very serious matter, involving the taking of new land and the construction of new bridges. This was an extension line, and there was, therefore, the greater reason why it should be constructed on the gauge which had been adopted as the standard one in Ireland. It was said that the rolling stock of the narrow gauge would be much cheaper than ordinary rolling stock; but it must be borne in mind that the owners of the line would be entirely dependent on their own rolling stock, so that it was not at all likely that they would be able to work their line so cheaply as if it were suitable for the ordinary rolling stock. One or two exceptions of this kind had been sanctioned, but in those cases the promoters were obliged to include in their Bills power to take land for widening their lines. He objected to exceptional Bills of this kind. If a double gauge in Ireland were to be permitted at all, it ought to be by a general Act, and not by private legislation.

THE DUKE OF RICHMOND AND GORDON bore testimony to the efficient manner in which the Chairman of Committees performed his duties in respect of Private Bills. There were, he thought, many districts of Ireland where the allowance of the narrow gauge would be of advantage; and as the Government were exceedingly anxious to develop trade in Ireland in every practical manner, they were not disinclined to support any proposal such as this that would tend to that end. He could not see the force of the objection made by his noble Friend the Chairman of Committees as to the ordinary rolling stock not being suitable to these narrow lines. Nobody would think of putting heavy locomotives on those light lines, and the curves and gradients were such as would preclude the use of the ordinary rolling stock. In some places less sharp curves and easier gradients could not be made, and as in certain of those places railway accommodation was much required, to insist on his noble Friend's objection would be to exclude those localities from the benefit of railways. The Government did not think there ought to be a general measure such as was suggested by his noble Friend. They thought that the Board of Trade ought to exercise due diligence in all exceptional cases, but that each case should depend on the decision of the Select Committee.

THE EARL OF KIMBERLEY regretted the decision of the Government, for he thought that to leave each case to the decision of the Select Committee might result in the establishment of a dozen different gauges in Ireland. This would cause serious inconvenience.

THE DUKE OF MARLBOROUGH thought that his noble Friend the Chairman of Committees, as was too much the habit in such cases, viewed this question from a purely English point of view. The only way in which railways could be made in wild and mountainous districts in Ireland with any prospect of remuneration was on a system which would permit of the use of bogie engines and light and comparatively inexpensive rolling stock. He believed lines of this sort would be of national importance in Ireland.

LORD ABERDARE said, that the proposal was not only for a break of gauge, but for a break of gauge of the most startling character. This was a question of the construction of one short branch line of 27 miles on two different gauges, the Bill being one for the continuation of a branch line, 10 miles of which had already been constructed on the standard Irish gauge. He believed that the inhabitants of Donegal did not desire the break of gauge, which they thought would have for its effect the cutting them off from the rest of the country.

LORD CARLINGFORD supported the second reading, believing the question to be one between half-a-loaf and no bread—the railway as proposed in the Bill or no railway at all.

THE DUKE OF ABERCORN said, his knowledge of the country through which the proposed railway was to pass enabled him to say that it would not afford a return if it were to be constructed on the standard Irish gauge. The resources of the country were utterly inadequate to construct and maintain a broad gauge railway.

THE DUKE OF SUTHERLAND said, he should give his vote for the second reading. Lines such as that proposed in the Bill might have been constructed with much advantage in some parts of Scotland, where there would be no remuneration for the construction of broad gauge lines.

On Question, *Resolved* in the *Affirmative;* Bill read 2ª accordingly.

MEDICAL ACT (1858) AMENDMENT BILL.

(*The Lord President.*)

(NO. 16.) SECOND READING.

Order of the Day for the Second Reading, read.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª."—(*The Lord President.*)

THE MARQUESS OF RIPON said, that though he thought the measure might be improved in Committee, he would be sorry to press objections going only to minor points, if his noble Friend thought they might interfere with the passing of the Bill in the present Session. He would, however, ask his noble Friend whether there should not be a distinct statutory limitation to the amount of fees which might be levied from persons desirous of entering the Medical Profession? Would it not be possible, under this Bill, to levy on such persons larger fees than were desirable? He had presented to their Lordships' House a Petition from the King and Queen's College of Physicians in Ireland as to the composition of the Medical Council. When introducing the Bill, his noble Friend the President of the Council announced his intention to appoint a Committee of the other House to consider that subject. It was important that the Committee should be appointed as soon as possible, and he hoped there would be no delay in their proceedings. He hoped that those who were intrusted with the inquiry would first determine in their own minds the objects for which the Medical Council had been appointed, and then proceed to consider the constitution proper for the attainment of those objects. He could not help thinking that many of those who advocated changes in the composition of the Medical Council did so because they proposed to make a change in the objects for which it existed. Its constitution ought to be determined by the objects for which it was established, and not the objects by the constitution. He hoped that whatever might be the result of the Report of the Committee, his noble Friend would not allow this question of the composition of the Medical Council to stop the progress of this Bill. The main object that concerned the interests of the public in this Bill was that there should be a uniform minimum qualification for admission to the Medical Register. This was a matter of so much importance to the public that no side issue ought to stand in the way. If the Bill were passed this year, there was no reason why his noble Friend should not in some future year deal with any other questions of medical reform. Indeed, he hoped that if this Bill were passed, his noble Friend would be encouraged to proceed with other improvements that were required; whereas, if he failed to carry this measure, he conceived that his noble Friend might, like himself, be inclined to throw up the matter altogether. His main object in speaking was to dwell upon the importance of the measure to the public, and to impress upon those who had other medical reforms they wished to obtain, that they would act far more wisely by supporting his noble Friend in obtaining this reform, than by appearing in the position of persons who desired to obstruct useful legislation intended to benefit the public.

THE DUKE OF RICHMOND AND GORDON said, he had very lately had an opportunity of expresssing his views upon this subject in introducing the Bill; and, therefore, but for the observations of his noble Friend, he should not have thought it necessary to make any remarks upon the subject. He took this opportunity of expressing his gratitude to his noble Friend for the very fair, candid, and open manner in which he had expressed himself upon the subject of his Bill, and of thanking him for his support. As to the point with regard to the limitation of fees, to which his noble Friend had referred, that would be a subject to be dealt with in Committee. Before the Bill proceeded to that stage, he would look into the matter and see what arrangements could be made to meet the observations of his noble Friend. Another point was the appointment of a Committee in the other House of Parliament upon the subject of the constitution of the Medical Council. It was, of course, impossible for him to say what would happen in the other

House; but he believed it would be proposed in the other House, in the course of this week, to appoint a Committee to inquire into the constitution of the Medical Council, and he hoped the reference would include all the points adverted to by his noble Friend. He quite agreed with his noble Friend that if, from unforseen circumstances, or from the attempts of those who desired to see reform in the Medical Council, this Bill should make shipwreck, he should be very much disposed, like his noble Friend, in former years, to give up the attempt as vain, and to admit that his mission was not to legislate for medical reform, but to leave it in the hands of those who thought they had better means of doing it. In conclusion, he had only to propose that the Committee on the Bill should be taken on Thursday, the 20th of this month.

Motion *agreed to;* Bill read 2ª accordingly, and *committed* to a Committee of the Whole House on *Thursday* the 20*th instant.*

INTEMPERANCE—REPORT OF THE SELECT COMMITTEE.—QUESTION.

THE EARL OF WHARNCLIFFE asked, When the Report of the Lords' Committee on Intemperance, nominated on the 14th of February last, will be laid on the Table? There had, he said, been a general feeling among the Licensed Victuallers that they laboured under great disadvantages, owing to grocers' licences.

LORD ABERDARE, in the absence of the noble Duke the Chairman of the Committee, said, that the Committee met for the last time yesterday. The Report was practically finished, and no reason existed why it should not be in the hands of noble Lords next week.

House adjourned at half past Six o'clock, to Thursday next, a quarter before Five o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Tuesday, 11*th March,* 1879.

MINUTES.]—SELECT COMMITTEE—Co-operative Stores, *appointed;* Clare County Writ, Mr. O'Shaughnessy *added.*

SUPPLY — *considered in Committee — Resolutions* [March 10] *reported.*

PRIVATE BILLS (*by Order*)—*Second Reading*—Clare Slob Land Reclamation Extension *.

Second Reading—Referred to Select Committee—Liverpool Lighting.

PUBLIC BILLS — *Ordered* — *First Reading*—Mutiny Act (Temporary) Continuance * [99]; Marine Mutiny Act (Temporary) Continuance * [98].

Second Reading—Drainage and Improvement of Lands (Ireland) Provisional Order Confirmation * [94].

Committee — Report — Friendly Societies Act (1875) Amendment [85]; Registration of Births, Deaths, and Marriages (Army) * [95].

Considered as amended — Habitual Drunkards [47].

Third Reading — Bankers' Books (Evidence) * [65], and *passed.*

PRIVATE BUSINESS.

LIVERPOOL LIGHTING BILL (*by Order*).

SECOND READING.

Order for Second Reading read.

MR. RAIKES: After this Bill shall have been read a second time, I intend to make a Motion which stands in my name on the Paper, my object being to have the Bill referred to a Hybrid Committee, in order that it may be determined, in some degree, what form of legislation shall be taken in regard to Bills of this character. There are before the House, in the present Session, I think, some 34 Bills in which provisions are taken for employing the electric light, or an improved mode of lighting; and it is clear that it will be a highly inconvenient arrangement to submit these various schemes to various Private Bill Committees, and to run the risk of producing the same chaos which for so many years prevailed in regard to Gas Bills. If the House will allow me, I will briefly state the history of the gas legislation of the House. In the year 1810, the first Gas Act was passed in regard to London, in connection with the Chartered Company, and in 1818 the first Gas Act relating to the country, which had reference to the City of Bath, was passed. From that time, owing to the happy-go-lucky system which seems to have prevailed in regard to the mode of conducting the Private Business of the House, several hundreds of Gas Acts have been passed, based upon very various principles, and dealing with the question in very various manners. The consequence has been that a good deal of confusion has at times prevailed as to the precise rights of the Gas Companies, and the precise powers of the Committees. This being so, I venture to think that as we may, perhaps, be on the eve of a great change in our system of public lighting, we should do well to take some steps to secure something like uniformity and regularity in our prospective legislation. There is no Bill before Parliament this year in relation to the Metropolis which raises this question; and therefore it appears to me that the Liverpool Lighting Bill, which is one of great importance, affecting a large population and promoted by a public body—the Municipality of Liverpool—is a fit one upon which to raise a question like this. I may say that I have in view another Bill affecting another large and important community, which has not yet passed a second reading, in which case the Bill is promoted by a Gas Company and opposed by a Corporation. I hope, in that case, if the Bill is brought forward, to see it referred likewise to the same Committee, who will then have before them two alternative modes of procedure—in one case a scheme proposed by a Municipal Corporation and opposed by a local Gas Company, while in the other the position is reversed—the scheme being proposed by a local Gas Company and opposed by a Corporation. Such a Committee will, I think, be sufficient to thresh out all the different questions that are likely to arise; and the House will see that I propose to give them a rather large Order of Reference, in order to enable the Committee, if they think proper, to lay down any canons which it may be as well to follow in the consideration of cases of this sort hereafter. I have been in communication with several hon. Members with the view of obtaining their consent to serve on this Committee; and I am sure the House will fully appreciate the names of the gentlemen with whom I have spoken. I hope, in the course of another day or so, to be able to place on the Table of the House a list of the names, which I am sure will command the confidence of the House in dealing with a question of this sort—a question of the highest scientific interest, and of great practical importance to the country. I will, therefore, only add now that I support the second reading of the Bill, but with the understanding that, as soon as it has been read a second time, I shall be allowed to propose the Motion which stands on the Paper in my name.

Bill read a second time.

MR. RAIKES: I beg now to move—

"That the Bill be committed to a Select Committee of Seven Members, Four to be appointed by the House and Three by the Committee of Selection."

Motion *agreed to.*

MR. RAIKES: I have now to move—

"That it be an Instruction to the Committee that they have power to inquire whether it is desirable to authorise any schemes for lighting by Electricity or other improved methods; to consider how far and under what conditions, if at all, the use of such modes of lighting should be sanctioned by Parliament in the case of Municipal Corporations, other local authorities, or Public Companies, and to report their opinion to the House; and that such of the Petitioners against the Bill as pray to be heard by themselves, their Counsel, or Agents be heard upon their Petitions (if presented on or before the 17th day of March), and Counsel heard in favour of the Bill against such Petitions:—That the Committee have power to send for persons, papers, and records:—That Four be the quorum of the Committee."

I have struck out of the Resolution after "other improved methods" the words "in thoroughfares and other places." I have done so because it has been intimated to me that there are such places as factories, churches, schools, theatres, and other places which, in the opinion of the Board of Trade, cannot be regarded as public places.

Motion *agreed to.*

And, on March 13, Committee *nominated* as follows: — Lord LINDSAY, Mr. ADAM, Sir UGHTRED KAY-SHUTTLEWORTH, and Mr. SPENCER STANHOPE.

QUESTIONS.

ARMY—THE MILITIA.—QUESTION.

EARL PERCY asked the Secretary of State for War, Whether, in consequence of the limited time which will be afforded this year for the training of the Militia, he will sanction the omission of the usual musketry course?

COLONEL STANLEY, in reply, said, that in exceptional cases the Militia when called out had been exempted from musketry instruction; and this year, if a special application was made by the commanding officers of regiments, there would be no objection to sanction the omission.

SOUTH AFRICA—THE ZULU WAR—SIR BARTLE FRERE'S DESPATCH.

QUESTION.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN asked the Secretary of State for the Colonies, having regard to the Despatch of Sir Bartle Frere, dated January 24th, and just published, in which the High Commissioner recapitulates the reasons which have induced him to commence hostilities without waiting for the assent of Her Majesty's Government, Whether he now considers that any further delay is necessary in the public interest before the House discusses the causes of the Zulu War.

Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH: Sir, I am not quite prepared to endorse the description which the hon. Member gives in his Question of the despatch of Sir Bartle Frere to which he alludes, or to accept the implication which appears to be contained in the Question that it is my duty to fix the day on which the hon Baronet the Member for Chelsea (Sir Charles W. Dilke) should bring on his Motion; but so far as regards the opinion of the Government on the subject, I would ask the hon. Member to repeat his Question on Friday next, by which time the despatches by the mail next due will have arrived, and will be in our possession.

MINES ACT—THE ACCIDENT AT WAKEFIELD.—QUESTION.

Mr. MACDONALD asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, If he has appointed anyone to attend, on behalf of the Government, the inquest on Thursday at Wakefield, which is to inquire into the cause of the death of twenty-one persons who lost their lives in a pit there?

Mr. ASSHETON CROSS replied in the affirmative.

CRIMINAL LAW — CASES OF THEODORIDI AND GORLERO.

QUESTION.

Mr. CALLAN asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Under what circumstances, and after what procedure, convicts sentenced to seven years' penal servitude, and "dealt with in the ordinary course by the authorities having the supervision of the criminal law in this country" have any portion of their sentences remitted; whether, in the "ordinary course," convicts sentenced to seven years' penal servitude are liberated at the expiration of eighteen months; whether, inasmuch as Constantine Theodoridi and Paulo Gorlero were, in the month of September 1877, convicted of having conspired together to extort money by threats from a lady under circumstances characterised by Mr. Newton, the committing magistrate, as "one of the most wicked cases he had ever heard of," and were sentenced to seven years' penal servitude by Mr. Justice Hawkins, he would state to the House whether Theodoridi has been liberated; and, if so, under what representations, and by whom made; whether Paulo Gorlero is still in prison; if so, what were the special grounds upon which Theodoridi has been liberated; and, whether Mr. Justice Hawkins, who tried the case, was called upon to make a report; and, if so, did the learned judge recommend the remission of the sentence?

Mr. ASSHETON CROSS, in reply, said, every case must depend upon its own circumstances—upon the health of the prisoner, or the recommendation of the Judge, or the action of the prosecutor. In this case, Theodoridi and Gorlero were convicted and sentenced, as stated in the Question. There was no dispute as to the facts. Theodoridi was not pardoned in any way, but was released on licence last September. The Turkish Ambassador made an informal application privately to him (Mr. Assheton Cross) that the man might be released, on an undertaking being given that he should leave the country and not return again. The ground of his release was that there certainly seemed to be a considerable distinction between the two cases of Theodoridi and Gorlero, and that the lady concerned in the case, to whom great injury was done, had strongly recommended Theodoridi to mercy. There were certain letters in the man's possession which it was necessary should be given up, and their surrender was part of the condition on which he was released. The undertaking was also given that he would leave the country and not return to it. A precisely similar private application was made by the Italian Ambassador on behalf of Gorlero; but he (Mr. Assheton Cross) could not comply with it, because it did not warrant the same consideration; and, in that case, there was no recommendation on the part of the prosecutrix, who was so nearly concerned in the matter. There was no Correspondence of any official nature on the subject in the Home Office.

SCOTCH BANKS — EXTRAORDINARY DIRECTORS—THE SCOTCH JUDGES.

QUESTION.

Mr. CALLAN asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether his attention has been called to the fact that no less than one-half of the Judges of the Superior Courts of Law in Scotland, including the Right honourable the Lord President of the Court of Session, and five other Lords Justices—viz.: Lord Curriehill, Lord Adam, Lord Deas, Lord Rutherford Clark, and Lord Gifford, are Extraordinary Directors of Banking Companies in Scotland, and are advertised as such in the public newspapers; and, whether, in view of the recent conviction of Scotch bank directors for fraudulent practices, the occupation of such positions by the Judges meets with the approval of the Government?

Mr. ASSHETON CROSS: Sir, if the office of extraordinary director had anything to do with the management of the bank, I should be inclined to agree with the suggestion conveyed in the Question; but I am told that the Charters under which the extraordinary directors are appointed make it distinctly understood that they have nothing whatever to do with the management of the bank, that they are not entitled to interfere in any way, and that they receive no emoluments; and, therefore, the case appears to me to stand on very much the same footing as that of the English Judges, many of whom give their names to insurance companies of high standing.

HIGHWAY ACT, 1878—FORMS OF ACCOUNTS.—QUESTION.

Mr. CLARE READ asked the President of the Local Government Board, When the new forms of Accounts for the different Highway Authorities will be issued by the Local Government Board, in conformity with the provisions of the Highway Act of last year?

Mr. SCLATER-BOOTH, in reply, said, that these new forms of accounts were in type, and would be issued in a very few days.

MERCANTILE MARINE—FOREIGN STEAMERS.—QUESTION.

Mr. BATES asked the President of the Board of Trade, If he will cause to be laid upon the Table of the House Copies of the Correspondence between Messrs. Luscombe, Bellamy, and Co. of Plymouth and the Board of Trade in 1876, on the subject of the foreign steamers calling there?

Mr. J. G. TALBOT: Sir, in answer to my hon. Friend, I beg to say that we do not consider the Correspondence between Messrs. Luscombe, Bellamy, and Co. and the Board of Trade of sufficient public importance to justify our laying it upon the Table of the House; but we shall be happy to show that Correspondence to my hon. Friend or anyone else who may take an interest in it, if he will be good enough to call at the Board of Trade.

MOTIONS.

INTOXICATING LIQUORS (LICENCES).

RESOLUTION.

Sir WILFRID LAWSON: Whatever may be thought of the Resolution which I have now the honour to propose to the House, I do not suppose that there can be two opinions as to the importance of the question with which it proposes to deal. Of course, as the House knows, the evil that I attack is the great evil of the enormous quantity of intoxicating drink which is consumed by the people of the country—an evil which works to the detriment of the community at large. Everybody admits the evil, and I am afraid that none of us can get up and say that that evil has been very greatly diminished of late. Indeed, I think it is more than doubtful whether, in spite of the efforts that have been made to effect a diminution of that evil, it is not as great now as it has been at any previous time of our history. I need not detain the House long with statistics on the subject, for we all know pretty well that the greater part of our crime arises from intoxication. Apart from the serious crimes, we know that an enormous number of people are arrested in this country every year simply and solely for intoxication. The last year for which I have got Returns I see that about 350,000 people were arrested by the police for drunkenness. That, however, shows nothing like the intoxication prevailing in the country. It appears to me that this evil of intoxication arises simply and solely from the consumption of drink. [*Laughter.*] That is an assertion which no one will dispute, and what test have we as to the amount the people have consumed? Now, I was reading only this morning in a paper somebody sent me the words of a very old advocate of temperance in this country, Mr. Joseph Livesey—and I am glad to quote him, because my hon. and learned Friend the Member for Leeds (Mr. Wheelhouse) has often quoted him when he has spoken in this House. Mr. Livesey has advocated temperance all his life; and the other day, speaking to a meeting at Preston, he said he did not think we were making much progress, and added—"When the Chancellor of the Exchequer brings out his yearly account, I am always checked by that." He concluded that the endeavours to promote temperance have not been very successful, especially when we find from the yearly account that the consumption of drink was on the increase. Now, fortunately, this morning, in *The Times* newspaper, we had a short statement from a gentleman who had taken great interest in this matter. This statement showed the amount of drink consumed in the country. It appears that £142,000,000 is spent every year in intoxicating drink; and, strange to say, the gentleman has found, by great and accurate inquiry, that in the year 1878—that year of bad trade, bad times, banks breaking, strikes, people starving, relief committees all over the country—in that year we had, as a nation, spent, instead of less upon intoxicating drink, £181,000 more than in the preceding year. Stranger still, there had been an increase in the consumption of beer and a decrease in the other kinds of drink, showing that the increased quantity of liquor had probably been consumed by the working classes, who we were told were in so much distress. I believe Lord Aberdare was perfectly right when he said the other day that, notwithstanding all that had been done during the last 10 years to promote temperance, both by legislative and non-legislative action, intoxication is worse now than it was 10 years ago. My doctrine has always been, and still is, that as you increase the facilities you increase the consumption, and as you increase the consumption you increase the amount of intemperance; and I am very glad to think that all these people who have been advocating temperance so laudably for so many years are beginning to come to that conclusion. Again, I will quote Mr. Livesey, for the sake of my hon. and learned Friend the Member for Leeds (Mr. Wheelhouse). Mr. Livesey said a short time ago—

> "What simpletons we are to sit here on the platform of the Temperance Hall in Preston singing about winning the day, when there are 400 houses in this town retailing drink."

Of course, he spoke common sense there. My hon. and learned Friend the Member for Leeds agrees with me. Now, Sir, in proposing this Resolution—which I hope may form the basis for some satisfactory settlement of this great evil—I think I ought to prove two things: first, that the statements contained in the Resolution are true; and, secondly, that it is desirable to affirm them by vote. I have seen it stated that I am not correct in saying that it was the ancient practice, the ancient design of licensing, that the houses should be licensed for the benefit of the community. Now I think I am right; because if we go back—and I must to prove that it is ancient—if we go back to the year 1495—and surely that is far enough—we find that this licensing system was first mentioned, and curiously enough it was mentioned again in 1504, in an Act concerning vagabonds, an exact reproduction of the Act passed in the year 1495 (11 *Henry* VII., c. 2). This Act states—

> "And that it be lawefull to ij (two) of the Justices of the Peace where of oon shalbe of the quorum within their auctorite to rejecte and put awey comen ale sellying in townes and places where they shall thynk convenient, and to take suerties of the kepers of ale howses of their gode behavyng by the discression of the

> seid Justices, and in the same to be advysed and agreed at the time of their sessions."

Another Act of Parliament passed in 1552 said—

> "Forasmuche as intollerable hurtes and trobles to the Common Wealthe of this Realme dothe daylie growe and encrease throughe such abuses and disorders as are had and used in commen Alehouses and other houses called Tiplinge houses. It ys therefore enacted by the Kinge our Soveraigne Lorde, withe thassent of the Lordes and Commons in this present Parliament assembled and by thauctoritie of the same,
>
> "That the Justices of Peace within everie shire, cittie, boroughe, toune, corporate franchese and libertie within this Realme or two of them at the lest whereof one of them to be of the quorum shall have full power and auctorite by vertue of this Acte within everie shire, cittie, boroughe, towne, corporate franchesse, and libertye where they be Justices of Peace, to remove discharge, and putte awaye common sellinge of ale and bere in the said common alehouses and tiplinge houses in such towne or townes and places where they shall thinck mete and convenyent:
>
> "And that none after the first daye (of Maye) next commynge shal be admytted or suffred to kepe any common alehouse or tiplinge house but such as shall be thereunto admytted and allowed in the open Sessions of the Peace or els by twoe Justices of the Peace whereof the one to be of the quorum."

That shows that these Justices were only to license these places for the benefit of the community; and I think I have proved my case, that it was the ancient design that houses should be licensed for the benefit of the public. You see that in that Act of Parliament there was a power of restraining—the same power that I advocate in my Resolution. [Mr. WHEELHOUSE dissented.] My hon. and learned Friend the Member for Leeds shakes his head; but surely the power to admit must imply a power to restrain. I have, I think, proved my point. The magistrates have possessed this power for hundreds of years; but I am not going to bring any charge against them; I am not going to bring a railing accusation against the Justices, and say that they have acted purposely to injure the public. I remember there was a right hon. Member of this House who used to go with me to meetings and make speeches against the drink traffic; and I thought I could always count upon his support; but upon one occasion I was disappointed. I asked him why he did not vote with me, and he said—"Why, in your speech, you did not pitch into the magistrates." That is not my line at all. I think the magistrates have done the best they can; but, like any other human authority, they are liable to make mistakes. What I want is that no mistakes shall be allowed to occur to the injury of the public. I want to give a certain power to those for whose comfort licences were granted; I wish them to have the right to say whether the magistrates are right in granting licences or not. You may say that this is not necessary; but when such power as I am advocating has been exercised, has it not been productive of good? There are plenty of hon. and right hon. Members of this House who have exercised the power they possess as great landlords to restrain the sale of drink on their estates and in the neighbourhood of their property. They have exercised their influence in this direction to the greatest benefit of their friends and neighbours, and they have given very great satisfaction by doing so. Would it not be well that the same power which the accident of property gives to hon. and right hon. Gentlemen should also be intrusted to the people themselves, who are quite as much interested in this matter as are the great landowners? I think that if we had had this power, and it had been exercised during the last year or two, we should not have had all that distress we have had in the country. No one knows that better than the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer, who is not deluded by all those fallacies about injury to the Revenue. He knows that the policy which I am advocating would be the best for the country; for what did he say in bringing forward his Budget a year or two ago? He said, according to the report of his speech in *The Times*—

> "I ask again, in what circumstances could it be expected that the consumption of spirits in this country would fall off to such an extent as seriously to injure the Revenue? It must be from one of two causes—either from some general failure of the consuming power of the people—from some failure in their ability to purchase spirits, the will remaining as it was—or from some great change in the habits of the people, inducing them to abandon the use of such enormous quantities of ardent spirits. If it were the former, it would tell upon all the sources of Revenue, just as well as upon that derived from spirits. But if the reduction of the Revenue derived from spirits be due to the other cause, if it should be due to a material and considerable change in the habits of the people, and increasing habits of temperance and abstinence from the use of ardent spirits, I venture to say that the amount of wealth such a change

would bring to the nation would utterly throw into the shade the amount of revenue that is now derived from the spirit duty, and we should not only see with satisfaction a diminution of the Revenue from such a cause, but we should find in various ways that the Exchequer would not suffer from the losses which it might sustain in that direction."

Sir, the Chancellor of the Exchequer was quite right. When this trade that I am talking about progresses, other trades suffer. I do not know whether hon. Gentlemen read the accounts of the Licensed Victuallers' proceedings with the same diligence that I do; but if they do, they will see that recently a high festival was held at Burton—Burton-on-Trent, the great citadel of the brewing trade—and there they rejoiced greatly. They said—"It is true that the country has suffered, and that there is pauperism, and misery, and ruin all around; but here we are, all right; Burton is the one green spot in the desert of misery." Yes, it is true that this trade flourishes, not along with other trades, but it flourishes on other trades—in fact, it lives upon them. Great efforts have been made to restrain this trade within proper bounds; great efforts have been made by both Parties in this House; and when these efforts went on the right principle they have been eminently satisfactory. I say that when they have gone on the principle of local option, which I am advocating, these efforts have always, more or less, been successful. Sir George Grey brought in a Bill enacting that the sale of drink should stop from 1 o'clock in the morning, until 4 o'clock in the morning. Sir George Grey gave power, I think, to stop the sale in London by Imperial Act; but he gave power to municipal bodies to put that Act in force in their own localities if they pleased; he gave local option to those who represented the community. That Act was set in force in a very large number of towns in the country, with the best effect—so much so that when, a year or two after, I ventured in this House to propose the extension of the power contained in the Act to other elective bodies besides municipal councils, the House unanimously supported me, thus approving the power of local option. My hon. Friend the Secretary to the Treasury, formerly the Under Secretary of State for the Home Department (Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson), brought in a very useful Act, before he was in Office—people do not bring in so many good measures when they are in Office. My hon. Friend saw the great evil of licences being granted to beershops without the magistrates having a veto power. When a man wanted a beer licence he went to the Excise, who granted him a licence, and the man was then enabled to carry on his trade. The hon. Gentleman said—"No, that is not right; the magistrates ought to have the power of vetoing the granting of these licences." Common sense characterised the proposition of the hon. Gentleman, and when he went to a Division he carried the whole House with him. Sir Robert Clifton and Mr. Harvey Lewis went into the Opposition Lobby, but had the pleasure of telling nobody at all. That is another instance of local option. We all remember the Bill of Mr. Bruce. Some Gentlemen on this side have very good cause to remember it, I believe. Mr. Bruce, in introducing his Bill in 1871, endorsed entirely the principle of the Resolution which I am now asking the House to adopt. If the House will allow me, I will read his words, because they are so apposite. He said—

"I have explained that I could not in any way accept as a solution of that question the Bill brought forward by my hon. Friend the Member for Carlisle. At the same time, I am bound to say, I think that measure contains a very valuable and wholesome principle, and that the principle of an appeal to the ratepayers on matters affecting their interests is one of which great use can be made. Over and above the fact that the ratepayers are the persons chiefly interested; that it is their comfort and convenience and not that of other people that they should be consulted; that they are the persons who bear the burden of all the crime and misery produced by the multiplication of those houses, and by their disorderly conduct—over and above these considerations there is another, and, in my view, a most important one—namely, the advantages of enlisting the minds and hearts and feelings of the people in the thorough consideration of that subject. Let us give the ratepayers a voice in that matter—let us give them the power in some way or other of deciding how far these houses shall exist among them, and we shall at once create a strong public opinion; we shall at once create among them that sort of feeling which, among the upper classes of society, has long made drunkenness disgraceful, which is also rapidly making it disgraceful among the working classes themselves, and which no longer permits them to call a mere sot a good fellow, or to look upon the offence of drunkenness as merely venial. I am satisfied, therefore, that if we are to create a wholesome and vigorous public opinion on that subject, we must give the ratepayers of the country some direct interest, and that the wider spread that interest is the greater will be the social advantage."

I think this is a vindication of my Resolution. But we have had other legislation on the same principle. We have had the Forbes-Mackenzie Act. Why was that passed? The people of Scotland said—"We object to having this trade carried on amongst us on Sunday," and Parliament said—"This is a matter in which the people alone are interested, let them have local option." And that measure was carried; and it has been so popular in Scotland that there is not a single Scotch Member in the House of Commons—let him sit in what part of the House he may—who would vote for the repeal of that measure, even if it had the slightest chance of passing. I have another instance, more serious, and more important, and more telling. We all remember what struggles we had last year over the Irish Sunday Closing Bill. The Irish people wanted local option. Throughout Ireland there was the cry—"We wish to be spared the evils of the drinking trade on Sunday; we want the House of Commons to give us the opportunity of preventing these evils." And there were plenty of hon. and right hon. Gentlemen in this House who did not believe for a moment that stopping the sale on Sunday would result in a great benefit to the people; but they said—"This is a matter which meets the wishes and wants of the Irish people, and we will vote for it on that ground, and on that ground alone." I do not know whether the right hon. Gentleman the Member for the City of London is in his place or not; but I remember that that right hon. Gentleman said substantially in a letter which he wrote on the subject—"I do not approve of the Bill. I do not think it will do any good; but I vote for it because it is a matter which concerns the Irish people, and they desire it." Surely, Sir, this is a good example, and one which we can all look back to with pleasure. Last Session was not a very cheerful one; but there is one bright spot in it, and that is, that we conferred a boon upon Ireland. I will prove to you how it is a boon. The Licensed Victuallers held a meeting the other day in Ireland, and Mr. Lane, of Cork, said he had been informed that from one-third to one-half of their trade in his locality had been destroyed by the Sunday Closing Act. Well, can anybody calculate what that means; can anybody conceive what benefit accrues to the nation if one-third to one-half of the publicans' business is stopped; can they conceive the increase of happiness and comfort in the homes of the working classes? I think that even the gallant band—"the Eleven of all Ireland"—who kept us up all through the night last Session, will rejoice with us at the benefit which has resulted to their country in consequence of the passing of the Sunday Closing Bill. We used to have an expression in this House last Session which was very familiar. Some of us used to say—"We are patriots first and Liberals afterwards." What I have to ask of the Eleven of Ireland is that they should be patriots first and publicans afterwards. Now, what I want to point out is that all these evidences of the benefit arising from the exercise of local option when employed to remove a great evil have attracted the attention of the people and created a great demand out-of-doors, that we should have some legislation passed on the same lines as that I am now advocating. Why, this House is counted out every night; no one takes any interest in its proceedings this Session, and look now how full it is. And yet there is no special reason why people should come down to-night. There is no new war announced since last week; probably no new war will be announced for another week. No, Mr. Speaker, the crowded House indicates the interest taken in this subject out-of-doors, and shows that there is no question in which the people of this country are more interested than the attempt to remove the evils which arise from the liquor traffic. What is to be done? Well, I hope we shall not be put off with any suggestions as to a Select Committee. We have had enough of them. If hon. Members chose to go into the Library they will find overwhelming evidence of the evils of the system which I am now attacking. Sir, as the House knows, I have made an effort for some years past to make a successful attack upon this system; for I thought—as I have often told the House—that it is a great injustice that this sale of drink, for the benefit of those who sell it, should be forced upon the people of those localities who do not wish to have it, and do not wish to suffer from the evils which it introduces.

I endeavoured, to the best of my ability, to meet the evil by that Bill, which got the name of the "Permissive Bill," somehow or other. I do not know why it should get that name, for there are innumerable Bills introduced of a permissive character; but I said in that Bill, let the people be allowed to give instructions to the magistrates as to how to use their restraining power. I did not want to interfere with the licensing authority in any way. I only said—"Systematically let them know what the wants of the community are. They are bound to consider these wants, but they have no accurate means of knowing them; let the people be allowed to inform the magistrates of their wishes, and then let the licensing authority act upon the information given them." Well, Sir, people said that was not right. Good friends of mine told me I did not go far enough, for I gave the people power to do only one thing; whereas, they ought to have power to do many things to regulate the trade. I did not see my way to bring in a Bill of that kind, for I did not want to pass a vote of want of confidence in the magistrates; I only wanted to pass a vote of confidence in the people themselves. Many hon. Members had brought in Bills bearing on the subject. The hon. Member for Newcastle (Mr. J. Cowen) brought in a Bill for appointing Licensing Boards; the hon. Baronet the Member for Fife (Sir Robert Anstruther) brought in a Bill of the kind for Scotland; the hon. Member for Staffordshire desired, by a Bill, to give local option to the magistrates in respect of grocers' licences; and the hon. Member for Birmingham (Mr. Chamberlain), in a most able speech, brought forward an elaborate scheme for getting the working of public-houses into the hands of municipalities. All these propositions had something good in them; but none of them touched the point I wish to insist upon —namely, that you should not licence if the people do not want a licence. My Bill was intended solely for those places —be they many or few—where the people did not desire licences; and I felt that if any other of the schemes proposed answered—if they reduced the evil and made the licensing system a blessing instead of a curse—my Bill, if passed, would, of course, be a dead letter, and I should be glad of it. If these schemes would not answer, it is no reason why my Bill should not be tried. Well, Sir, as you know, the House differed from me, and, I am sorry to say, differed from me by very considerable majorities. I began to see if I could not find something by which I might harmonize the discordant views which were entertained on this matter; and I thought I might get a Resolution passed laying down the principle of local option, but leaving the details to be worked out and decided upon hereafter; and at the conclusion of last Session I gave a Notice which would enable me to move something of the kind I am moving to-night. Sir, I found a Resolution which I thought would suit the case in the Report of a Committee of Convocation appointed to inquire into the state of intemperance some years ago, and now I have the honour of reading the Resolution to the House. What I wish to move, Mr. Speaker, is this—

> "That, inasmuch as the ancient and avowed object of licensing the sale of intoxicating liquor is to supply a supposed public want without detriment to the public welfare, this House is of opinion that the legal power of restraining the issue or renewal of licences should be placed in the hands of the persons most deeply interested and affected—namely, the inhabitants themselves—who are entitled to protection from the injurious consequences of the present system by some efficient measure of local option."

I have had a good many inquiries made to me in the Lobby and elsewhere as to the meaning of this Resolution. It appears to me that the meaning is so clear that in an intelligent House like this it is hardly necessary for me to make any explanation; but I will do my best to explain it if there is a difficulty. What I mean by it is this—that in legislating on this subject it is necessary to make the desires and interests of the public superior to the desires and interests of the trader engaged. That is the principle of my Resolution; and if hon. Members do not think that clear enough, take what *The Times* says in a very able article this morning. Alluding to my Resolution, *The Times* said—"The words are wide enough to include the 'Permissive Bill.'" I admit that freely and fully—in fact, I would not propose my Resolution if they did not. Then, *The Times* goes on to say—"But they do not necessarily oblige any man to support this measure." The effect of these words was that my Resolution includes the principle of my old measures, but leaves the details to be settled hereafter. Hon. Gentlemen are very suspicious. They go about the Lobby, and think I have a Permissive Bill concealed about my person. But I tell them they will not be pledged to the details of the Permissive Bill. I cannot speak more clearly than that. What were the details of the Bill? There is nothing about them in my Resolution. In my old Bill I proposed that we should have a trial of my system for three years, and then take a poll as to whether there should be a return to the old system. There is nothing about that in this Resolution. Then I laid down a certain mode of voting—namely, by papers, such as are used in the election of Guardians. Many people objected to that part of my Bill; but there is nothing about it in my Resolution. Then I took certain areas, or parishes, or boroughs; but there is nothing about these in my Resolution. Then there is the question of compensation. People say that the Permissive Bill did not provide for compensation. That is quite true, it did not; but it left it an open question, and so my Resolution leaves it an open question. If the House shall hereafter decide that, having given an enormus bonus to the sellers of drink to go into the drink trade, they should give them another enormous bonus to go out of it, they would be perfectly free to do so notwithstanding this Resolution. Let me re-assure hon. Gentlemen who are so timorous and suspicious about my intentions. Who is going to support this Resolution? I believe my right hon. Friend the Member for Bradford (Mr. W. E. Forster) will support it. I am quite sure he is not a reckless politician; and I think he objects to the Permissive Bill, yet he supports this Resolution. I believe, too, I shall have the pleasure of receiving the support of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Birmingham (Mr. John Bright). He, too, has often said distinctly and straightforwardly—as he says everything in this House—that he objects to the details of my Bill, and thinks them unwise; but he is quite able to support this Resolution, for he knows that the details are left open for future consideration. The Bishop of Peterborough, too, has expressed his hearty concurrence in the Resolution, although he strongly opposes the Permissive Bill. Therefore, if anybody still thinks this Resolution is the Permissive Bill, I refer them to the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Bradford, and the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Birmingham. Well, Sir, I have said that out-of-doors this policy is approved; and I am very happy to find my Resolution so largely supported by the public. The greater part of the religious communities have passed resolutions in favour of this Motion. The Church of England Temperance Society, which is advocated by many hon. Gentlemen who are Members of this House, has given its warmest and heartiest support to it—indeed, there has hardly been a discordant note. Stay, there has been one, and that came from the Presbytery of the Established Church in Scotland. They held a rather curious meeting on this matter. They had endorsed this Resolution, the same as the Church of England Convocation had endorsed it some years ago. One gentleman in the meeting rose and said—"I propose that we petition in favour of the words of Sir Wilfrid Lawson." Thereupon up jumped a rev. gentleman and said—"No, that will never do. Sir Wilfrid Lawson is a Radical, and he has some designs of benefiting the Liberal Party." Now, that is a new charge to bring against the Radicals. We have been charged with breaking up the Liberal Party; but I never heard them charged with uniting it. There must be a great change in us. I cannot help being a Liberal; a man must be of some politics—unless he is a Home Ruler. But really, Sir, I think these Scotch clergymen must have forgotten themselves. I said just now that I hoped even the Irish Eleven had determined to be patriots first and publicans afterwards; but these clergymen in Edinburgh seemed to have resolved to be Tories first and Christians after. Surely they might have exercised a little more liberality. If it is suggested that this Resolution is to benefit the Liberal Party, I ask who is going to second my Motion? Why, my hon. Friend the Member for Manchester (Mr. Birley); and I am sure he is as loyal and true, and as honest a Tory as you can find throughout this House—a gentleman respected by both sides of the House. Why, 14,000 clergy, headed by the Archbishop of Canterbury, have approved of my Resolution. Now, are these 14,000 clergy coming over to the Liberal Party? I do not expect to live to see that day. I say, Sir, it would be more worthy of all of us, on a great question like this, involving the best interests, morality, and happiness of the great masses of the people, to put Party aside for a little space of time, and think only of the nation. But, Sir, I must also defend my Resolution as an abstract Resolution. I am quite aware that this House is not fond of abstract Resolutions. The hon. and learned Member for Leeds does not like abstract Resolutions; but he does not like Bills either. I am not in love with abstract Resolutions any more than he is; but there is a time for all things: and I want to point out that both Parties have on suitable occasions given their support to abstract Resolutions. We all remember the Resolutions of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Greenwich (Mr. Gladstone) on the Irish Church. He commenced his attack upon that institution by passing a Resolution in this House, and that Resolution led, in subsequent years, to action. Take our hon. Friends on the other side of the House. In 1872, when the Liberals were in Office, the Gentlemen opposite brought forward a splendid Resolution, through the hon. Member for South Devonshire (Sir Massey Lopes), in favour of transferring certain local charges to the National Exchequer. They passed that as an abstract Resolution, which was the basis of their policy and on which they came into Office afterwards. Let us take an instance in which Party was not involved. The House will remember well that in 1876 Professor Smyth—who was very dear to many personal friends, and who, I believe, was respected by gentlemen on both sides of the House—brought in an abstract Resolution, showing that it was desirable that the sale of drink should be stopped in Ireland on Sunday, and that proposition was carried by a very considerable majority. It resulted, not long afterwards, in the House insisting that the principle laid down should be acted upon, and the Irish Sunday Closing Bill was adopted. Well, Sir, I must now trouble the House for one or two moments with a few observations on the Amendments which have been proposed to my Resolutions. It has occurred to me that if they were all put together we might perhaps get a decent one out of them; but, as they stand now upon the Paper, I do not think they have much to do with the subject I put before the House. I will deal, first of all, with that of my old friend and opponent the hon. and learned Member for Leeds, with whom I have had many a tough battle, and with whom I shall have many more tough battles, and whom I shall conquer in the end. Now, I think it a very strange Amendment. Strange is a Parliamentary word. I might use a stronger word; but I should not like to hurt his feelings. I have no doubt he will give good reasons for it. I read all his speeches with great attention; and I find he has a motive, and a good motive, for everything he does in this House. He was addressing the annual dinner of the Yorkshire Brewers' Association the other day, and he said—"Beer, and hops, and Episcopacy are all very good in their way. Practically, a Member of Parliament will go in for neither one nor the other. In the performance of his duty he does not care very much for anything but the Bible." So I suppose that, by-and-bye, we shall have a Scriptural argument in favour of his Amendment. I was puzzled when I saw his Amendment, strange as it is, to think whom he can get to second it, and I ran over in mental review the whole list of my hon. Friends opposite; and I came to the conclusion that there was only one hon. Gentleman who had the ability to do justice to the Resolution in seconding it, and that was the hon. Member for Guildford (Mr. Onslow), and I shall be very much surprised if he does not rise to second the Amendment. Let me point out to the House that the Amendment has nothing to do with the Motion. My hon. and learned Friend objects to "any tribunal subject to periodical election by popular canvass and vote;" but instead of my Resolution dealing with any such tribunal, you may leave the licensing authorities exactly as they are. Then the hon. and learned Gentleman goes on to say that such tribunals

> "might, and in all probability would, lead to repeated instances of turmoil, and thus be detrimental to the peace and quietude of every neighbourhood in England."

Was there ever such a damaging Resolution to his own case brought forward by an hon. Member? Did he ever hear of people rioting because licences were granted when they did not want them? It is possible that the hon. and learned Gentleman's own friends may make riots; but I am surprised that such a good general as the hon. and learned Member is supposed to be should not have seen the disrepute into which he is bringing his own Party. Then my hon. and learned Friend objects to canvassing; but is he not aware that there is a great deal of canvassing at the present time? Is he not aware that when there is a job to be done, when a licence is wanted, the magistrates are whipped up from all parts of the country? Did my hon. and learned Friend not canvass his constituents at Leeds? I do not suppose my hon. and learned Friend will withdraw his Amendment. I hope he will not. I do not want him to; but I do think it would be the best thing he could do to make one of his old speeches against the Permissive Bill during the dinner-hour. His Amendment has nothing to do with the Resolution; his speech will do no harm; but it will please the publicans. The hon. and learned Gentleman thinks that we never can have too many speeches on the subject, and he intends to score a victory. Having finished with the Yorkshire brewers, he goes to speak to the publicans at Barnsley. In fact, the hon. and learned Gentleman is perpetually turning up in all parts of the country at licensed victuallers' meetings; and he told the licensed victuallers at Barnsley very confidently that the hon. Member for Carlisle would only have a small following; but he himself was perfectly satisfied, for he was prepared to take the remainder under his wing, and lead them to certain victory. Now, I think it would be one of the most interesting and exciting political episodes of our time to seen the hon. and Biblical Member for Leeds leading his bibulous majority to victory, assisted by the hon. Member for Guildford (Mr. Onslow). No doubt there will be cartoons of the scene in all the illustrated periodicals of the day. Well, then, I come next to the Amendment of the noble Lord the Member for Bury St. Edmund's (Lord Francis Hervey). I have no particular objection to the Amendment; but I think there is not much in it, for it simply says we must wait for the final Report of the Lords' Committee. I think the House should be able to say "Aye or No" to the Resolution like men. By the bye, I have heard a rumour that the Report of the Lords' Committee is to be laid on the Table of the House of Lords this very evening whilst I am speaking. Really, I think we have heard quite enough of this talk about the Lords' Committee. Someone said, long ago—"Thank God we have a House of Lords;" and during the last year I am sure the Home Secretary must have repeatedly exclaimed—"Thank God we have a House of Lords' Committee." What has happened? If anybody has got up and asked a twopenny-halfpenny question about the regulation of the drink trade, the right hon. Gentleman has said—"This is a matter which cannot be touched until the House of Lords' Committee reports." The same answer has been given to enthusiastic deputations of temperance societies; even when the brewers and licensed victuallers have gone to him, he has said—"Gentlemen, you have a very good case, but we cannot do anything until the House of Lords' Committee has reported." I am rather doubtful about this House of Lords' Committee. I was in the House of Lords when this Committee was appointed, and I heard Lord Salisbury say—

> "The Government will agree to the Committee being appointed on the understanding it is only with a view to inquiry, and not with a view to legislation."

But they have changed that view, and now say that all legislation is to depend upon the Report of this Committee. I have another reason for doubting whether anything is to come of the Lords' Committee; for a Committee of this House was appointed to consider whether certain towns in Ireland should be exempted from the Sunday-closing law; and although the Committee reported in favour of no exemption, the House straightway passed exemptions at the instigation of the Government; and now there are in Ireland five cities of refuge for the drunkard established by the Government. The noble Lord is well able to deal with Ancient Monuments, Burial Bills, and upon all the burning questions of the day he speaks well and sagaciously; why should he not make up his mind on this without waiting for the Report of the Lords' Committee? I say it is a pitiable Amendment, and I hope he will not press it. I now come to my hon. Friend the Member for East Devon (Sir John Kennaway), and I was rather surprised at his Amendment; but I suppose it was put on the Paper for the purpose of giving him an opportunity of making a speech. I know he is a leading member of the Church of England Temperance Society, which warmly supports the Motion. I have no objection to the details he suggests. My hon. and learned Friend the Member for Dewsbury (Mr. Serjeant Simon) comes in and wants the licensing authority to require sworn evidence as to what the people want. Well, let them swear. The noble Lord opposite the Member for North Northumberland (Earl Percy) has also something to say. He says—"We must wait for the Report of the Lords' Committee;" but he goes a little further, and I am glad to see he admits the evil, and I hope, if he has not the opportunity of moving the Amendment, he will support my Resolution. We have one more—the hon. and learned Member for Cambridgeshire (Mr. Rodwell)—who says—

> "That no new Licence for the Sale of Intoxicating Liquors ought to be granted unless the application for such be supported by a Memorial of such a character, and signed by such a proportion of the residents in the district to be served, as shall satisfy the Justices that the Licence is required for the wants of the district."

To use a vulgar expression, that only puts the boot on the other leg, requiring them to say they wanted licences instead of saying they did not want them; and although I have no particular objection to the Amendment, I do not see that it is so germane to the Resolution as to be moved in connection with it. And now I would ask the House what would be the practical effect of carrying my Resolution; what will be the practical effect of our division on this question? Of course, it will be either that the Resolution will be carried, or it will be defeated. If we are defeated, that means the House thinks I have not succeeded in making out a sufficient case of injustice to warrant the House at present in dealing with it. I shall be sorry if the House comes to that conclusion; it may do so, and I must submit to it for the present. If we carry the Resolution, it would decide that it laid down the right principle of legislation, and in that case the Government would have to act upon it, and bring in some measure based on this proposal. If they did not, then it would be my duty to consult with my Friends to try to hit on some rational, sensible, and satisfactory way of carrying out the proposal that has been enunciated. I want the House to see who it is that opposes this Resolution. I think, if you will reflect, you will find there is no organized opposition to this Resolution of mine from any class, from any party, from any portion of the community throughout the country, except from the publicans. Let the House consider that, and they will see they are the only systematic and formulated opposition that has been brought out against my Resolution. The list of objections sent to Members is called "Objections to Sir Wilfrid Lawson's Resolution on local option," and comes from "The Licensed Victuallers' Protection Society of London, and of the London and Home Counties Licensed Victuallers' League." The first Resolution is this—

> "That it is so destitute of details, as showing how the principle which it contains is to be applied, that no discreet person could safely pledge himself to the principles until such details are supplied."

Of course, every Resolution is. A Bill is objected to because of its details, and the Resolution because it is devoid of details.

> "That, as it stands, it pledges its supporters to what is equally the principle of the Permissive Bill, Sir Robert Anstruther's Bill, the Licensing Boards Bill, and the Gothenburg scheme."

Very good; that shows how good the principle is. Then we are told it is "subversive of individual liberty." Of course—all acts of Parliament are. We sit here to subvert individual liberty, and to prevent anyone doing wrong to the public. Then we are told the Resolution

> "Is not acceptable to the constituencies, and that hon. Members voting against the Resolution will, therefore, be voting in accordance with the preponderating opinion of the constituencies."

That, Sir, is a matter of prophecy, which I shall cheerfully leave to the next General Election. Then they say it is an unjustifiable attack upon the magistracy. Now, I think there is nothing of the kind. The Resolution is intended to assist the magistrates in finding out what the people want. Then we are told—"The whole licensing question will therefore have to be taken up *de novo*."

Nobody doubts it, and the sooner the better. Then we are told it will "confiscate licensed property." It will not; there can be no confiscation of property in licences that are only granted from year to year. If the great drink interest can bring forward no better arguments than those to which I have alluded, they will not succeed in deterring the people of this country from pressing this demand. I am glad the question is now put on a right issue by the trade itself. The question now is, beyond all doubt, the question of British interests *versus* vested interests. I know how they are growing; I know they are overgrown, and are almost paramount in political power; but they cannot successfully withstand a great and growing public opinion. Plenty of hon. Members in this House heard the conclusion of one of the greatest speeches which the hon. Member for Greenwich ever made. He was fighting some great political question, and he concluded his speech by saying—

> "Time is on our side; you cannot fight against time; the great social forces as they move on in their might and in their majesty are marshalled on our side."

And I say, Sir, beyond a doubt, the great social forces are marshalled in our support. Sir, they are marshalled in our support; and, strong in the conviction of their ultimate triumph, I ask the House to take a step which will not discredit itself; which will encourage all those who are working for the welfare and happiness of England; and which, above all, I am certain, will be an act of justice to the people whom it is our duty and privilege fearlessly and faithfully to represent in this House. The hon. Baronet concluded by moving his Resolution.

MR. BIRLEY: Mr. Speaker, I am sure there will be no serious controversy about the recitals of this Resolution; but the main question raised by the hon. Member for Carlisle is the vesting of legal power in the inhabitants of any place to prevent the issue of new licences. It is upon this point that I support the proposition of the hon. Baronet. I have no wish or desire to take away from the magistrates the power of licensing, inasmuch as I believe that that duty has been worthily and wisely exercised during the period of something like 330 years, as will be found by a reference to the Statutes of Henry VII. and Edward VI., to which reference has been already made. It must be borne in mind that although the authority was then intrusted to the Justices, and not to the inhabitants, this included the power of putting down all common alehouses. Although I desire that the magistrates should retain their authority, I think it exceedingly inconvenient, and also unjust, if the inhabitants of a locality are not allowed to influence them in withholding the licences, except by memorial or remonstrance. I am at a loss to know why this Resolution should be called the "Permissive Bill," unless it is because it is moved by the hon. Baronet. It is well known that the Resolution is not the hon. Baronet's, but is that of a Committee appointed some time ago by the Convocation of the Province of Canterbury. It was supported by the great bulk of the clergy of the country. I am, therefore, of opinion that it should receive careful and thoughtful consideration. The hon. Member for Carlisle has quoted from two Statutes bearing on the subject; and I find that, in the beginning of the 17th century, in the year 1604, the 1st of King James, another important Statute was passed on the subject. In that Statute a strong expression appeared in the Preamble, denouncing in the very gravest terms the abuse of taverns. And the same principle has been asserted in various forms at subsequent periods. With regard to magistrates, there was an Act of the reign of George II., in which it was set forth that many licences had been granted by certain Justices living at a distance, and not well informed about these licences, or with regard to the character of the persons to whom they had been issued. Care was taken, therefore, in that Statute, in some degree, to reduce the jurisdiction of such Justices as regarded the area under their control. That, however, is not so grave a complaint at the present day. With every respect for the magistrates, I must still express the opinion that they are not in all cases sufficiently well informed whether there is good cause for granting the licences, nor as to the character of the persons licensed. That, as the House is aware, is one of the main reasons why the supporters of the present Motion ask that powers should be conferred on the inhabitants. In 1635, Lord Keeper Coventry charged the Justices on this subject, and told them to take care that no house was opened unless the same was duly licensed, and that those licences ought to be few in number. It would also appear that before that time—in feudal times—the Houses of Parliament occupied themselves very little with regard to the character of the alehouses, confining themselves to the assize of bread and ale. They were anxious to keep up the quality and to keep down the price. It appears further that the lords of the manor exercised jurisdiction in this matter, and that offences were cognizable by the Court Leet, which had in it a portion of the popular element. One idea that they had with respect to the use of public-houses was not to close them only at an early hour—say, for instance, 8 or 9 o'clock—but to prevent people resorting to them after a certain hour. I cannot refrain from touching, although the matter has been very fully considered by the hon. Baronet the Member for Carlisle, upon the various Amendments on the Paper. First, I will deal with the Amendment of the hon. and learned Member for Leeds (Mr. Wheelhouse), who placed his Amendment there not because there was anything wrong in the Motion, but because he was desirous of peace and quietude, which might be disturbed by elections. That is desired by the hon. Member for Carlisle, not only at election times, but all the year round. I have a complaint to make against the hon. and learned Member for Leeds, because, when we had last an encounter in this House, it was on the occasion when it was thought desirable that Manchester should be supplied with an abundance of pure water. The hon. and learned Member for Leeds endeavoured to arrest the flow of that valuable element; but if it had been a flow of pure beer that was sought, the reverse might have been the case. As regards the other Amendments on the Paper, they are very hopeful indeed, and very emphatically in favour of the Resolution. The noble Lord the Member for North Northumberland (Earl Percy), it is true, wishes to wait for the Lords' Committee to report. The Amendments went as far as I desire, and as far as, I think, the supporters of the hon. Baronet can expect. I cannot agree to the Amendment of the hon. and learned Member for Dewsbury (Mr. Serjeant Simon), because I do not think we could get trustworthy evidence. The remedy, I think, would be very much worse than the disease. False swearing would be worse than drink. As regards the Amendment of the hon. and learned Member for Cambridgeshire (Mr. Rodwell), there is very much to be said in favour of that, if it could be properly carried out. I will now give my reason why I desire this Resolution to pass and to be accepted by the House. I think I have seen long since in this country a very sturdy determination to restrain excessive drinking. I have long seen in this country a very urgent desire to mitigate these evils; and the classes that suffer more than any other are, perhaps, the middle and lower classes. They suffer more than the higher classes, and that is perhaps why the question does not fully command the sympathy of this House. We see it all over the world. Every English and English-speaking people takes part in it. Whether it be in the United States of America, in the English Dependencies and Australia, in Canada, or in New Zealand, the same spirit and desire to diminish the number of licensed houses is manifested. Then, as to the result, we may entertain a confident belief that as the number of public-houses is diminished, so we may increase the number of improved dwellings, the number of coffee-houses and recreation grounds, and working men's clubs, and public-houses themselves will improve materially, and we may come back perhaps to the typical public-house of three or four centuries ago, that seems to have thrown a charm round the neighbourhood. If I might say a word upon the question of grocers' licences, I would like to know why it is that the House has always refused or neglected to intrust the magistrates with authority over the grocers' licences? The magistrates and the people of the country desire it, and yet it remains, Session after Session, to be exercised by the Government authorities. With regard to vested interests, I desire to deal very considerately with them where they could be shown to be just; but I would remind the House we are now building up vested interests of a gigantic character. I will not say they have been literally concentrated in the hands of a few capitalists; but the tendency is very strong in that direction. It reminds me of a speech of Dr. Johnson when he attended the sale of Thrale's Brewery — "We are not here to sell merely a few brewing tubs and vats, but the potentiality of wealth beyond the dreams of avarice." So it is with regard to public-houses in the present day. They are becoming more and more concentrated in the hands of the brewers themselves, who put their representatives into these houses to manage them. In conclusion, I beg to thank the House for its attention. I have not sought the duty of seconding this Motion; but I do so with a distinct conviction that it offers a reasonable opportunity of settling many difficulties and composing the public mind, which is violently excited on the subject, and will continue so until they have a legal right of restraining the issue of licences.

Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That, inasmuch as the ancient and avowed object of licensing the sale of intoxicating liquor is to supply a supposed public want without detriment to the public welfare, this House is of opinion that a legal power of restraining the issue or renewal of licences should be placed in the hands of the persons most deeply interested and affected—namely, the inhabitants themselves—who are entitled to protection from the injurious consequences of the present system by some efficient measure of local option."—(*Sir Wilfrid Lawson.*)

Mr. WHEELHOUSE moved, as an Amendment,

"That it would be most undesirable and inopportune to change the arrangements now legislatively provided for the regulation of the trade carried on by the Licensed Victuallers of this Country, because any tribunal subject to periodical election by popular canvas and vote might, and in all probability would, lead to repeated instances of turmoil, and thus be detrimental to the peace and quietude of every neighbourhood in England."

Taking each and both of the propositions which he had endeavoured to embody in his Amendment, he hoped, before he concluded, to treat each of them in the most strict order possible. He would not for a moment deny the great ability with which the hon. Baronet—who, although on this and other questions his particular opponent, was personally his friend—had introduced his Resolution on the plea of promoting temperance; whereas the question of temperance was very little in his mind or in the mind of any one of his supporters. Everyone in the House, be he more or less conversant with the subject, must know, as he did, that the Motion had nothing whatever to do with temperance, but was, from first to last the result of a teetotal movement. Again, they were told by the hon. Baronet that there were not any details in his Resolution; and that as the great objection raised against the Permissive Bill was that the details were so full and objectionable, there was no chance of passing it into an Act of Parliament. Therefore it was they were relegated to the idea of an abstract Resolution, which, according to the views of the hon. Member for Carlisle, was altogether free from details. He (Mr. Wheelhouse), however, trusted that he should be able to show the House that the Resolution was not only pregnant with details, but that its terms were sufficient—as, indeed, the hon. Baronet himself had admitted—to include, not only the Permissive Bill itself, but every other form of objectionable legislation on this subject. The hon. Baronet, however, told them that he had not any desire to interfere with the Justices in the jurisdiction which they exercised in regard to the granting and the renewal of licences; but was there any Member in the House who could doubt—whatever might be intended—that this Resolution was, in fact, though he quite admitted unintentionally, a slur upon the magistrates? Why, the whole purpose of this Resolution was to place in the hands of a popular constituency the power which had been for hundreds of years exercised by the magisterial bench. It had been said that words were used to conceal thoughts; but such could not be stated of the words employed in this Resolution; for, if it meant anything whatever, it meant that they were to take from the magistrates that power, without any proof of their having made a wrong exercise of it, in order to place it in the hands of another set of persons chosen by popular election. They were told they were to take the Resolution as it stood, and to leave the details to be filled up in some Bill, which was to be based upon the same lines; which was as much as to tell them that the Resolution was in itself useless, and that it was a waste of time to spend an evening in its discussion. The hon. Baronet told them that it pledged the House to nothing, and his assumption throughout was that he did not want to change anything. But, if that were so, then why this Resolution? It was clear to him that the Resolution was only paving the way to legislation; and if, as the hon. Baronet had told them, it covered not only the Permissive Bill, but a great deal more, was it not, he would ask, likely that the moment they had passed the Resolution they would be called upon to proceed further, and make it take the form of a Permissive Bill, being, at the same time, told that, having accepted the principle enunciated in the abstract Resolution, they were bound to support the Bill? This was the introduction of the thin edge of the wedge, and an almost insidious attempt to get, under the disguise of the Resolution, to the Permissive Bill itself. They were told the magistracy had done their work very well. "I am not going," said the hon. Member for Carlisle, "to bring any charge against the magistracy." From beginning to end, from first to last, if his Resolution meant anything, it meant that it was necessary to put the power into the hands of somebody else. It meant that the magistrates were incompetent to perform what for 300 years they had satisfactorily performed, and what, he thought, they ought to continue to perform. He was amused at what the hon. Member had said with regard to restraint. Surely, the magistrates had always acted as a judicious counterpoise between the publican on the one side and persons of extreme views on the other. That duty, he (Mr. Wheelhouse) maintained, was the one which the magistrates had exercised from the very hour they were first placed in a position to deal with this question until now; and that was the power, he ventured to think, they were exercising with most salutary influence. But they were told that some fashion of local option ought to be introduced. What was that fashion to be? Was it to be at the instance of popularly-elected bodies—such as Municipal Councils, School Boards, or Vestries? If so, he ventured to assert most fearlessly that that would create turmoil and proscribe peace and quietness in every district. The hon. Baronet had represented the magistrates as influenced by wire-pullers; but while he denied that such was the case, and appealed to the House to confirm his statement, would there not, he would ask, be worse than wire-pulling in such a state of things as the Resolution would bring about? There would be canvassing and pledges asked and given, and, under such circumstances, the whole question of the convenience of the public would be lost to sight. It was, therefore, infinitely better that the power should be still left in the hands of the magistrates, who would exercise it impartially, and altogether irrespective of what might be a popular vote. He did not know whether the hon. Member was a Justice of the Peace for his own county, or what might be his personal experience on the subject. He (Mr. Wheelhouse) could only tell him that, speaking not as a magistrate himself certainly, but as having had very much to do with them in their judicial capacity, the magistrates were accustomed to exercise immense care, supervision, and exactitude, when they were asked to renew licences or grant new ones. It was said that magistrates were often earwigged. He did not know how it might be in some out-of-the-way place in Cumberland; but that certainly did not happen in 99 cases out of 100 elsewhere. Knowing, as he did, how closely magistrates investigated every claim, he dissented entirely from that statement. But if in some exceptional instance a Justice of the Peace might be earwigged, was it not certain that candidates in every municipality of the country would be ten times more subject to such a process? The very influence which could not be brought to bear on magistrates, because they stood in a position of considerable social elevation, would operate on those who would form the Local Licensing Board. Did anyone suppose that such a Board would not be acted upon, more or less? The hon. Baronet said the brewers had enormous power; but that power was far more likely to be used in their own favour over local bodies and small jurisdictions than over the magistracy. The allegation made was that the magistrates, being gentlemen of property residing on their own estates, were not sufficiently close to the neighbourhoods where public-houses might be asked for to know what were the real wants of the district. He greatly doubted that allegation. In his own locality, the magistrates who dealt with questions of that kind were always residents in the immediate neighbourhood; they were perfectly acquainted with every house in their district, or, if not, they visited every house for which a new licence was asked, and sometimes also those houses for which only a renewal of the old licence was sought, and they required such structural or other alterations as were necessary to be made. Still, they had been told that a body popularly elected—a body which might be, if they liked it, the *vox populi*, but to whom the rest of the quotation would not apply—were to be thought the arbitrators of each district. For the sake of the peace and quietude, which he desired to see prevailing throughout the country, he hoped that particular matter would not be placed in the hands of a popular tribunal, such as was indicated in the Resolution before the House. He admitted that this Resolution was very artistically—he did not like to say very craftily—framed; but its intentions were on the face of it, and they on that side of the House were not likely to be deceived. Again, they were told that the present system had produced the distress which it was now said prevailed. An argument more far-fetched than that had never been heard either in that House or elsewhere. Had they not had much worse periods of distress than the present? And yet such a remedy for it as was now proposed had never been thought of before. The hon. Baronet the Member for Carlisle must have tried how far he could impose on the credulity of his audience when he employed such an argument. Again, they were told that the Irish Sunday Closing Act was a great tribute to the principle of local option; but it really had nothing to do with that principle. They were told there were some men who were "publicans first, and patriots afterwards." Alliteration of that kind was amusing enough, and he did not know what this had to do with the matter. On the other hand, there was a very large band of men who were teetotallers first, and statesmen, if they liked, afterwards. He had no notion of teetotalism. If any man liked to drink water, and nothing but water, he did not object to his doing so; but that such a man should try to compel him (Mr. Wheelhouse) to confine himself to that beverage was what he did most sincerely protest against. The teetotaller had no more right to interfere with his (Mr. Wheelhouse's) predilections or habits, than he had a right to interfere in the regulations of the teetotaller's household. They were also told that, according to some of these measures, the magistrates were to have the veto. He would say—"Do not give them the veto, but leave them the power they have at this moment." The magistrates, he ventured to submit, knew better than any other class of men in their several districts what was good for the neighbourhood in which they lived; and as long as that was the case, it was most undesirable to change the present mode of granting licences. It was said—"Let there be a sort of joint committee, and place on the Licensing Bench some of the ratepayers of the district." But how were they to put those ratepayers on the Bench? They could not get rid of the difficulty in that way. Either they must have the magistrates as a body to deal with the question, or they must resort to popular election in some shape or other. It was no question whether the whole body should be elected by popular vote or only a part of it. Some part must be elected by popular vote, and then they would have all the evils incident to canvassing for votes in the lower stratum of society, while the members returned would also be liable to be canvassed in turn and subjected to objectionable pressure. That measure was simply the Permissive Bill in disguise, with the worst features of the Gothenburg, and other cognate systems, superadded to it. It had been said that this was a Resolution of Convocation; but this was the first time he had ever heard the proceedings of that Body referred to in terms of approval on the opposite side of the House. They were told, again, that there had been talk enough about the Lords' Committee. When, however, either House devoted its attention by means of a Committee to any question of this kind, it was simply an act of courtesy on the part of the other House to wait until it became known what would be the purport of the Report of the Committee. If, as had been stated, that Report was laid on the Table of the other House that evening, so much the better; but whether it was laid on the Table of the House of Commons, or elsewhere, it would require some process of digestion before it could properly be discussed or appreciated. Now, as to that, it was his strong opinion that the result of the Lords' deliberations should be fully known before anything was attempted to be done on the subject before the House, either in the shape of an abstract Resolution or a Permissive Bill. It was not a question whether they might or might not agree with the conclusions of the Committee; but it might be that they had some suggestion to offer, though at the present moment they could not even say as much nor even guess whether any proposal was made by the Committee to solve the question. However that might be, he felt assured that magistrates, whether they were noblemen or not, were not prepared to give up their present authority under the existing licensing laws. It would greatly surprise him were the case otherwise, and to find that magistrates were prepared to surrender their authority in order that it might be placed in the hands of irresponsible electoral bodies elected under the worst conditions. That was, in his opinion, a statement which would receive the most conclusive contradiction when they came to a Division that evening. Then they were told that there was no opposition to this "local option" movement except that of the publicans themselves. Was there not? They would find there was opposition to the Bill other than that of the publican interest, and they would also find that the opposition was by no means to be despised. To tell them that it was merely a publicans' question was to repeat the cry raised when hon. Gentlemen felt it their duty to oppose the Permissive Bill. It was not a question between publicans and the public. It was an issue between the organization of the teetotallers, the outside public, and all the other classes of society. That was the true aspect of the business, and it would be well for the House to understand it. They were told by the hon. Member for Carlisle—"Oh, let people swear;" and the hon. Gentleman who seconded the Motion said—"Swear not at all." He (Mr. Wheelhouse) did not care very much, if at all, whether the testimony was ordered to be taken on oath or not; but he most assuredly would say—"Leave things as they are" at the present time. If magistrates required testimony on oath, they had full power and were competent to take it; or, in the event of people objecting to an oath, they could allow a statutory declaration to be made. What did they propose instead? That there should be an irresponsible tribunal, which might, if it pleased, take sworn testimony. The present Licensing Tribunal, composed as it was of gentlemen of position, of gentlemen of experience, and gentlemen who were anxious to do their duty, was the best possible one, and answered every purpose. Then, turning to another side of the question, they had had quoted the Bishop who was said to have stated that he would rather see England free than sober. Now, he (Mr. Wheelhouse) was anxious to see England free; but he was also extremely anxious to see the freedom associated with sobriety. He believed there had been no greater friend of the drunkard than that class of legislation, or attempted legislation, which had continually been brought under the notice of both Houses of Parliament—measures which were truly impracticable—measures which were rejected year after year, and which had no further good or evil in them beyond postponing all useful legislation on the subject. It had been asserted to-night that drunkenness was increasing in the country. He was very happy, indeed, to think that this was the view only of those who were ardent teetotallers, and that it was not shared by the large body of thoughtful men of temperate habits who had carefully investigated the subject. Let them consider what was the state of things at the present time. Would any of them do as their grandfathers did? Would they employ workmen who were known to be habitual drunkards? He thought not. Why, one of the first questions asked by every lady, when about to employ a servant was—"Is she sober?" Was that not the first question asked by every employer of labour in this country before taking any man or boy into his service? The question was always asked—"Is the man of sober habits?" or—"Is the boy temperate?" If it were really true, as contended, that drunkenness was increasing, then he would venture to assert it was because the magistracy of this country had not the power of former years, which, in his opinion, should never have been taken from them—namely, that of supervising all the licences which were issued. If, instead of granting wine licences, beer licences, or grocers' licences, licences were only given to the recognized licensed victuallers, in the manner of years ago, there would be very much less private or public drinking. Enormous facility for drinking had been given by the several classes of licences to which he had alluded. No supervision was exercised over those places, and they were, he strongly contended, a source of great danger to the nation. Still, they were told, as they had been that evening, that on the shoulders of the licensed victuallers should fall the whole of the blame. He was not one of those who thought so, and he protested against assertions of the kind. It was not the fault of the licensed victuallers, or the law of the land, if the country had degenerated. It was those who deluged the country with beerhouse, wine, and grocers' licences who were to blame, and upon them should it be mainly placed. He was one of those who had a great respect for the rights of property, for vested interests, and he would allow all those having licences to hold them in the future, with the proviso that the magistrates should, in all cases, exercise the old right of supervision. The Justices were the only body in which such powers could be placed with safety; and the result would be disastrous were they placed in the hands of a self-elected body, or a body elected, as it sometimes would be, by a majority of a couple of teetotallers. Such tribunals would be again repeating the most injurious thing England had ever seen. They knew very well that if the principle of Licensing Boards were adopted, there might follow what would practically amount to confiscation of property. At every annual licensing session, respectable men would run the risk of having a renewal refused for no earthly reason other than that a majority of one or two teetotallers chose to say—"You shall not have it." In the North of England they had had one specimen—happily, only one—of this arbitrary mode of proceeding on the part of teetotallers a short time ago. In a large town there, the so-called licensing authority took upon itself to say, by a majority of one or two, that they would not renew licences. Why did they do this? Were the houses badly conducted, or disorderly? No; the licensing authority declined to renew the licences for no earthly reason other than that a majority of them were teetotallers. The publicans applying were respectable persons, and nothing could be said against them. Of course, the matter was brought up to the Court of Quarter Sessions, where the action of the teetotallers was laughed at, and the publicans were at once given their rights. But the men were put to great expense, and none of them got off for less than £60. Of course, the hon. Baronet had never heard of this.

Sir WILFRID LAWSON: Will the hon. and learned Member give the name of the town?

Mr. WHEELHOUSE: Sunderland. The hon. Baronet knew of the case, or he ought to know of it. ["Order!"] The scheme of the hon. Baronet was cetarin to fail, both as regarded the issue and the renewal of the licences. Besides, it was far too vague, and conveyed to the House no idea of its practicability. Now, if they were to have legislation on the subject at all, let them have some practical measure brought before the House; let them have a Bill, with all the details of a Bill, and not a mere abstract Resolution. He had never objected to the Permissive Bill of the hon. Member for Carlisle because it contained details; but he objected to those details which it did contain. Legislation might be desirable—he would not discuss that; but whether desirable or not, let them have the proposals in a tangible form, so that they could reject them if they did not like them. To ask the House to commit itself to a Resolution which involved the consequences of the popular vote and the action of men chosen in the worst possible form of election, and subject to the most objectionable influences, was a course he hoped they would not adopt. He would say that had they legislated half-a-century ago on the lines drawn by Mr. Livesay, of Preston, they would long ago have had a reasonable national temperance, and they would never have had to encounter a teetotal agitation which was continued year after year, useless in itself, and the outcome of which had been to postpone all legislation on the subject. He hoped and trusted that the people were becoming more temperate; but that they would ever accept teetotalism as a doctrine and the Permissive Bill as its practical result he could never believe. The object of teetotallers and the Permissive Bill was not to secure temperance, but to abolish public-houses, breweries, distilleries, and all vested interests therein. If the House desired to see anything in the shape of temperance in the country, and if they were to promote the fair use of alcohol, which was considered necessary to the great majority of people, they would go on lines wholly and entirely different to those of teetotalism, and they would have no more of the Permissive Prohibitory Bill legislation. The hon. and learned Gentleman concluded by moving his Amendment.

SIR CHARLES LEGARD seconded the Amendment.

Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "it would be most undesirable and inopportune to change the arrangements now legislatively provided for the regulation of the trade carried on by the Licensed Victuallers of this Country, because any tribunal subject to periodical election by popular canvas and vote might, and in all probability would, lead to repeated instances of turmoil, and thus be detrimental to the peace and quietude of every neighbourhood in England,"—(*Mr Wheelhouse,*)

—instead thereof.

SIR MATTHEW WHITE RIDLEY: Sir, I must apologize for interposing for a few moments between the House and the right hon. Member for Bradford (Mr. W. E. Forster) who rose with me; but I am anxious to explain what is the attitude of the Government towards the Resolution of the hon. Baronet the Member for Carlisle. In doing this, I would first say that I think we cannot complain either of the language of the hon. Baronet in bringing forward the Resolution, or of the spirit in which he has moved it. The House is always amused by the hon. Baronet whenever he addresses it upon any question whatever; and I may add that on the present occasion he has also succeeded in interesting it. But while I have listened to the hon. Baronet with amusement and interest, I am compelled to add—if I may be permitted to say so—that I entirely fail to detect in his speech any adequate reason for the Resolution which he has brought forward. I have taken great pains in my own mind to discover, if possible, the real object which the hon. Baronet has in view. Of course, it has been said by the hon. and learned Gentleman who has just sat down that this is the Permissive Bill pure and simple. I do not myself like, however, to charge the hon. Baronet with a trick of that description. It has also been said that the real meaning of the Resolution is that it is a political move for a Party purpose; but I agree with the hon. Baronet that it is a wise principle, when dealing with an attempt at temperance legislation, for us to believe that hon. Members who bring forward measures of this kind are actuated with the best motives—namely, attempting to promote, as far as legislation can accomplish it, the cause of temperance in this country. When I come, however, to look at this particular Resolution, I am obliged to quarrel even with its premises. The hon. Baronet has laid it down that the object of licensing houses for the sale of intoxicating liquor is to supply a public want without detriment to the public welfare. I am not disposed to follow that argument to its conclusion, for it has already been dealt with by the hon. Baronet and the hon. Member for Manchester (Mr. Birley), both of whom I am of opinion are much mistaken in the view they take of it. I contend that whatever may have been the original purpose of the licensing system, it may now-a-days be defended principally on the ground that it is for the protection of public order. On this first point I am, therefore, at direct issue with the hon. Baronet. And I will go further than that, and say that it appears to me the only ground for interfering with any trade would be that it possessed special characteristics affecting public order. It appears to me that the hon. Baronet—though he would be the last one to admit it—has not quite sufficient respect, in the legislation he proposes, for the rights of individual liberty. That fact, I think, accounts for the failure of the proposals which the hon. Baronet has brought before this House from time to time, and I think that that very fault underlies and vitiates the principle of the Resolution before us this evening. I do not think we ought to subordinate the privileges of the sober man to the reformation of the drunkard Therefore, at the first start, I am at issue with the hon. Baronet. If a Bill is brought in to restrict the sale of intoxicating liquors in this country, it should only be brought in to check the excessive use of such liquors, and the only means which the law has of testing the excessive use of liquors is when there is a breach of public order. Taking the widest interpretation of public order, I cannot help thinking that the view I have laid down is the right one, and it is in strict opposition to the course pursued by the hon. Baronet the Member for Carlisle. But even if the premises of the hon. Baronet be conceded, I confess it is somewhat difficult to admit the conclusion from them that the local power of restraining the issue or the renewal of licences should be placed

> "In the hands of the persons most deeply interested and affected—namely, the inhabitants themselves—who are entitled to protection from the injurious consequences of the present system by some efficient measure of local option."

It would seem to me that the legitimate consequence of his premises, taking the interpretation which he put upon his Resolution—and which I was glad to hear him put upon it, for it is not expressed in the words of the Resolution —would be a very different mode of proceeding than that which he has adopted. I think he said that the Resolution meant that all licensing should be conducted in the interests of the public, and not in the interests of the publican. I venture to say that there is no Member of this House who will not agree that that is the true principle of licensing. But when I come to look at the Resolution of the hon. Baronet—and I venture to remind the House that it is by that we must be guided, and not by any remarks of the hon. Baronet—I may say that I think we should be committing a great error if we pledged ourselves to such an extremely abstract Resolution as that which he has proposed. I have listened with some amusement to the explanation he has given for the abstract character of his Resolution. He gave some instances of abstract Resolutions which have been accepted by this House; and he mentioned, I think, the Resolution proposed by the right hon. Gentleman opposite (Mr. Gladstone) in favour of the Disestablishment of the Irish Church, and also the Resolution brought forward by the hon. Baronet the Member for South Devon (Sir Massey Lopes), who sits upon this Bench, in favour of removing certain burdens from local taxation and placing them upon Imperial funds. I am at a loss to see any parallel between those cases and the case now before the House. I do not complain of this being in the form of a Resolution; but what I do complain of is that the Resolution is a tissue of words which practically have no meaning, and which require an explanation of the details of the proposition they are intended to cover. I am perfectly within my right when I retort upon the hon. Baronet that it is not procedure by Resolution of which we complain, but the utter vagueness and unmeaning character of the Resolution as it is worded. I was also somewhat amused by the explanation which the hon. Baronet gave of his own Resolution when he told the House, in the most simple-minded manner, that it had been intended to embrace all the measures—his own included—that have ever been proposed for the acceptance of the House upon this subject. I cannot suppose that the dignity of this House collectively, or of ourselves individually, will be promoted by assenting to a Resolution which merely says that something should be done, when it is admitted by the hon. Baronet himself that it embraces a proposal which the House has again and again, by substantial majorities, declared to be mischievous. Whatever interpretation is put upon the Resolution in this House, there is no doubt of the view that is taken of it in the country. I speak with all respect of those men, divines—ministers of religion of all denominations—who have taken up this subject; and with all respect also of those societies of men throughout the country—the Good Templars and others—who are not failing in any possible effort to force this particular solution upon us; but, at the same time, it is perfectly plain that, as with the hon. Baronet, so with his supporters out-of-doors, those who support the Motion are the advocates of the Permissive Bill. I do not complain of them for that; but I think I am within my right in asking them when they support an abstract Resolution like this, what that Resolution means besides that which they themselves admit it to mean. It is not fair to the House to put hon. Members in a position of not knowing in the least to what they will be committed if they support the Resolution of the hon. Baronet. "Local option" is a very convenient phrase; and from the rumours one hears in the Lobbies, I have not the slightest doubt that a certain number of hon. Members will be led to support the Resolution of the hon. Baronet, because, as in the early days of the Permissive Bill, they fancy they are only voting that something ought to be done to promote the cause of temperance. That is not the way in which a Resolution ought to be voted for in this House; and such a vote does not show a proper appreciation of the responsibility which we undertake when we come here to represent the views of our constituencies. I have endeavoured, as far as I could, to consider the various meanings that have been attached to local option, and the different propositions that have been made on the subject. There is, first of all, the Bill of the hon. Member for Newcastle (Mr. J. Cowen) for the establishment of Licensing Boards; but I think that is not a description of local option that is likely to find favour in this House. It means direct popular election, and it is open to all the objections that have been urged by my hon. and learned Friend the Member for Leeds (Mr. Wheelhouse). Considering what kind of tribunal the licensing authority must be, I cannot think the House would approve of making it a Board not judicial, not even representative, but consisting merely of delegates of the majority for the time being. Nor can I see that it would be possible to give a preliminary veto to the Board of Guardians. I cannot see how such a mode of proceeding could do other than diminish the proper influence that the Guardians ought to exercise in the administration of the Poor Law; nor can I conceive anything more likely to vitiate and demoralize the elections that now take place than the introduction of such a disturbing element. And when you come to consider how you want to make known the views of the ratepayers as to the issue or renewal of licences, I think it is extremely difficult to see how that is to be provided for without giving a majority the absolute power of choosing the licensing authority. And if you do that, you introduce even a worse principle than that of the Permissive Bill; for under the operation of the Permissive Bill a majority of two-thirds of the inhabitants of a locality would be required before action could be taken; whereas, in this case, the vote of a majority would be conclusive. What would then take place? It must, of necessity, follow that the minority defeated on one occasion would strain every nerve during the next two or three years to become the majority; and the result to the neighbourhood would, I should imagine, be far from favourable to the interests of temperance. And when would it come into operation? Just when it is least needed. When you have a majority of the ratepayers inclined to license any number of public-houses and not disposed in any way to restrict drinking, that is the very locality where restriction is most needed; yet by the operation of such a proposal as this all the public-houses now complained of would remain and new licences would be granted. Such a proposal, therefore, would be altogether illusory. If the Resolution is perfectly plain, it is rather curious to see so many Amendments upon it; but, indeed, when one comes to look through them, it is rather a matter of surprise that there are not more, because many other schemes of local option have been suggested. The hon. Baronet the Member for East Devon (Sir John Kennaway), as I read his Amendment, seems to point to a representation of the ratepayers associated with the magistrates for the purpose of determining upon the issue or renewal of all licences to sell intoxicating liquor within the area of their jurisdiction. I would only say that if it is a direct representation of the ratepayers that is intended, the proposal is, to my mind, open to the same objection as Licensing Boards. It is open to some extent to the objection I have urged to bringing a new element into the elections to County Boards, and I am afraid, as a consequential act, to the Town Councils also. I believe I am correct in saying that throughout the country where most complaint exists is not so much in the counties as in the boroughs. Therefore, if the proposal were carried that representatives of the ratepayers should sit with the magistrates as the licensing authority, and if it should be thought wise to give the licensing power to the County Boards, it would be difficult to resist giving it to Town Councils. I am not sure that that would be a satisfactory mode of proceeding. I am afraid that all these propositions of local option, so far as I have been able to understand them, altogether violate what appears to me to be the first principles of a licensing authority, if we are to have a licensing authority. And I think we cannot now begin to set up an ideal as to what ought to be done with the liquor traffic. We must remember that we have had several years of licensing; many Acts of Parliament have been passed on the subject; many vested interests have been created; and we have many habits of the people to respect and watch over. It appears to me that the licensing authority ought, in the first instance, to be judicial, and, in fact, it is very little more than judicial. If you have a representative body elected *ad hoc* it is not judicial, and even if it were not elected *ad hoc*, a strong feeling would be brought into the elections, and an element introduced which I think you would desire to keep out. But setting that aside, I think the licensing authority ought to be stable and consistent. What can be expected for the benefit of a neighbourhood, if the authority is liable to be disturbed even from one period of three years to another? If it is true that a licensing body should be judicial, it is equally true that it should be consistent. But I go further, and I say that it should be entirely acceptable to public opinion—it should be thoroughly conversant with all the wants of the neighbourhood, and bound to take into consideration the wants and necessities in that neighbourhood. There are other Amendments on the Paper, and amongst them that of the hon. and learned Member for Dewsbury (Mr. Serjeant Simon), which is to the effect—

> "That, in the opinion of this House, among the conditions prescribed by law for the granting of new licences for the Sale of Intoxicating Liquors, it should be expressly provided that the licensing authority shall take into consideration the population and the number of existing licences in the district, and shall find as a fact, upon sworn evidence, that new licences are required for the necessary convenience of the public."

I do not think it would be convenient, even if there were an opportunity of putting the Amendment to the House, to accept absolutely these words; but as far as regards the principle they are thoroughly sound. As is well known to Members who take an interest in the question, it is practically done now. In most of the districts throughout the country no new licences are given without the strongest evidence. But if there should be any bench of magistrates who so far neglect their duty as to grant new licences where the necessity is not sufficiently proved, it is but reasonable and fair that they should be obliged to find as a fact, not perhaps that new licences are absolutely required for the convenience of the public, but that they are not in excess of the requirements of the neighbourhood in which they are situated. The consent of the owners of neighbouring property might also be a material consideration. There is another Amendment, to much the same effect, by the hon. and learned Member for Cambridgeshire (Mr. Rodwell). The action of the magistrates since the passing of the Act of 1874 has practically been to diminish, to a considerable extent, the number of licences; but the effect of that Act has also notoriously been to increase the number of what are called "off" licences throughout the country. I do mean to say that the Government are in favour of doing that which the magistrates ask for in many parts of the country—namely, giving them the discretion over new licences which they have over others. I am aware that there are two sides to the question. The argument against the principle urged by hon. Gentlemen opposite is that by such a course you would be practically erecting another monopoly. But, however that may be, it is notorious to everybody that there is a great deal of abuse arising from these "off" licences. I am not setting up one set of licences against the other; but if there is blame you must not throw it entirely upon the licensed victuallers, but you must throw it, to some extent, on those "off" licences. I hold in my hand an advertisement issued by a firm of grocers offering to give away 10 barrels of the best ale to their customers. The circular gives the name of the firm and the price of their groceries, and then it goes on to say that a person buying half-a-crown's worth of goods will receive a gill of the best ale, and each person buying 5*s*.

worth, will receive a pint. It might as well have been spirits, and the attention of the Government, I think, certainly ought to be directed towards putting fresh regulations on a trade of this kind. It has been represented that there is some utility in the system, and that if properly regulated it ought not to be interfered with; but I do say that, whether you are to proceed in the direction of more police supervision, or more magisterial discretion, or of a higher rental qualification, some further regulation must be made for this trade, if we are to act up to our professions of anxiety to do what legislation can do to promote the cause of temperance. I think I have communicated to the House very shortly the position which the Government wish to occupy upon this question. It is impossible for us to accept the Resolution of the hon. Baronet. Unexplained, as it is, it is certainly vague. As far as it is understood it would be highly mischievous and objectionable, and I cannot conceive it possible for the House to commit itself to it. Neither am I prepared to endorse the Amendment of my hon. and learned Friend behind me. That is an absolute *non possumus*. I cannot think that the House would wish to commit itself to the admission that nothing ought to be done to improve the licensing system of their country. That is not the view of the Government; and it is certainly not the view I would venture for a moment to urge upon the House. There are other Amendments on the Paper which practically say that this House will not consider the question until the Committee of the House of Lords, who have taken a great deal of evidence on the subject of intemperance, has reported. I am not going to urge that that is a reason why the House should at present decline to do anything with reference to this subject. It seems to me that the House is in possession of a considerable body of evidence; and that it is perfectly fair for any hon. Member to propose a Bill or a Resolution supported by evidence. But it is plain that no one can blame this or any Government for not bringing forward legislation while they are waiting for the Report of a Committee of such importance as that which has been sitting in the other House for two or three years, and which has collected a great mass of evidence on the question. I will only say, in conclusion, that the Government are prepared to resist the Resolution of the hon. Baronet and the Amendment of my hon. and learned Friend.

MR. W. E. FORSTER: The hon. Baronet who has just sat down, and of whom I may be allowed to say we must all feel sorry he does not speak oftener, has stated that the hon. Baronet the Member for Carlisle is really bringing forward the Permissive Bill again. I am one of those who have always been opposed to the Permissive Bill. I have never voted for it. I have voted twice in this Parliament against it, and yet I support this Resolution. I think the hon. Baronet has a perfect right to ask me on what grounds I do so. I am very well aware that this is a question on which many Members wish to speak, and that the House wishes to hear them, so that I shall not detain you more than a very few moments. I hope that the accident of my speaking from the front Opposition Bench will not be supposed to commit anybody but myself. This is a very important question—the question as to how far laws can stop drunkenness. It is not a question to be solved on Party lines. No successful treatment of the subject can be hoped for except by the action of a Government strong and united; but what we are now doing is debating the principle on which we think a measure ought to be framed. That seems to me to be eminently one of those questions on which every Member of this House, irrespective of Party allegiance, can form his own opinion. It has always seemed to me that the Bill of the hon. Baronet the Member for Carlisle contained two principles—one, the principle of absolute prohibition of the sale of intoxicating liquor, in which I do not agree with him; and the other, the principle of giving power to the inhabitants over the sale, in which I do agree. I will not detain the House at any length with my reasons for not agreeing to the principle of absolute prohibition. They are simply three, and I can state them in three sentences. First, I do not think it would be just to make a general law to prevent the innocent use of an article because some have abused it. Next, I think it would be still less just to intrust such a power to a local majority. I think also that the power given to a local majority merely to choose between enforcing or withdrawing this prohibition would not be a practical remedy for the evil. Now, I come to the other principle involved, of giving power to the inhabitants of a district to control the number of public-houses, and that is a principle which I have always been in favour of. I am in favour of giving them power to restrict the number, but not altogether to prohibit public-houses. I rely upon the knowledge of the ratepayers and their representatives; and I think this is one of the matters in which their wishes ought to be consulted. I do not want to attack the magistrates as a licensing body. I believe that they have almost always meant well, and in very many cases they have acted well. I think that the hon. Baronet, in vindicating their authority, or rather in stating that any fresh body would be open to fresh charges, thereby implying that they were free from them, gave one description of them which will not apply throughout the country—namely, that they are consistent. But I am sure that if there was any new licensing authority to be created, many of the magistrates both ought to be and would be members of that body. I believe, however, that men, whether magistrates or not, elected by the ratepayers for this purpose, would be more likely to know the wants and wishes and needs of a district, and they would be more likely to know the evils of drunkenness in that district, and the best way of checking it. I think also this is one of the matters on which the wish of the inhabitants ought to be consulted. If the inhabitants of a town or village wish that their streets should not be crowded with public-houses, I think that wish, under certain limits which I will describe, ought to be satisfied. But I would guard against an unreasonable wish. If this Resolution should pass within a year or two—and I suppose the hon. Baronet is hardly sanguine enough to expect that it will pass to-night, though I dare say he will have a good following—we shall probably have a Bill founded upon it; and that Bill, I think, ought to contain a provision for preventing the representation of the ratepayers from diminishing the number of public-houses below a certain limit. It should also reserve a certain power, independent of the local authority, to take care that there is no increase beyond a certain maximum. I do not believe that either of these two limitations will be often wanted. I do not imagine that many of the local authorities throughout the country—indeed, I think there will be very few, and that these will be the most exceptional cases—would attempt to absolutely stop public-houses; I believe that in many cases they would be in favour of their restriction; but I do think we ought to guard against unwise excess on the part of local authorities, either in the direction of teetotalism or tippling. Looking carefully at the words of this Resolution, I find that it embodies the principle of local self-control, from which I have most hope; and that it admits of the limitations which I think necessary; and therefore I cannot refrain from supporting it. Let me say one word as to one or two of the objections that have been started to-night, and which, I dare say, will be started elsewhere. The first objection is that which has been raised by the Amendment; it is the objection that there will be yearly or periodical tumult in consequence of there being a periodical discussion with regard to licences. It is quite true that there would be some disadvantages in that; but I think that the advantages would far outweigh the inconvenience. There are disadvantages connected with all representative action; but, upon the whole, we find it best to abide by the representative principle, both in local and in national matters. For my part, I believe that in the end there would be an overwhelming majority in favour of making it the duty of the best men, and of the wisest men, and of the most reasonable men in each district, to consider what it would be best to do to guard against the great evil arising from the excessive use of intoxicating drink. I believe that, independently of this, great indirect good would come from attracting such men to the administration of local affairs. I now come to another, and a strong objection, that has been urged against one word in this Resolution, and that is the word "renewal." It is undoubtedly true that the Resolution not only looks to a new authority, but it looks also to a new power being given to that authority. It appears that hitherto the magistrates have acted on the principle of never refusing the renewal of a licence except for bad conduct. I do not think it too much to say that my hon. Friend (Sir Wilfrid Lawson) looks forward to a considerable diminution of renewals solely on the ground of numbers; and here I think the hon. Baronet (Sir Matthew White Ridley) is a little inconsistent. He said the licensing authority was constituted merely for the purpose of keeping public order; but then he stated that new licences ought to be considered in relation to the wants of the district. Now, I do not think that these two duties, if given to the licensing authority, would exactly agree. However, keeping to the question of renewals, I think there can be no doubt that any Bill which may be framed on the principle of this Resolution must have a power as to the granting of renewals. I do not imagine that it would be very often that the renewal would be refused. Population increases, and public-houses, from various causes, disappear year by year; but I think the power ought to be given, and in some cases used. Can anyone say that decent people, fathers of respectable families, should be compelled to leave their houses, because the streets they live in are crammed full of ginshops and beerhouses? This, of course, brings us to the question of vested interests and the rights of property, and involves the very difficult question of compensation, respecting which I will only say that the Resolution does not in any way determine that question. Whenever we have a Bill dealing with this subject we shall have to discuss that point; but when we consider the rights of property I would ask, is it not notorious that a public-house injures the property in the neighbourhood? There is another objection against the Amendment, and that is that we ought to leave things as they are. I need not dwell on this, because the Home Secretary has admitted that things ought not to be left as they are, and it is not for me to insist on what almost every man in this House admits to—namely, that we cannot allow these two things to go on—this terrible drunkenness from which a large portion of the population is now suffering, and the acknowledgment of want of power on our part to apply any remedy. Now, there is one objection to the Resolution with which I have not dealt, and that is as to its Mover. Not that there is any personal objection to my hon. Friend. No one is more popular in the House. We all feel grateful to him for his wit and humour; and I hope he does not suppose that we can entertain any personal feeling, either as to what we hear from him, or what we may have heard from him. But, going from the hon. Baronet to his Resolution, I have heard it said that, "no matter what interpretation you put upon it, if you pass this Resolution you restrain a man, and restraint means prohibition." I do not think that if you restrain a man you destroy him. "But," it is said, "the hon. Baronet the Member for Carlisle means prohibition;" and the public outside will therefore think that this House also means prohibition, should it pass this Resolution. Well, I think I may say this is giving too much power to the hon. Member for Carlisle. Look at the words of the Resolution—they are in the possession of the House. I think my hon. Friend (Sir Wilfrid Lawson) has made a most candid and clear speech, and he admitted that we shall not by passing the Resolution be bound to the principle of prohibition. But I will go further than this. For my part, I wish to say I am glad to be able to vote with my hon. Friend. I have often disagreed with him, and with many of his supporters, on this matter on other occasions, and I have thought their action has been, to some extent, one-sided; perhaps in some cases intolerable in expression, and open to the charge of being fanatical in purpose. I have stated that I cannot approve of the Bill he has previously brought forward, because I think it would, if carried, be a needless and unwise interference with the liberty of the subject; and I do not altogether like the way—although it is relieved by his exceeding good humour—in which my hon. Friend has sometimes talked of the publicans, many of whom are carrying on their trade under the most difficult circumstances, and are very respectable men; but we cannot forget that my hon. Friend and those who act with him are devoting their lives to an attempt to relieve this country from its greatest danger, and to remedy its greatest evil. I am therefore glad that in bringing forward this Resolution my hon. Friend has taken a course I am able to support. I have only one other objection to refer to, and that is the objection which is urged against dealing with this question by an abstract Resolution. I must confess that very often there is much to be said against abstract Resolutions; but in this case I think it is desirable, before we debate a Bill upon the subject, we should first settle the principle on which it should be based. My hon. Friend has asked us to say "Aye" or "No" to this question—whether a new principle should be acknowledged in dealing with the sale of intoxicating drinks. This new principle is that of local representative control. It seems to me that that is a question that can be discussed very fairly in the form of a Resolution. Let me further say that in voting for this Resolution I simply vote for that principle, and for that principle alone. I consider that those of us who vote for it hold ourselves perfectly free from any pledge either as to the form of the tribunal—it might not be a tribunal —as to the form or manner of the representation, or the mode in which the views of the inhabitants of a district will be ascertained. It will admit of the carrying out of the proposal of the hon. Member for Newcastle (Mr. J. Cowen), or it will admit of the proposition contained in the first Bill of the late Government. And my hon. Friend must allow me to say that, even in voting for this Resolution, I shall consider that I shall be in no wise acting inconsistently if I take the same course hereafter in opposing the Bill he has so often brought forward that I have hitherto adopted. I have only one point more. I am not so certain as my hon. Friend, or at any rate as some of his supporters, as to the power of the law to stop drunkenness. I do not deny that the law has some power. There must be drink laws. They may be good laws or bad laws. It is our business to pass laws to regulate this traffic, and those laws may increase or may diminish the temptations to drink. It is quite true that this serious national evil is the besetting sin of this country. It is not easy for us sitting here to deal with sins; but, after all, we have imposed on us the responsibility of making the necessary laws with regard to the drink traffic in such a way as shall not increase its temptations. I need not say more to impress on the House my conviction of the great responsibility resting upon us in this respect. I can only say that I look forward with the greatest hope to enabling the best and most reasonable men of a district to deal with this matter.

MR. MARK STEWART: I am sure, Sir, the House has listened with much pleasure to the clear and able speech of the hon. Baronet the Member for Carlisle (Sir Wilfrid Lawson), and I may also add that the senior Member for Manchester (Mr. Birley) has spoken with an earnestness that must have carried great weight among many of those who have listened to it. The House has also had from the two front Benches speeches that are calculated to do much good in enabling it to deal with this difficult question. The question before the House is, to my mind, one of the most important that could be brought under the discussion of this Assembly; and although I have sat in this House during what may practically be called the whole of the present Parliament, I have not hitherto ventured to say one word either in defence of, or against the principle on which this Resolution is founded. When this question comes up in a more practical form, I hope I shall be able to give a cordial support to the measure which may be brought forward. This question is important, not only to this nation, but also to the world at large. It is exceedingly important to us as a commercial nation, especially when we see the statements that are made in almost every statistical work we can take up, the effect being to prove that by far too much of the hard-earned gains of the working classes are spent in drink. When you have before you such a drink bill as my hon. Friend the Member for Carlisle has mentioned to-night—a bill amounting to £142,000,000, the greater part of which is paid by the working classes—I think it is time for those who reflect on these questions to hold up their hands and ask what is coming next. If you take the three years prior to and including 1860, and then the three years prior to and including 1877, you will find that the sum of money spent in intoxicating drinks for the last-named three years amounted to the enormous excess of £165,000,000 over the same period ending with 1860. We find, also, that if we turn to another article of commerce forming one of the great staple industries of the country—I allude to cotton—and get at the sum spent on the raw material and the consumed goods in this country, the total value of our cotton goods last year was £10,000,000, whereas we have heard that £142,000,000 was spent in drink. Again, take another view of the raw product, and you will find that whereas 503,000,000 lbs. were consumed in the three years ending 1860, only 395,000,000 lbs. were consumed in the three years ending 1877, showing a decrease of 108,000,000 lbs. Thus the value of cotton goods consumed in the United Kingdom, as compared with the amount of money spent in drink, was 14 times as great in favour of the drink as against the cotton. I think every man who is interested in this question must view it with deep concern. It is all very well to say, "Do nothing;" but I say that when we see the enormous amount of social degradation, misery, and suffering produced among us by the use of intoxicating drinks, we cannot afford to stand still much longer, and it is time that this House should take some action in the matter. It was only yesterday that we heard some stirring words from the highest Law Officer of the Crown (Earl Cairns), who stated that

> "There is not at the present day any question, in my opinion, which so deeply touches the moral, physical, and the religious welfare of the world as the question of temperance. It occupies the attention of moralists, statesmen, and divines."

But he goes on to say—

> "I have myself but very little hope of making men sober by Act of Parliament."

But not only is this question important in regard to trade and commerce, it has also an important bearing on our criminal statistics. We know that something like 84 per cent of the crime of the country is traceable to drink; at least, this is the calculation that has been made by different parties who have gone into the matter. When it is known that our jails and workhouses trace so many of their candidates to this traffic, can we wonder if philanthropic men take up the subject warmly, and demand some change in these laws of ours, in the hope that such change may produce a beneficial effect? From the time of Sir Matthew Hale down to the last utterances of Mr. Justice Lush, all the high dignitaries of the country have confirmed what I am now saying with regard to the great difficulty attending any mode of dealing with this question. These difficulties confront us at every turn. We have had no less than some 400 Acts of Parliament dealing with this subject. We have had proposals for free trade in drink, and, on the other hand, we have had attempts at total prohibition, of which latter I am a sincere opponent. We have had proposals for restricting the hours of sale, and we have adopted restrictions on the hours; but we have taken them off again, and yet all our action has ended in a miserable failure. We have had the number of houses reduced; have had licences taken away and licences given. We have heard of protection, and we have heard of vested interests almost all in the same day, as questions of give and take. Almost every Session of this Parliament we have had eight or nine Bills tabled on this subject, and as many Bills have every Session been rejected. We have had Bills dealing with Sunday closing, we have had Bills relating to the hours on Monday, and we have had a Bill for Licensing Boards; and none of them have given satisfaction. Then we have had the Bill of the total abstainers; and, lastly, that panacea for all evils, the Permissive Bill. I never have voted for that Bill, and, as far as I know, I never shall. I think it a measure fraught with great difficulty and great unfairness, not only to the liberty of the subject, but to the liberty of the particular class against which the proposed legislation would be directed. There is one thing that is peculiar about this Permissive Bill, and I will here quote the words which I have taken from the Report about to be issued by the Committee of the House of Lords, which has been considering the subject of intemperance. It is there said—

> "It is safe to say that the great bulk of more than 200 Members who at one time or another have voted for the Bill have done so in response to the declared opinions and wishes of a large portion of their constituents, rather than from, at the first, any eager zeal or earnest convictions of their own as to the social and political expediency of the measure."

It could not be carried out in the large towns throughout the country, where it might be wanted, with any degree of certainty; and in the small towns and country districts it would not be much wanted, and, if adopted, it would either utterly fail as a piece of legislation, or would only end in producing the worst results. Then, again, it is not only unjust that four persons shall control three, a provision that would not only cause much irritation among the population, but it would also, in my opinion, entail an immense amount of drinking in private houses which does not now take place—not to speak of the turmoil that would be created and the amount of local prejudice against the landlords, publicans, and others, which would be stirred up in every direction. So that, as we all know in the local contests that would take place, the real merits of the question would be lost sight of through the introduction of abstract questions having nothing to do with the real point at issue. There is one other point in connection with the Permissive Bill to which I should like to allude, and it is this—we are told that the principle of that measure has been in operation in America and in the Dominion of Canada. Now, it cannot be forgotten that in those countries the climate essentially differs from ours, nor that the law is perpetually being broken in the States of America where it was enacted. I have had personal experience of this in visiting America, and living in the State of Maine, where I found that anyone could go into almost any shop he chose and ask for a certain liquor, calling it either by its proper and orthodox name, or by a name by which it was known, and he would be sure to get it. Now and then, it is true, there is a re-action, and what happens? The old law is re-enacted, and, after a time, it is again broken. Thus the matter goes on without doing any good, and without affording the slightest proof that that panacea is a real panacea for the evil aimed at. As I have said, we cannot forget that the climate there is very different from that of England; that instead of the cold, muggy, damp weather we have so much of here, the air is brisk and bracing, and the people do not require that stimulant which is required here. With regard to the remedies that have been proposed for the difficulty, we have already touched on that which is supposed to underlie this Resolution, which I do not regard in the same way as many hon. Members. I read the Resolution as the right hon. Gentleman who has just sat down (Mr. W. E. Forster) reads it—namely, that it is to give a local option to the inhabitants if they chose to intrust their interests to the representatives who sit on the bench, and to those who advise and guide the magistrates. In that event, I think it would be a good means of arriving at the truth of the case; but if you give the whole exclusive power into the hands of the inhabitants, you could not do a worse thing in the interests of temperance, because, while there would be a number of people who would adopt the side which this Resolution advocates, there would be a large number, on the other hand, who would give their interest to the public-houses, and that interest would certainly not be of a temperate nature. But there is no doubt that many of us look to other sources and other means for reducing the present excessive use of intoxicating drinks as likely to be more effectual than legislation. There can be no doubt that education is one of those corrective means. I may be answered by hon. Members, who will say that education has been tried for a long time and has failed. At the same time, there are some remarkable statistics on the subject, and I will trouble the House only with one sample. I quote from the evidence given by the Chief Constable of Chester, before the Committee of the House of Lords on the 17th April, 1877. He there gives the number of persons arrested in Liverpool for drunkenness, and states the number of those who were convicted and committed who were unable to read and write at all to have been 25·1 per cent; those who could read, but not write, made 11·3 per cent; those who could do both imperfectly were 51·2 per cent; while the proportion of those who could read and write was only 1·3; therefore, the House will see that of those who were convicted of drunkenness, 97 out of 100 could not read or write perfectly, and only 1·3 could do both well. Then I would point out that we have now a free Press. We have the platform, and we have the pulpit, and their efforts may, perhaps, be more useful than legislation in inducing the working men and others—for it is not alone the working men—to refrain from visiting the public-houses. These are some of the means; but others have been mentioned to-night, such as depriving the Excise of its present control over the granting of licences to grocers, and over the granting of wine and beer licences, and placing all these more directly under the control of the magistrates or those who assist them in their decisions. I would take another illustration from the Australian Colonies. I think it would be a great thing if the character of the houses could be improved. In this country the law requires that a public-house in a town should have four bed-rooms and two sitting-rooms; but in Australia there must be six bed-rooms and a front room. I would suggest that publicans should be required to pay an *ad valorem* duty in proportion to the worth of the premises. Supposing a public-house to be valued at £1,000, it should pay 5 per cent, or £50 per annum, instead of the 13 guineas now paid, as well by the house valued at £50 as by that which is valued at £1,500. All this takes us back to the starting point—how are you to ascertain the real wants of a district? Had they a right to a seat on the county bench, or any bench constituted for licensing purposes, then I conceive their opinions would be far more fully developed than at present. I quite agree with the right hon. Member for Bradford that in any Bill there must be a maximum and a minimum of houses. I would not go the length of total prohibition, because I do not believe that is possible. One more point, and that is, to reduce the number of public-houses. If what I have suggested were carried into effect, the result would be that inferior and worthless houses would be diminished in number, and you would thus get really good men for those which would remain. At present there are a number of small houses not worthy of the name. In some houses that I can refer to, there is upstairs a suite of apartments let off to lodgers. Other shops, again, had long back passages running into a back alley, conterminous with a number of back-doors of houses, where a regular Sunday trade goes on all day. Should there not be an inspector to look after public-houses of this character? If an inspector was appointed to go about, not in an inquisitorial manner, but rather to learn whether those houses were acting up to their requirements, an enormous amount of drinking would be stopped. You would thus get a better class of houses, and a better class of men to manage them. Again, with regard to racecourses, it is very well known that the drink sold at these places is greatly adulterated, and I myself have known it, when unsold, to be thrown away. It is a great point to get respectable men to carry on this trade. In conclusion, this can hardly be said to be a Party question. The Tories have demoralized by their Beer Act; the Liberals by their grocers' licences. We are much obliged —I speak for myself—to the hon. Baronet for bringing this Resolution forward. He has placed his object so candidly before the House that I shall feel more constrained to vote for it than for the Permissive Bill. Like the right hon. Member for Bradford, I shall go into the same Lobby as the hon. Baronet to-night, and I think I shall, by that act, be doing the best I can for my own locality. I would far prefer a representative system, such as that involved in the Resolution, to a system in which I have little confidence, such as that contained in the Permissive Bill. I feel that if the House accept this Resolution much good will be done, and that this debate will, therefore, not have been in vain.

MR. M'LAGAN: Sir, some years ago I voted for the second reading of the Permissive Bill, because, although not approving of the clauses, I agreed with the principle of the measure, and my vote was a protest against the regulations for the granting of licences. Since then, however, I have not voted for the Bill of the hon. Baronet. The Resolution now introduced by the hon. Baronet contains the principle of the Bill, while it is entirely free from those objectionable details which would inevitably lead to turmoil and cause expense. The question, I maintain, is whether the ratepayers ought to have a voice in the granting of licences? I contend that they ought, and for various reasons. For what are the rates expended? Why, on the relief of pauperism, the punishment of vice, and the healing of disease. Now, in all the Returns that have been made, it has been proved that pauperism, crime, and those diseases which are commonly tested by the rates are caused chiefly by drunkenness, which is in itself mainly due to the number of public-houses. From statistics furnished by constables at Glasgow and other places, it has been indisputably shown that in proportion to the number of public-houses was the amount of drunkenness. Not long ago a most interesting inquiry was conducted by a Committee which sat on the Poor Laws of Scotland, and the evidence of all the witnesses was to show that the pauperism of the country was due very much, if not entirely, to drunkenness and the large number of public-houses. In every one of the places from which Returns had been received, it was clearly shown that nineteen-twentieths of the crimes committed were directly traceable to drunkenness, while every assault originated in its influence. The same Returns also revealed the fact that from 75 to 90 per cent of the criminal population were the victims of intemperance. I have read some extracts from the Returns of the superintendents of police, and one of the questions which they were asked to answer was this—"What proportion of those who have come under your cognizance as criminals have been the victims of drinking habits and associates?" The answer varied from 75 to 90 per cent victims of intemperance, and the lowest was 41 per cent; but the proportion generally was from 75 to 80 per cent. Some years ago, Mr. Hume in this House moved for an inquiry into the character of all the prisoners in gaol. An inquiry was made in the case of all the prisoners in the gaol of Edinburgh. There were 569 prisoners present, and they were all asked—"What do you think would be the effect of reducing the number of public-houses?" 504 of them answered spontaneously that they would prefer to have no public-houses at all, and there was a unanimous feeling that a reduction would be a benefit. I will not multiply instances to show the effect of drinking upon crime; but I think I have stated sufficient to prove my point. I come now to speak very shortly of the effect of drinking on disease. A medical gentleman connected with one of the hospitals of London was before the Committee of this House which I have already referred to, and he was asked to tell the Committee what proportion of the patients in that hospital suffered under diseases caused by drink. He was not prepared to state exactly; but he thought about 50 per cent of the cases were caused by intemperance. Such a large figure as that was doubted at the time by many of the Members of the Committee; and this medical gentleman, therefore, determined on returning to his post to make an investigation, and he kept a return of all the patients who came into the hospital, and instead of finding that the amount was 50 per cent, he found that from 70 to 80 per cent of the cases arose from intemperance. Now, Sir, if I have proved to the satisfaction of the House that the rates of ratepayers are spent in relieving pauperism and dealing with crime, I think it is only an act of justice that if the ratepayers are allowed to elect their Guardians in this country, or in Scotland the members of the Parochial Board, they should be allowed to have some voice in preventing the crime, pauperism, and disease; and the only way in which that can be done is to stop the cause of it—to stop the drinking, and to reduce the number of public-houses. But there is another point which has not been touched upon, so far as I am aware, in the course of this discussion; but it is a most important point for the owners of property and the ratepayers—and that is the depreciation in the property of a district which arises from the establishment of public-houses. I know of an instance myself, where a man retired from business, and built himself a little cottage, where he thought he could spend the last days of his life; but being afterwards obliged to go and live some distance away, he let the house, and got sufficient money from the rent to pay a proper interest on the capital he had invested in the building. But shortly afterwards another house was erected near the cottage, and a licence was got for it, whereupon this tenant left, and he never could get a tenant afterwards until he got a licence for the cottage also. We see from this, not only that property is depreciated in value for residential purposes, but in this case the owner was compelled to convert his cottage into a public-house before he could let it, and thus to become an agent in the spread of drinking against his will. Surely the ratepayer or inhabitant who is so much injured by drink should have a voice in preventing the erection of public-houses which depreciate the value of his property. These are the reasons which I have for voting for this Resolution; but I would guard myself generally against being supposed to support the Permissive Bill. I have strong reasons for not supporting that measure; but I am quite prepared to support any measure which is founded on giving the ratepayers a voice in the number of houses which may be licensed. It was mentioned to me the other day that there had been a village built not far from a manufacturing town, and containing possibly about 1,000 inhabitants, and that those people set their faces against the erection of a public-house. But a brewer in the neighbouring town tried to get a licence, but for a long time without success, though he tried again and again. At last he succeeded in getting a licence transferred from one of the houses in the town to one in the village. Now, that was an extreme case of injustice and hardship to those working men, who wanted to be away from mischief of that kind, but who were obliged to have a public-house whether they liked it or no, as it was forced upon them. That is the case also in towns—in large towns. I speak more particularly of the case of Edinburgh, as we have considerable evidence upon that point. Mr. Lewis, a magistrate who appeared before the Committee which I have already alluded to, stated that in the better part of Edinburgh the inhabitants went against the public-houses, and said—"We won't have liquor shops;" and they have an influence and power which the magistrates dare not resist. But the poor and working classes are divested of all influence and power, and, in fact, they have got into that desponding condition that they do not resist. For these reasons, I have much pleasure in supporting the Resolution of the hon. Baronet the Member for Carlisle. Again, I would guard myself from being supposed to give any support to the Permissive Bill; but I certainly will support any measure that will give the ratepayers a voice in the regulation and granting of licences, not by popular vote, but by representation.

EARL PERCY, who had an Amendment on the Paper—

> "That, while it is desirable that some provision should be made for the expression of local public opinion with regard to the licensing question, this House declines to consider the details of any proposal having this object in view until the Select Committee of the House of Lords on Intemperance shall have issued their final Report;"

said, he could not support the Resolution of the hon. Baronet the Member for Carlisle (Sir Wilfrid Lawson), although he gave him credit for his *bonâ fide* intention not to identify it in detail with the Permissive Bill. It appeared to him that the mistake of those who had the cause of temperance at heart was the extreme character of their proposals. An instance of that had been shown in the measures which had been introduced into that House for the custody of habitual drunkards. The late Mr. Dalrymple had in the last Parliament introduced a Bill of so sweeping a character that most hon. Members had voted against it. He (Earl Percy) was one of those who voted against it, and when a similar Bill was introduced by the hon. Member for Glasgow (Dr. Cameron) last year, it also contained provisions of so sweeping a character that it certainly would never have passed the House if the hon. Member had not seen the propriety of excluding a great number of his proposals, and turning his Bill into one of a tentative character and of much smaller scope than the original measure. Unfortunately, he could not assent either to the Resolution under discussion, or to any of the Amendments except his own. The hon. Baronet brought forward an abstract Resolution, and they were obliged to vote for or against it. He was unable to do either without the risk of being misunderstood, and therefore he had given Notice of an Amendment expressing what he was prepared to vote for. The Resolution of the hon. Baronet the Member for Carlisle contained one word which it was very inconvenient to introduce; that was "inasmuch." It was unwise to give reasons for the conclusions at which the House arrived. Those who had supported the Resolution had given half-a-dozen reasons for doing so, and they differed from those given by the hon. Baronet himself. He wished to know what was meant by "a legal power of restraining the issue or renewal of licences." He thought at first it meant absolute control; but the Church of England Temperance Association had issued a document showing that they did not regard it in that light; they remarked that the Resolution did not say whether the control should be absolute or conditional, whether it should be by direct vote or through representative bodies; and these observations only showed the extreme vagueness of the terms of the Resolution. How was there to be restraint without controlling power? He did not see how restraint could be exercised without the possibility of its being exercised to the extent contemplated in the Permissive Bill. The Resolution spoke of the inhabitants, and the Bill of ratepayers; and if the House accepted the Resolution it would in this respect be committed to what no hon. Member could intend to vote for. There was no "local option" in the licensing laws of either Scotland or Ireland in the sense in which the term was used in the Resolution. It was not surprising that many hon. Members should identify this Resolution with the Permissive Bill, because the Report of the Committee of Convocation showed that this Resolution was mainly supported by those who also advocated the Permissive Bill. He could not accept any Amendment which declared that it was unnecessary in any way to modify our licensing laws. The Amendment of the hon. Baronet the Member for East Devon (Sir John Kennaway) began with an "inasmuch," and declared that the inhabitants were most interested and were well qualified to judge. It was a dangerous thing to give reasons for the decisions of the House, and especially to give reasons which went further than the object they had in view; and he did not see any reason for committing themselves to such opinions as these. The question was, whether the House was or was not of opinion that some means should be provided for the expression of local public opinion on this question; but the various details raised by the different Amendments might, he thought, be very well left until they had before them the Report of the Select Committee of the House of Lords. He hoped for a satisfactory solution of the question from that body; but in the meantime he thought they had sufficient evidence before them, without waiting for that Report, to enable them to decide whether it was desirable or not that some local option should be given. Local option having already been given in many other matters, and a measure for county government being in the immediate future, he thought it was impossible to deny that it was desirable to give some expression to the voice of the ratepayers on the licensing question. His own belief was that it had better be given to selected persons than to the mass of the inhabitants.

Dr. KENEALY: Mr. Speaker, I regard it as extremely fortunate for those hon. Members who have placed Notices of Amendment on the Paper that they should possess so valuable a guide, philosopher, and friend, as they evidently have, in the noble Lord (Earl Percy) who has just addressed the House. That noble Lord criticized these Amendments in detail, and was pleased to instruct their authors how such documents should be framed in future. His chief fault with each and all is that they state the reasons on which they were founded; and the noble Lord suggested that this was a great error, which no wise man should commit. It is odd, however, to observe how strangely inconsistent is the conduct of the noble Critic with his strictures upon others, for he himself has absolutely committed the same error for which he rebukes these hon. Members. In his own Amendment he gives as a reason for declining to consider the present proposal that we should wait for the Report of the Select Committee of the House of Lords on Intemperance. Now, if it be admissible for the noble Lord to assign his reasons, I hardly see his consistency in rebuking others for doing the same. But the noble Lord's reason is not a good one. I have no doubt that the Report of the House of Lords will be instructive and valuable. As a rule, I think that the Reports made by Committees of that House deserve all consideration and respect; and if I believed that this promised Report could throw any new light upon the subject before us, I should gladly join in a prayer to wait till we had received it. But does any hon. Member imagine that it will contain anything that we do not already know?—that drunkenness is on the increase; that it is producing the most terrible evils; and that much of its growth is due to the multiplicity of public-houses. This, I apprehend, must necessarily be the sum and substance of the Lords' Report—and if so, why should we put off discussion till it is printed? The wonder to me is, why such advice should be given; or why we should delay an hour in legislating upon this most serious and all-important question. Who, indeed, can contemplate the present condition of our population—gravely and thoughtfully—without deep regret and alarm? A spirit of intoxication is abroad. Drunkenness is alarmingly on the increase. The public-houses are almost as thick as gas-lamps in the streets. I took a drive some short time since through the East End of London; and in the course of it, though it did not last an hour, I counted 150 public-houses. With such temptations in the way, can it be wondered that intemperance spreads? It does not embrace the rich or the educated; but it absorbs a great portion of our humbler brethren. It is impossible to view this state of things, either as Englishmen or Christians, or lovers of our kind, without the most serious reflections; nor ought we to defer the cure for an hour, if a cure we can find. I listened with great pleasure to the speech of the Under Secretary of State for the Home Department (Sir Matthew White Ridley), a speech that did him honour for its good feeling, its candour, and its good sense. I was glad to hear the hope which it held forth, that Her Majesty's Ministers may soon be expected to introduce a measure on this subject. I can assure them that if they do, the lovers of temperance will not forget it. It will give them new power, and gain them many new friends; sentiments and speeches such as that just delivered by the hon. Baronet will strengthen their position with all who can rise above Party, and can view this question as philanthropists; as persons who sympathize with human improvement, and with all well-directed efforts to that noble end. But the speech does not give me unlimited satisfaction. It shadows forth, I fear, a continuance of that magisterial jurisdiction in the matter of licences which has already produced many evils. I think the hon. Baronet need not have been alarmed at the proposed introduction of the popular element into the licensing tribunals. He has read, no doubt, the Amendment of the hon. Member for East Devonshire (Sir John Kennaway). The hon. Member is a Tory of Tories—a Tory of the good old school, as it is called; and has, no doubt, as great a partiality for magistrates as the Under Secretary of State himself; and yet he (Sir John Kennaway), with all his predilections, proposes to "associate representatives of the ratepayers with the magistrates"—thus proving that gentlemen of strong Tory principles do not regard such associations as being either dangerous or revolutionary. Another slight fault I have to find with the speech of the Under Secretary of State, which, in most other respects, was ingenuous and straightforward, and marked, too, with special ability. He complains of the Resolution as being vague. I respectfully differ from him. What can be more plain or explicit than the following?—

> "That a legal power of restraining the issue or renewal of licences should be placed in the hands of the persons most deeply interested and affected—namely, the inhabitants themselves—who are entitled to protection from the injurious consequences of the present system?"

Surely words cannot be plainer than these. I hope the Government will not defer legislation on this subject. In my humble opinion, no time should be lost to grapple with so great an evil as the intemperance which is so widely spread. I pass to the Amendment of the hon. and learned Member for Leeds (Mr. Wheelhouse), the chosen child and champion of the brewers and distillers, the apostle of beer, who is eloquent upon so many publicans' platforms. The hon. and learned Gentleman tells us that this Motion is "inopportune" for legislation of any sort on this subject. This is one of the old fallacies, or assertions, or sophisms, that ever crop up when any measure of reform is proposed. I thought that this crop had long ago been thrashed out. I thought that the poor old thing had died of old age; but here we have it, apparently alive and fresh, and starting from the grave in which I hoped it had been quietly inurned. Inopportune! Can the hon. and learned Gentleman be serious? Can he enter an Assize Court, can he go to Quarter Sessions, and not hear either the Judge, or the Chairman, deploring to the Grand Jury the growth of drunkenness, and tracing to it the alarming increase of crime? Can he walk the streets, and not see them polluted by drink-shops, almost as thick as blackberries? Can he go out at night, and not witness the numbers of drunken men and women in rags—creatures to be pitied, above all others, for their weakness and their folly? Can he view their helpless, half-fed, ragged children, and say that the moment is "inopportune?" To me, on the contrary, it seems most opportune; and we are called upon to seize it, as Englishmen, as Legislators, as Christians. The hon. and learned Gentleman the Member for Leeds deprecates the Resolution because it may lead to teetotalism. Would that, then, be an evil? On the contrary, would it not be one of the greatest blessings that could happen to the land? I am no teetotaller myself; but I see in those who are many mental, and physical, and moral advantages which they have over other men. I cannot imagine, therefore, why the hon. and learned Gentleman should look with alarm upon this prospect. He warns us against casting "a slur upon the magistrates," as we shall do if we declare that they have not well fulfilled their duties. I think my observations on the Amendment proposed by the hon. Baronet the Member for East Devonshire dispose of this. And he says that "no one has a right to interfere with his tastes and habits." Is this so? Is it either law or morals? If a man has a taste and habit of beating his wife, we are cruel enough to interfere with him. We repress him, as well as we can, by penalties. Why are we not to do the same with the drunkard, who makes his home as miserable—perhaps more miserable even than the wife-beater—who holds forth an example to his household calculated to demoralize and destroy them? Is this no crime that ought to be repressed? Or should we give it impunity because, forsooth, it is one of his "tastes and habits?" I do not agree with this notion; and I say that if we cannot make men sober by education, by example, by morals, or by religion, we must try to do so by Act of Parliament. This fallacy which has prevailed so long, and which has passed into a sort of proverb, melts away like mist when one endeavours to seize it. I have no doubt that just as men are made better citizens by Acts of Parliament than they might otherwise be; are restrained from violence or turbulence, or from indulging their passions upon others; so also they might be induced, and, if necessary, forced, into sobriety by Act of Parliament. It is a strange absurdity that a man shall be prohibited by law from inflicting injury upon others—upon his wife, or child, or a stranger—and yet be allowed to inflict most deadly injury upon himself and those dependent upon him, and upon public morals as well, by an unrestrained indulgence in drunkenness. Much has been said on this theme about the sacredness of individual rights; but there is no sacredness about a drunkard; and all civilized life necessarily implies interference with individual rights in some shape or other; it is part of the price which we pay for law and civilization; and why there should not be that interference with individual rights in regard to drunkenness —if any such "right" exists, which I wholly deny—I confess I am at present unable to see. In conclusion, I must express a hope that when Ministers come to deal with this subject they will have no hesitation about the Grocers' Licence Act. This measure of the late Government I believe to be one of the greatest calamities that even they inflicted upon the Empire. It has been a fertile source of sin and consequent misery. It has put facilities in the way of women getting drink, and drunk, which I suppose its authors did not contemplate, but which as statesmen they should have foreseen. It has brought wretchedness, and want, and woe into thousands of homes, which before that Act were happily exempt from those afflictions. It has destroyed domestic happiness by tempting women into indulgence. It has broken up households that once were happy, because temperate and saving. No greater boon to the country could be offered than its repeal; and I hope the Government will grant us that blessing, which will assuredly return in blessings upon themselves.

LORD FRANCIS HERVEY, who had the following Amendment on the Paper:—

> "That it is undesirable for this House to commit itself to legislation on the subject of licensing till the Select Committee of the House of Lords on Intemperance have published their final Report,"

said, it became his duty to vindicate his conduct in venturing to propose his Amendment to the Resolution of the hon. Baronet (Sir Wilfrid Lawson); but such was the extreme acerbity of what he would venture to call the more ardent spirits among the supporters of the hon. Baronet, that one found that no sooner had he taken a step that was not absolute submission to the dictates of the hon. Baronet, than one was assailed by correspondence of a very vehement, not to say violent and vituperative character. This being the case, he felt it his bounden duty to say that, although he had given Notice of an Amendment, there was no difference whatever between him and the hon. Baronet as to the magnitude of the evil which both alike deplored. In his judgment, it was impossible to exaggerate the evil or its effects; but if he must tell the truth about his Amendment, which had given the supporters of the hon. Baronet so much displeasure, it was that he found on the Paper an Amendment proposed by the hon. and learned Member for Leeds (Mr. Wheelhouse) in which he could not possibly concur. He would not follow the noble Lord the Member for North Northumberland (Earl Percy) in criticizing the logic of that Amendment, which was about as bad as logic—or, rather, want of it—could possibly be; but what he complained of in the Amendment of the hon. and learned Member for Leeds was that it took up a position which would be thought absolutely incredible in the case of anyone who really had experience of the enormous evils which intemperance of this country brought about. When he put down that Amendment, he (Lord Francis Hervey) would frankly confess it was quite as much aimed at the Amendment of the hon. and learned Member for Leeds as it was at the Resolution of the hon. Baronet the Member for Carlisle. He was convinced they could not dispense with any means for lessening this evil. The only condition he was disposed to place upon legislative proposals having that object was that while they should be efficacious for the purpose for which they were intended, they should not clash with those established principles of legislation which, from time immemorial, had been dear to the people of this country. The previous numerous proposals of the hon. Baronet were not such as to render the House easily disposed to agree with any proposal which might emanate from him; and he thought that those proposals had, for a considerable number of years, retarded the very cause which the hon. Baronet wished to promote. ["No, no!"] That was his (Lord Francis Hervey's) opinion. Of course, he did not in any way impugn the sincerity of the hon. Baronet; but that was his opinion of the effect of the hon. Baronet's efforts in the cause of which he had been the acknowledged champion for a long series of years. He (Lord Francis Hervey) was amazed to hear the principles of legislation favoured by the hon. Member for Stoke (Dr. Kenealy). If such principles were adopted, they would have penal laws against over-eating as well as over-drinking. He hoped that legislation so Draconian as that which appeared to recommend itself to the hon. Member for Stoke would not receive much support. The hon. Member for Carlisle had been pleased to take some notice of his Amendment, and had called it a pitiable Amendment. But he was indebted for it to one of the hon. Baronet's most frequent supporters—the hon. Member for Scarborough (Sir Harcourt Johnstone)—who, when he wished to check a Bill for regulating the number of licences, had met it by an Amendment to the effect that until the House of Lord's Committee had published their Report it was inexpedient to legislate. He had copied his Amendment from the Amendment of the hon. Member for Scarborough, for he thought this would be the mildest and most satisfactory course to pursue. He (Lord Francis Hervey) proceeded on the doctrine, *fas est et ab hoste doceri*, and he considered it the most satisfactory course to be pursued. Was the Committee of the House of Lords to be treated with so little respect that their Report was not to be regarded? Consider first of all the eminence and distinction of the noble Lords who composed the Committee, the vast amount of pains they had taken, the varied and voluminous evidence they had taken, and the position of independence which a Select Committee of the House of Lords necessarily occupied. Was it extravagant to ask the House, before it committed itself to legislation, to wait for the Report of that eminent Committee, and for the proceedings before the Committee which had from time to time been sent for by that House? It was certain they would not have to wait long for the Report, although the hon. Baronet was mistaken in thinking that it was already on the Table. It would be disrespectful to the House of Lords to prejudge the question. He would now pass on to the Resolution of the hon. Baronet opposite. The hon. Baronet said the licensing system was introduced to supply a public want. He forgot that its cause was just the opposite. A licensing system, viewed strictly, was a system, not of permission, but of prohibition. Before the licensing system was instituted this supposed public want was a great deal more than satisfied; and the licensing system was devised, not so much to regulate, as to curtail the supply. Not to go into the antiquarian part of the question, it might be interesting to hon. Members to know, more especially those who were toxophilites, that it was established to promote the art of archery. Shooting at the butts had been greatly neglected, and the licensing system was instituted to promote the practice of the noble science of archery. But it was against the hon. Baronet's conclusions that he had the gravest complaint to make. They were incorrect, and not such as the House could accept. The evil they had to contend with was a definite, a known, and a certain evil. The measures which the hon. Baronet proposed—were they certain, were they definite, or such as the House could agree upon? If the hon. Baronet's Resolution was passed that night, could the House found a Bill upon it? They could not, or, what came to the same thing, they could found 20 or 100 Bills upon it. Then, if they did pass the Resolution, would they be nearer by one day or one hour to useful legislation on behalf of temperance? The moment they attempted to found a Bill upon the Resolution, the very men who were supporters of the hon. Baronet would be broken up by irreconcilable differences. There would even be room for a measure which left the licensing authority in the very hands in which it was placed already. Had the hon. Baronet, in framing his Resolution, contemplated the maintenance of the magisterial authority? [Sir WILFRID LAWSON: The licensing authority might be retained.] He was not sure whether he entirely grasped the hon. Baronet's meaning. His words seemed to imply that the magistrates might retain their authority, while the ratepayers had a right of veto. But, in that case, the authority of the magistrates would be gone. He thought he had gathered from the speech of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Bradford (Mr. W. E. Forster) that he considered it possible to retain the magisterial authority under the terms of the Resolution; but that, he was sure, could not be the case. But, assuming that it might be so, why then he must beg to be allowed to make one or two observations. They all knew the story of the razors which were made to sell, not to shave; and this Resolution somewhat resembled them, as it had been made not to act, but to pass. If they were to pile up upon the authority of the magistrates all the different tribunals which the ingenuity of man could imagine under the terms of this Resolution, then he would not hesitate to say that the debate which was going on was a waste of the time of the House, and that they had nothing practical to discuss. They had not before them anything which could advance the object they had in view; and that justified his Amendment, that they should, before proceeding further in the matter, wait for the Report of the Committee of the House of Lords, who might be able to help a halting, a perplexed, and a dissonant House of Commons out of their great difficulty. Unless they did that, they would be committing themselves to a Resolution which, however excellent in intention, was both vague and shadowy, and could not be productive of any good results.

MR. ARTHUR PEEL: Mr. Speaker, I have never opened my lips before on the subject of the licensing question, and though I have voted on several other occasions, I have uniformly voted against the Permissive Bill introduced by my hon. Friend the Member for Carlisle (Sir Wilfrid Lawson); and it is because I am able to vote for the Resolution of the hon. Baronet to-night that I ask permission to state my views. I have heard a great many criticisms passed on this Resolution of the hon. Baronet; they say the proposition is so vague it means anything, it binds you to nothing, and it is so large it includes any number of Resolutions, big or little. I certainly think the hon. Baronet has, by a skilful stroke of policy, so framed his proposal as to gain as many supporters as possible; and I must say his policy seems likely to meet with a large measure of success. I am willing to admit the real difficulty to begin with will be when a Bill framed on the lines of this Resolution—if it is passed as introduced—is introduced to the House. We should then see that many hon. Members who go into the same Lobby with the hon.

Baronet take different views of the question. I do not wish to examine the motive the hon. Baronet has had in framing the Resolution; he is free, as far as I am concerned, to put what interpretation he likes on his Resolution; but, in the same way, I am also free, with other hon. Members of the House, to put what interpretation I please on the Resolution, and I think I put a natural and reasonable interpretation upon it, when I say it binds him, if I vote for it, to the principle of local option. The hon. Baronet will excuse me for thinking him wrong in making the mistake that he put the question before the country in the shape of drink or no drink; and it was impossible for me, and hundreds of other Members, when the question was put thus broadly and nakedly before the country—it was impossible for us to do anything but vote in the affirmative. But when we did not vote for the negative, it did not follow we were in favour of free and unlicensed drinking; we only said we thought it was undesirable, by a vote of the majority of the inhabitants, to absolutely forbid a thing, itself innocent, and in thousands of cases perfectly harmless. But to return to the opponents of the Resolution; we are told that the proposition as it stands is worse than the Permissive Bill, because that Bill, at any rate, depended for its operation on the action of a large majority, while, according to the Resolution, a bare majority of the board or body that it was proposed to create would absolutely decide the question whether there was to be drink or no drink in any locality; so that, whilst voting for the Resolution, we should be absolutely going beyond the Permissive Bill, and voting for something that is ten times more stringent and severe. I should like to ask what is the position some of us formerly took up? We think there is excessive drinking at the present moment; the licences are practically granted in an indiscriminate manner. We think there is no sufficient discretion allowed to magistrates in certain cases; we think that some better control ought to be exercised; and we think that no better control could be anywhere than in the hands of those ratepayers upon whose shoulders all the annoyance and all the burden falls. Holding those views, we are face to face with the following difficulty:—Suppose the licensing body—no matter how created—were to express themselves dissatisfied with the mere control of the licences in a particular locality, and were to desire to take them all away, and to issue no fresh ones; in short, suppose we are advocates of the Permissive Bill, and we think it our duty to make a clean sweep of all drinking houses within our jurisdiction, it is quite obvious, if you vote for this Resolution, some limitation of the power of this new authority would be necessary. It is obvious that an Act of Parliament would be necessary to limit and control this new representative body when you have it. For one moment I should like to ask the House what are the conditions of the licensing system in England? In the first place, it is quite clear you should have some uniformity throughout the country. I recollect when the discussion on the Gothenburg system was proceeding, some hon. Members were of opinion that though it might never become general, it might yet be introduced advantageously into particular districts. I do not believe that so considerable local differences are desirable, and the same objection applies with equal force to the system contemplated in the Resolution. You must have some uniformity throughout the country, or you have chaos come again. More than all, I think you want some security against fluctuations in the trade. A great deal is due, after all, to that trade; a great deal of capital is invested in it, a great many honourable men are employed in the exercise of it, and it is essentially necessary that the conditions which you impose upon it should not be one whit more onerous than are demanded. That being so, I think it is essential that you should lay down certain rules which are to guide this constraint, this licensing body, beyond which they cannot travel one side or the other. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Bradford (Mr. W. E. Forster) says he understood him there should be a maximum of public-houses. I think the thing we rather want to assent to is the establishment of a minimum of public-houses. If there is one thing more dangerous than another in this matter of licensing, it is exaggeration of fact, exaggeration of feeling, and exaggeration of speech. I should like to mention a fact before the House, as illustrative of the exaggeration of fact. When the Habitual Drunkards Bill was being debated, an hon. Gentleman stated a case, on high medical authority, that a man who had been a habitual drunkard was sent to the hospital, and when the surgeon at the hospital made an autopsy, when he punctured the body, there streamed from each puncture a gas jet which ignited, so that there were 30 or 40 distinct lights. Now, that was contradicted by the best medical authorities, and an exaggeration of that kind did a deal of mischief. But exaggeration of feeling was just as dangerous, and if in any particular locality there was to be a sort of spasm of virtue coming over the place, and the people were to abstain from the drink, I am quite certain the pendulum, forced in one direction, would swing back as violently in the other, and the result would only be untold mischief to the morality of the place. Well, Sir, I think it has been surmised as to how this new body is to be constituted. I may venture to say what I approve is this—that the magistrates should continue their licensing functions, and should be aided by direct representation of the ratepayers, assessors, or call them what you please, who should bring to the magistrates evidence of the actual state of feeling of any particular district, and the magistrates would, I venture to say, think themselves strengthened and supported by the information so got. So far from resenting that as an interference, the magistrates would be glad to rely upon it, they would derive greater support in the important matter of checking abuses introduced, and in the management of public-houses; in the infliction on offending publicans of penalties that are already provided for by law, but which have become almost obsolete; in the supervision of transferences, especially in the issue of new licences, and in the control of out-door licences. All those matters, which at present are nominally within the present magisterial functions, will come within their actual power and discretion, if they were supported by such assessors, and if the Bill to be framed upon this Resolution were to give them the requisite power. The question of compensation has been raised. I understand the hon. Baronet has neither excluded nor included compensation; at all events, he said it was not excluded. That is the whole point of the matter. If he had said it had excluded compensation, I certainly should not have given him my support. Compensation must be given in all cases where the house was closed on public grounds, and not because the conductor had committed any breach of the law. To reduce the number of licences in such cases as that he referred to without compensation would be a violation of the rights of property and confiscation in the worst sense of the term. I may say that if a Bill was so framed as to give the new licensing body the power which I have hinted at, there would be the very widest scope for legislative action. We have only to go back to the year 1854, when we find a Committee of this House, presided over by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Wolverhampton (Mr. Villiers), and called the Villiers Committee, advised the issue of licences to everybody who was of good character and chose to apply for one—it was to be a uniform licence all round. But in the present day we have come down to what is called a well-regulated monopoly. I am perfectly aware of the evils of monopoly. I am aware that every interference of licensing by Act of Parliament is, to a certain extent, an interference with the freedom of the trade and creates a monopoly. If I am asked as to the evils of the present system and those of monopoly, I say I am willing to establish a monopoly to this extent—that those who exercise the functions of publicans must do so in such a way that they do not trench on the rights of their neighbours or interfere with the morality of the place. The association of the elected representatives with the magistrates would bring about a gradual reform; it would not operate in the sudden manner that would occur if the change were effected under the Permissive Bill, which would give power to say whether there should be drink or not. Then I think the assessors appointed from the ratepayers should be elected for some period of years, and the strength and support they would give to the magistrates would, in the end, tell on the habits and the morality of the people of any locality.

Mr. RODWELL claimed a few words in explanation of the Amendment he had placed on the Paper. That Amendment was as follows:—

> "That no new Licence for the Sale of Intoxicating Liquors ought to be granted unless the application for such be supported by a memorial of such a character, and signed by such a proportion of the residents in the district to be served, as shall satisfy the Justices that the Licence is required for the wants of the district."

If he had entertained any doubts as regarded the vague character of the Resolution of the hon. Baronet, they would have been removed by the speech to which they had just listened, for the hon. Gentleman justified his change of opinion upon the grounds that the Resolution bound him to nothing, and afforded unlimited scope for legislation—he might say, for legislative imagination—for suggestions were made of provisions enough for half-a-dozen Bills. It was not only a vague and unsatisfactory, but it was also an embarrassing Resolution, meant to serve two purposes. If it meant anything at all, it meant the Permissive Bill, and he should vote against it as he would against that Bill. Many temperance reformers would be quite satisfied if the public had some better mode of expressing their feelings and making their wishes known. Justices knew that the present mode of dealing with licence cases was not altogether satisfactory. A *primâ facie* case was made out, and perhaps there was a feeble opposition; it might be that the opposition had been bought off, or that it had been promoted by a rival publican, and the magistrates were often placed in very great difficulty from the actual want of information. His Amendment was intended to meet that difficulty, by providing that new licences should not be granted unless a substantial demand had been made out and the confirming Justices should be satisfied there was a *bonâ fide* expression of opinion on the part of those who desired them. That was all the local option that was called for; but it would not satisfy the supporters of the Resolution. That there was no organized opposition but that of the licensed victuallers told rather against the hon. Member for Carlisle. If ever pressure were put upon Members, it had been put upon them to support this Resolution; and if there were opposition, it seemed to him to be all the stronger because it was spontaneous, and was not the result of pressure brought to bear on Members by various parties throughout the country. He could not help noticing that the grounds on which the hon. Baronet based his Resolution were entirely different from those brought forward by his hon. Friend the Member for Manchester (Mr. Birley), who admitted that the position for which he (Mr. Rodwell) contended by his Amendment was worthy of consideration. If the hon. Baronet was logical and consistent, he ought never to stop in his exertions until he had swept away every public-house from off the face of the country. He put all the drunkenness and immorality on to the public-houses; if he got rid of that idea, the hon. Baronet would not be so vehement. There were other ways in which drunkenness was encouraged besides at public-houses. The hon. Baronet said it was frightful to contemplate the increase in the consumption of beer just now in this country. There was a very simple explanation of that apparent increase. Some years ago people brewed their own beer at home; but now the common practice of people in towns and counties was to get their beer from public brewers, who had to render a return of the beer that was sold. If he were asked to say whether he thought drunkenness was increasing or decreasing in this country, his answer would be that he thought it was diminishing; and that was also the opinion of many others. From his own personal experience he believed it was gradually diminishing, both in the towns and in the country. Public opinion would have more effect in that direction than any Bill or Resolution ever had or would have. He thought the Resolution might be discarded in favour of his own Amendment, which would meet the views of a great many of those who would vote against the hon. Member for Carlisle, and also of those who were desirous of supporting him.

MR. SERJEANT SIMON: I have so much respect for my hon. Friend the Member for Carlisle, and feel so much sympathy with his object, that it is with very great regret that I find myself unable to support his Resolution. I have always been opposed to the Permissive Bill. I have voted against it, because I considered it an unwise measure and an unfair as well as an inefficient mode of dealing with the question, and I have not yet heard or read anything to change my opinion of it. That there are evils existing in the present licensing system I am ready to admit; and although, like the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Bradford (Mr. W. E. Forster), I have no great faith in legislation as a means of curing a moral evil, I yet am willing to give a helping hand to the hon. Member for Carlisle, if he can show me some practical measure which might have the effect of restraining, if not of curing, the terrible evil of intemperance. But the hon. Gentleman, having abandoned his Permissive Prohibitory Bill for the present, has produced a Resolution of a character which I, for one, cannot give my assent to. I cannot accept, with the ease of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Bradford, the Resolution, simply because in it I might find out some meaning of my own invention. And I cannot join with the hon. Member for Warwick (Mr. Arthur Peel), who says that he will vote for it because he can put upon it any construction he pleases. [Mr. ARTHUR PEEL: Hear, hear!] Well, as I understand the hon. Gentleman—he will correct me if I am wrong—he says any construction he pleases. I was struck with the word, and I took it down. Now, Sir, I venture to think that when an abstract Resolution is proposed to the House of Commons, it should have a clear, definite, unmistakable meaning. The words ought to be of a definite character, of a character upon which you could found a Bill—of a character indicating some particular practical measure of legislation. Can that be said of this Resolution? The hon. Baronet has given us three cases as precedents for his Resolution. He cited the case of the hon. Gentleman who is now a Lord of the Admiralty (Sir Massey Lopes), who, in 1869, brought forward an abstract Resolution about Local Rates. But what were the terms of that Resolution? They were fixed and definite. He asked for

> "A Royal Commission to inquire into the present amount, incidence, and effect of Local Taxation, with a view to a more equitable re-adjustment of these burdens."

When he came to the House, he asked for a Commission of Inquiry, with a view to the re-adjustment of local burdens. Here was a definite object, clearly and unmistakably expressed. So, again, with the Resolution of the late lamented Member for Londonderry (Mr. Richard Smyth). What were the terms of his Resolution? They were—

> "That, in the opinion of this House, it is expedient that the Law which forbids the general sale of intoxicating drinks during a portion of Sunday in Ireland should be amended so as to apply to the whole of that day."

There, again, the terms of the Resolution were clear and definite—the House knew what it meant, and what it was asked to commit itself to. And what was the consequence? A measure was framed upon it, and it was passed by the House. With regard to the Resolution of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Greenwich (Mr. Gladstone), in 1868, upon the Disestablishment of the Irish Church, it was even more definite, if possible, and more explicit in its terms. The terms of that Resolution were—

> "That, in the opinion of this House, it is necessary that the Established Church of Ireland should cease to exist as an Establishment, due regard being had to all personal interests and to all individual rights of property."

There was a definite proposition. It was a proposition, too, on which subsequently a great measure was based, and which was afterwards passed through the House. And the right hon. Gentleman added two paragraphs setting forth provisions with a view to that measure. The hon. Baronet, then, could not have cited three more unfortunate instances. Each of those Resolutions was clear and definite. Their meaning was self-evident and unmistakable. They had a practical bearing, and measures were afterwards founded on them in accordance with the very terms in which they were expressed. But what are the terms of the Resolution now before the House? The hon. Gentleman says—

> "That, inasmuch as the ancient and avowed object of licensing the sale of intoxicating liquor is to supply a supposed public want without detriment to the public welfare, this House is of opinion that a legal power of restraining the issue or renewal of licences should be placed in the hands of the persons most deeply interested and affected—namely, the inhabitants themselves—who are entitled to protection from the injurious consequences of the present system by some efficient measure of local option."

We are called upon to grope our way through this prolixity of words and disjointed sentences, in order to arrive at a definite meaning, and then you find not one meaning, but a great many possible meanings. I could not, if I were asked to frame a Bill upon it, know what kind of Bill to frame. So we have the right hon. Member for Bradford drawing one deduction, and the hon. Member for Warwick another; and we have had other hon. Members treating this proposal of so-called local option each in a different way. Now, the hon. Baronet means the Permissive Bill, or he means nothing. We have heard his opinions on the question so often that it is unnecessary to go into them now. But the Permissive Bill is the meaning and intention of this Resolution. The hon. Baronet does not say so in so many words; but he speaks of the question of compensation in the same way that he has dealt with it before. He speaks of the licensed victuallers as already having got a bonus, and he says we were asked to give them another bonus, in order to get rid of them. There can be no doubt that the Permissive Bill is what he means by his Resolution, whatever others might infer from it, and I test his meaning in this way—would the hon. Baronet accept the interpretation put upon his Resolution by the right hon. Member for Bradford, or by the hon. Member for Warwick? Or would he accept the Gothenburg system as its meaning, or the plan of the hon. Member for Newcastle (Mr. J. Cowen)? Yet all these interpretations might be put on the Resolution, and they have been put upon it by some hon. Members who are supporting it, because it is so varied in its meaning, and so many-sided. I ask, then, is that a Resolution which can lead to any certain practical measure of legislation? I believe that it will not commend itself to the House, and it certainly does not commend itself to me. I take another objection. There is confiscation in this Resolution. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Bradford says there shall be a legal power of restraining the issue of licences. What is that but putting a stop to their issue? We know what restraining means in the Court of Chancery. It is to prevent an act being done. But, supposing it were otherwise—supposing it was checking the increase of the number of licences, as the right hon. Gentleman seemed to suppose—what are we to say about the renewals? Are they to be checked, too—in other words, refused? Under this Resolution, the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Bradford, who is against the Permissive Bill, says that he is unable to agree with this part of the Resolution, and yet he is able to support it. One word on the question of renewals. We are told that there is no property in licences, and that it has been so decided in Courts of Law. It has not been so decided, but the very reverse; and I appeal to any lawyer whether a licence, once granted, is not, for all practical purposes, a licence in perpetuity, unless forfeited by some illegal act? Consider for a moment what man in his senses would invest capital in order to establish a business, if it could be taken from him at any time, or at the end of a year? It was never so intended to be by law; and not only the practice of renewal, but the statutory provisions for renewing licences show this—that it was the intention of the Legislature that a licence once granted was to be renewed from year to year, unless it was forfeited by some act of misconduct, as laid down by the law. The hon. Baronet, in his Resolution, says that the ancient and avowed object of licensing the sale of intoxicating liquors was to supply a supposed public want without detriment to the public. I cannot accept the hon. Gentleman's history in this particular. I say that that was not the ancient and avowed object of licensing. The public want existed, and was supplied, before the licensing system began. At Common Law any person could open an inn or ale-house, and carry it on without a licence, and there was no restraint until the time of Edward VI., when the system of licensing began in the form of a recognizance entered into by the innkeeper—and this was avowedly for the purpose of regulating the conduct of the houses, and preventing disorder in them. In the reign of James I. a number of Statutes were passed, all of them dealing with the management and conduct of the houses; so also in the reigns of Charles I. and II. During these reigns there were Statutes to restrain—what? Not the sale of intoxicating drinks, or to limit the number of the houses, but disorder and drunkenness in them. This was the object of those Acts known by the name of the "Tippling Acts." I cannot, therefore, concur in giving my sanction to the statement in the first part of the Resolution as to the ancient and avowed object of licensing. The public want existed before any of these Licensing Acts, and it was supplied freely before and after them. The Licensing Acts were passed for the purpose of regulating the conduct of the places where intoxicating liquors were sold. Now, then, as to local option, what is it? What does the hon. Baronet mean, or intend the House to understand, by "local option?" I waited anxiously to hear from him something for our guidance upon what has been termed the principle of his Resolution; but, I must say, I waited in vain. The hon. Baronet did not, with his usual frankness, explain his meaning to us. What is local option? One right hon. Gentleman says that it means one thing, and another something else, others anything you please, a great many things, including the Permissive Bill. I think it was the duty of the hon. Gentleman, if his words were open to so many constructions, to tell us what local option meant, or what he intended us to understand by it. He says that it does not necessarily mean the Permissive Bill, and that it would not pledge anyone who might support his Resolution to support the Permissive Bill; and he left it to the ingenuity of hon. Members to find out some other meaning, or as many other meanings as they could extract from his words. I think that is not a fair way of dealing with the House. I think it is not right for an hon. Member to place a Motion, the terms of which are so vague that it is impossible to fix upon them any one definite meaning, so wide that they might embrace conclusions of the most opposite and objectionable kind. I say that a Resolution which is intended to enforce a principle should make it clear what that principle is, and how it is intended to give effect to it. In accordance with the precedents cited by the hon. Baronet himself, it should be in such a form that practical legislation might be founded upon it. Since I have been in this House, this is the principle I have always heard laid down by those of high authority; and when abstract Resolutions have been proposed, I have heard it objected again and again that Resolutions should not be introduced upon which a definite practical measure of legislation could not be founded, and hon. Members have been asked—"Why have you introduced a Resolution like this? We should know what you mean; do not give us vague and general terms that may mean anything or everything." That is what the hon. Gentleman has done now. And when he talks of legal powers, I do not think I am called upon to say whether they should be exercised by Local Boards or Representative Boards, or by what other method. But suppose you give these legal powers to corporate bodies, then the members of these corporate bodies, instead of being elected for their fitness for the proper work of a municipal council, would be elected on the question of temperance or intemperance. So it would be with Local Boards; it would be with the single idea of supporting the particular object. I do not myself see any mode of dealing with this question by the action of a popular franchise. I do not say that some measure might not be framed to which I could give my assent; but, at the present time, it seems to me that the Resolution of my hon. and learned Friend (Mr. Rodwell), who spoke before me, is very similar to the one which I have placed upon the Paper, and that it would go a great way towards solving the difficulty. I am quite of opinion that local wants and wishes should be consulted, and that these are not sufficiently regarded now. I have had sufficient observation of the working of the present system to satisfy me that it is capable of improvement; and what I would do—whether you retain the licensing authority in the magistrates, or hand it over to the other local representative bodies—would be this—I would lay down fixed conditions by law for the granting of new licences; and I would limit, as far as possible by those conditions, the discretionary power now exercised by magistrates—for in a number of cases it is only another term for caprice. The licensing authority should be made to feel that they have a solemn responsible duty to perform, and that they must perform it under the sanction and requirements of the law. Among the conditions, I would make it incumbent upon them to inquire into the wants of the locality, and to conduct their inquiry with care and strict impartiality, and neither to grant nor refuse a licence except upon evidence duly taken and properly considered. At present the only conditions required by law are the suitableness of the premises and the responsibility of the person applying for the licence. Beyond these, the magistrates need not go. I think that they should be bound to go a great deal further. I think that the population should be taken into account, and the number of licences existing in a district, before a new licence be granted. I believe the effect of such provisions as I have sketched out would be that the wishes and wants of localities would receive due consideration, which is not now the case, and that no unnecessary new licences would be issued. I have placed upon the Paper an Amendment embodying these views. If adopted in the form of legislation, I believe that in the course of not a very long time we should have a diminution in the number of public-houses, and no undue granting of licences in the future. At the proper time I shall move the Amendment I have placed on the Paper. At present I only regret that I cannot support the Resolution of my hon. Friend; and I certainly cannot give my adhesion to the Amendment of my hon. and learned Friend opposite (Mr. Wheelhouse).

SIR JOHN KENNAWAY, who had on the Paper the following Amendment:—

> "That, inasmuch as the inhabitants of a locality are the persons most interested in the due regulation and proper conduct of the liquor traffic, and are well qualified to judge of the requirements of their neighbourhood, this House, while it is not prepared to submit the Licensing question to a popular vote in any locality, is of opinion that representatives of the ratepayers might advantageously be associated with the magistrates for the purpose of determining upon the issue or renewal of all licences to sell intoxicating liquor within the area of their jurisdiction,"

said, he was thankful that all the speakers were agreed as to the necessity for a diminution of the evil of drunkenness. He regarded the action of the hon. Baronet (Sir Wilfrid Lawson) that night, in bringing forward his annual indictment against the liquor trade, not as a change of front, but as a change of tactics; and, abandoning the policy of bringing forward a Bill, he had adopted the policy of bringing in a net of wide dimensions, in the hope that all who were anxious that some action should be taken would be able to unite on some common ground. That agreement would, however, be dearly purchased by the dissension and difficulty which would arise immediately the matter was in such a state that action might be taken upon it. For his part, he was willing, as shown by his Amendment, to assent to some local option, or expression of local opinion, if the question were brought forward at the right time, in the right way, and by the right person. Another objection to the Motion of the hon. Baronet was that it came tarred with the permissive brush, and was, in fact, an attempt to induce the House to take a step in the direction of the Permissive Bill, which it had on several occasions, and with good reason, rejected. This being so, and it being admitted that the Permissive Bill was impracticable and hurtful, he could not but think that the cause of temperance, which all desired to see promoted, would suffer if the Resolution of the hon. Baronet were passed. In saying this he must also express satisfaction at the fact of the Motion having been brought forward; because it enabled the discussion to take a wider and more practical scope than would otherwise have been the case, and would, he hoped, implant the germs from which beneficial action would spring in the not far distant future—action which would have the effect of diminishing, if not exterminating, the evil of drunkenness, from which this country had suffered so much and so long. It was necessary that action of some kind should be taken. The means for the supply of liquor were far in excess of the wants of the population. There was a public-house for every 200 of the population, and temptations were, therefore, very freely placed before the people. "The sight of means to do ill deeds makes ill deeds done;" and working men and others were not able to resist the temptations which were before them. Since 1834 Parliament had been striving to put down the evil of drunkenness. The hon. Baronet said it could only be put down by the suppression of public-houses. The licensed victuallers were hopeful in the spread of education to find a remedy; the grocers said the public-houses were the cause of all the mischief. None of these remedies would, he believed, meet the case they had to deal with. It had been suggested that the sale of liquor should be regulated altogether by popular vote. He was no admirer of the popular vote system, seeing what stormy meetings had occurred in the country on the proposal to establish public libraries. The rate in that case was only one halfpenny in the pound; and what would be the result when the question of licensing came to the front? He thought, therefore, that the question of the popular vote was not expedient, and would be fraught with evil consequences. He was equally of opinion that prohibition would be entirely out of the question, since it would interfere with individual liberty and public convenience. There was also the question of compensation, for a large amount of licensed property had been acquired under the sanction of the law, and dealt with under the sanction of the law, and the law had decided that that licence could be held and protected so long as a man continued to fulfil the conditions of that licence and conduct his house properly. He held it wise and expedient that restriction should be carried out, and that they should endeavour to bring about a reduction in the number of public-houses. He believed that that could be done without injustice to the present holders; and the question was by whom it should be carried out. It would be hardly fair to cast this additional duty on the magistrates. They were not the best people to judge of the wants and needs of the people, seeing that they did not mix with them. He thought that, for the purpose of bringing about this reduction, the ratepayers should be associated with them. If it was objected that the principle set forth in his Amendment was new, he would submit that it had been followed by the present Government in their Artizans Dwellings Act, which empowered the inhabitants of localities to rid themselves of injurious works on paying fair compensation. He believed that the provisions of the present law were sufficient to secure order and sobriety, and that all that was necessary was that the magistrates should be more warmly supported by public opinion in carrying out the law. A large proportion of licensed victuallers were in favour of the reform he had indicated, and he invited temperance reformers to come to some reasonable compromise on a question which could not be long delayed, and which every right-thinking person must desire to see set at rest.

MR. SULLIVAN: Mr. Speaker, I think it seems almost necessary to recall the attention of the House to the fact that we are at this moment discussing the Amendment of the hon. and learned Member for Leeds (Mr. Wheelhouse), and I think it will be very generally agreed that it is a most remarkable fact that throughout the whole course of the debate, now extended so far into the evening, not a single speech has been made in favour of the Amendment, except his own. At this stage of the debate, things are looking very mournful indeed for the fulfilment of that prophecy which the hon. and learned Gentleman made recently at a Licensed Victuallers' dinner—that he would take the great majority of the House under the shelter of his wing, and lead them to victory. It seems to me, Sir, that the course of the debate, as far as it has gone, abundantly vindicates the line of action which my hon. Friend the Member for Carlisle has taken upon this occasion. He has been treated very generously by the speakers who have preceded me, although out-of-doors there may be some persons found ready to taunt him with what he has done. He has at length recognized the fact—and I honour him for it—that outside the band of earnest men who have hitherto followed him, there are many as honest and earnest as he is himself in the desire to grapple with a great and growing evil. I commend him to-night for his great liberality in abandoning this line of action, which he has hitherto believed to be the best, in order to move a Resolution which should afford an opportunity to all in this House who differ from him in point of detail to make, at all events, a protest that, whether the details of the measure be settled by him or by others, they are at one with him in believing that the wants of a locality, and the necessities of a district, ought to be consulted in the direction of temperance reformation. Every previous speaker, I may say, has spoken in favour of some description of local option. Attempts have been made to entangle my hon. Friend, by cross-examination across the floor of the House, as to what interpretation he would put upon "local option." I fully admit that the phrase is an elastic one, and that it has been selected for its elasticity. I will explain what I mean. For 200 years the licensing system has recognized the necessity for elasticity. This House has recognized the fact over and over again, and the law recognizes it. At present you have visible evidence before you that the system is elastic, because you give the Justices of the Peace power to grant, refuse, or, under certain conditions, to revoke existing licences altogether, if they think proper to do so. Is not that an elastic system? And is it not in this way—though not local option as I understand it—a recognition of local individuality, of local necessity, of wants and requirements? There is a new feature of this principle generally approved of in this House to-night; but I venture to assert that the kind of local option which the general concurrence of the House has welcomed during the debate is, nevertheless, a stranger to the Statutes of this Realm. The Statutes of this Realm do not recognize local option in the sense that the House has welcomed it whenever previous speakers alluded to the matter. At last, we are brought face to face with this great fact, that happily for England—for this country—the House of Commons, the voice of the country, is in favour of public morality, and is in favour of restricting the drinking habits which unfortunately hold possession of the country. My hon. Friend the Member for Carlisle, in his Permissive Bill, had very few details; but it was always open to this reproach—that it afforded no alternative beyond "all or nothing." There was no middle course possible under its provisions. There was no option given under it to the locality which did not want total repression. In 1874, I introduced a Bill to remove this defect in my hon. Friend's proposal. I allowed three courses, the number which we are told exists in everything. I allowed a locality a medium of restriction before total prohibition; but, be that as it may, it was time for the hon. Member for Carlisle to take note of opinion out-of-doors, and of the opinion of this House, which went to prove that, although there was a large majority sensible of the evil of the drink traffic, and ready to grapple with it, yet they shrank from his proposals, because they went too rapidly to extremes. But he has had the common sense and the statesmanship to address his observations to what, undoubtedly, is the preponderating desire of this House and of the country at large. Now, as to what my hon. Friend means by local option. Let no hon. Member be deterred from voting for, or led away to vote against, the proposal, because of any interpretation save what the words themselves admit of in their grammatical construction in plain English. I may wish to press the principle of local option to a considerable extent. Some other hon. Member may wish to see it restricted; but I most earnestly deny that the vote should be taken on the extent to which some hon. Members might be inclined to say the principle would be carried under cover of the words of the Resolution. The House is bound to vote on the words as they are on the Table, and no attempt should be made to twist them into any construction beyond that which, as I have said before, they grammatically bear. I am sorry that the noble Lord the Member for North Northumberland (Earl Percy) and the noble Lord the Member for Bury (Lord Francis Hervey) are not now present, because they were strong in their endeavours to alarm the House as to what the Resolution might cover. It has also been greatly objected that the House is called upon to decide upon a great and important question by a vote on an abstract Resolution. I would most respectfully ask the House to remember that many great questions which have been dealt with by this House have been fought up to the verge of legislation on abstract Resolutions. As well might it have been asked some years ago—"You ask for vote by ballot, but how will you vote? Will the hon. Member tell us what he means by ballot-balls in a box, or what he means by ballot-papers? He has not told us how the papers are to be marked. This abstract Resolution is meant to inveigle us into something before we know what it is." The same thing might have been said with respect to the Irish Church Resolution. Why did not someone taunt the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Greenwich (Mr. Gladstone) by pointing out that he did not explain how he meant to deal with the question of commutation. "Will you recognize recent endowments? Will you go back to 1840 or to 1701?" I appeal to the House to rise beyond the artifices of debate. The Resolution does not appear to me to be too abstract in its character or too much wanting in detail. If my hon. Friend had confined himself to so abstract a Motion as to say that it was the duty of Her Majesty's Ministers to introduce without delay measures for the relief of the evils of drinking, that would have been an exceedingly abstract Resolution, and I could in that case have understood the noble Lords Members for North Northumberland or Bury arguing against it. But, Sir, you will allow me to quote from a Resolution moved in this House by the present Lord Beaconsfield, then Mr. Disraeli, who shattered the Whig Ministry of the day by an abstract Resolution. He was too wise to entangle himself with details, and he moved the following abstract Resolution against the Government of Lord John Russell:—

> "That the severe distress which continues to exist in the United Kingdom, especially amongst that important class of Her Majesty's subjects, the owners of land, renders it the duty of Her Majesty's Ministers to introduce without delay such measures for the relief thereof as may be deemed advisable."

That was an abstract Resolution—a very abstract Resolution—for Lord Beaconsfield did not attempt to specify what measures were required; but I do not suppose that the noble Lord the Member for Bury, had he been in the House when it was brought forward, would have made an eloquent speech against abstract Resolutions. I shall not at this late hour of the evening enter into the various other arguments that have been suggested against my hon. Friend's proposal during the course of the debate; but I think it necessary to say one word as to the turmoil mentioned in some of the Amendments—that disturbance and riot which would be introduced throughout the country by allowing the ratepayers to decide upon a matter of this kind. Well, I contend that this is the whole principle of the British Constitution. The people are allowed to decide for themselves in Parliamentary, municipal, and school board elections, and why not permit them to decide upon a question which is, permit me to say, as vitally important to the welfare of the nation as one or other of those matters? The whole genius of the Constitution is wrapped up in the principle of leaving the people to decide for themselves. In 1861 I had a conversation with a Roman Catholic ecclesiastic who had just returned from Naples where he had an interview with King Ferdinand, to whom Lord Palmerston had just administered a severe rebuke. The noble Lord, as we know, was rather fond of administering lectures and advice to European Sovereigns. It was because he had not granted a Constitution to his Neapolitan subjects. The King said to this dignatary that the English Government wanted him to adopt a system like theirs, and in proof of that he referred to *The Times*' account of the late contested election. He said—"Look at these scenes of riot and confusion and discord throughout the country. Yet this is the system you want me to adopt among my people, to set them by the ears every election." King Bomba only forestalled some hon. Gentlemen who rise to-night to say that it would be a very disturbing thing to poll the people upon a question which so nearly and so dearly concerns themselves. I can only congratulate the House that at last all bye-issues have been swept aside, and we are face to face with the simplest issue that it is possible to put forward upon this great and daily growing question. It is this—shall we or shall we not take the people of the country into our counsels upon this subject? Shall we not allow them in their own localities to press their views in some measure at all events upon the functionaries who may be intrusted with the right to grant or to withhold these licences. I cannot doubt that in an age which has sanctioned certain boards, and so allowed the people to enter into our counsels, or rather to manifest their own desires in matter of education, sanitation, and municipal self-government, Parliament will be willing to give them a voice in the great question of the regulation of the drink traffic. I, for my part, rejoice that so many hon. Members have risen to support the Resolution who have hitherto voted against the hon. Baronet the Member for Carlisle. It shows that the hon. Baronet was not wrong in assuming that there was sincerity in many of the declarations hitherto made by those who differed from him. I welcome the adhesion of such voices here to-night; and I do not doubt but by approving the principle of allowing the people of a district some control in this matter, the

House will be entering this evening upon a path of wise and beneficent legislation.

MR. D. DAVIES: Sir, but for the speech of the hon. Baronet the Under Secretary of State for the Home Department, I should not have said a word upon the Resolution before the House, because that Resolution is broad enough to take in everything that we all want. I took his words down at the time, and if I am wrong, I hope the hon. Baronet will correct me; but what I understood him to say was that no new licences are now granted. If that were the case, it would not be much for the Government to make it an absolute law that none should be granted. Suppose a man bought up the licence of a house that was a nuisance to the neighbourhood, and that the people did not want, it should not then be lawful for the magistrates to grant a licence again in that locality without the consent of the people. I do not propose to remove the licensing power, but only that the magistrates should not grant a new licence without the consent of a majority of the people interested. I have always supported the Permissive Bill, although I never did believe in it—I supported it for want of something better. I knew it never would have any effect, because there was no provision in it for the protection of vested interests, and I knew that the poor publican would come with tears in his eyes and say—"If you do this you will take my living away." The publican is generally a very popular man in the country—he would gain the people over to his side by representing that his living was being taken away without compensation. All I ask is that no new licence should be granted where compensation has been paid. I do not want to confiscate anything. I do not want to take anything from anybody. I was happy to hear the hon. and learned Member for Cambridgeshire (Mr. Rodwell) speak up in the way he did, and I gathered that he would support the principle I am advocating. I will give you a case in point, which is worth 1,000 theories. Take the case of a large colliery where 700 or 800 people are employed. A public-house is opened within 100 yards of the pit's mouth. The colliery proprietors would be willing to purchase it at almost any price, in order to get rid of it; but, as the law now stands, if they did purchase it, a new one would be built in its place, and they would be no better off. I know several colliery proprietors who have had to fight the very agent who granted them the lease, because he would insist upon putting a public-house close to the pit, for the reason that he could get £50 or £60 a-year rent for a public-house, when he would only get perhaps £5 for a cottage. I put the case simply and plainly to the Government, and they will be able to put it together in some shape better than I can. There is an inquiry going on as to the cause of accidents in coal mines, a subject in which I and many others are very much interested. Take the case of one of the South Wales collieries, where 700 men are employed, and work in two shifts, 500 in the day and 200 at night. The 200 men come to their work at 6 o'clock in the evening. I am very pleased to see the Chancellor of the Exchequer taking note. I am sure he will help me when he understands the matter, and I think I can make him understand it. A great number of the 200 men having had the day to sleep, and having finished their sleep at about 2 o'clock in the afternoon, will then come to the pit and lounge about, and call at the public-house before they go down. They are good, able men—men who can earn large wages. Many of them are timber men. There is a foreman at the top of the pit; but the question is, when is a man drunk? A man may get in a muddle, and have his senses pretty well gone, yet still be able to walk pretty steady. I know several such. [*Laughter.*] I will explain the work these timber men have to do, and the House will see that it is no laughing matter. If the House understood it as well as I do, I am sure some steps would be taken. These men have to take timbers out and put new timbers in, when there is a great squeeze of perhaps 12 or 15 tons of loose rock on the top. Men muddled by drinking for two or three hours at the public-house at the top of the pit are in danger in taking the posts out of letting the stones down, and over and over again I have known men killed in that way. Not very long since I was called to my own pit to be told that two men had been killed in taking the posts up, and I had every reason to believe they had been drinking before they went to their work. I was willing to purchase the public-house, and to pay a large price for it, to get rid of it; but as the law stands a new public-house would be opened if I did so, and I should be none the better off. These public-houses are many of them in the hands of brewers, and some of them are making £1,000 a-year, while the men are half starving. There is no reason in calling upon us to protect the lives of our work-people, while they are left free to endanger their own lives and the lives of others, by getting muddled with drink before they go down the pit. I dread the idea of an explosion. I know what a dreadful thing it is. The collieries with which I am connected are among the most fiery in the whole Kingdom, yet the men go drinking about before they go down, and there is no knowing what the consequence may be. I have no wish to take up the time of the House, but I do earnestly press the Government to do something in this matter. I shall support the Resolution, of course, because it is broad, and any Bill can be brought in under it. I only want Government to understand the difficulties we have to contend with. I have known a case where certainly 19 out of 20 of the inhabitants petitioned the magistrates not to sanction a public-house, but with no effect; and I had myself to employ a solicitor to prevent the very agent who gave me my lease from putting up a public-house close to the pit. Of course, that was very unpleasant. The hon. Baronet the Under Secretary has said that practically no new licences are now granted, and it would not therefore be much for the Government to make this alteration in the law, that where there is no vested interest, no new licences should be granted till the majority of the people say they want it.

Mr. PELL said, the hon. Baronet in his Resolution was putting the cart before the horse. Instead of proceeding first with a Resolution and then with a Bill, he had brought in a Bill again and again and failed, and now he tried his hand on a general Resolution. He must caution his hon. Friends against yielding to the seductive advice of the hon. Baronet opposite. If they now voted for his Resolution they would be taken to have changed their opinions, and to have become converts to the principles of the Permissive Bill. The Resolution was not brought forward in the interest of temperance generally. The hon. Baronet had said that there was no organized opposition to his proposal but by the licensed victuallers; whereas there was an organized opposition by the Clergy, 13 of whom had sent a Memorial to him (Mr. Pell) from the town of Leicester. Some of them were in favour of the Resolution, but were opposed to a Permissive Bill. A great part of the debate that night had reference only to towns with large populations; but he wished to say a word about small country places. The hon. Baronet talked about "local option" with a maximum and a minimum rule, which meant that if they had a large proprietor in a parish, or in an adjoining parish, it was to be in the option of that gentleman or lady who saw some drunkenness along the road to put a stop to the sale of beer in his or her village. Hon. Members opposite had vehemently opposed the truck system, and maintained that agricultural labourers should not be paid partly in money and partly in beer; but if to men of that class beer was, as he held, a necessary of life, the House must be very careful not to enable one or two influential persons in a district to prevent working men from obtaining a beverage which was perfectly wholesome, merely in order to debar a few intemperate individuals from procuring the means of intoxication. If they stopped the sale of beer in villages, they would then have the drunkard going out like a tom cat at night over hedges and ditches buying, perhaps, a miserable allowance of bread and flour for his wife and family, coming home drunk, dropping the bread and flour in a ditch and losing them. Unless the hon. Baronet would show he was going by his proposal to check the desire for drink as well as the opportunities for getting it, he should not feel himself right in voting for his measure. Minimum meant monopoly, and a small district of 300 or 400 persons handed over to a small brewer and nauseous liquor, while they were debarred dealing with the large brewer. Were they perfectly sure that the amount of drunkenness in a district depended upon the number of public-houses or the opportunities for drinking? He believed it depended rather on the light in which the people of the district regarded drunkenness and the Poor

Law Guardians treated the members of the drunkard's family. Already, he believed, it had been proved before the House of Lords' Committee that no great town of England, in proportion to its population, had so many opportunities for purchasing drink as Norwich, and that in no other town had there been so few convictions for drunkenness. This result might be due to the character or the poverty of the people of Norwich, to the influence of the Clergy, to the police regulations, to the incapacity of the stomachs of the inhabitants to hold the liquor, or to the quality of the liquor itself. But such, he believed, was the fact. As far as they could judge, independently of statistics, drunkenness was diminishing in this country. Hon. Members should not forget what their forefathers were, and what were their habits. It was not, in the time of their forefathers, an unusual thing to finish their bottle or two bottles of wine in a night. They had heard of a famous Resolution carried in that House which had been settled by two statesmen, and arranged over 13 bottles of claret. In the present day it was a disgrace for a member of the upper classes to exhibit himself in a state of intoxication. That idea had come down to a class below, and, among the middle classes, a man was discredited if he was guilty of intemperance. Public opinion was operating upon him, and public opinion was doing what, he ventured to say, the hon. Baronet would not succeed, by his proposal, in doing—checking intemperance. He (Mr. Pell) had faith in the lower orders, Tory though he was, and he believed those influences would extend themselves to that order; and, as they got better paid and had better bread and meat, had better opportunities for moving about, more chances of being brought under the eye of their fellow-citizens, they would get rid of this miserable habit of drunkenness. Something, no doubt, was due to physical causes. Take a miserable creature suffering from illness, who could get no other relief, perhaps, than in a pennyworth of gin—why should she be denied some such temporary relief? He believed as people became better educated the habit of drunkenness would die out. He had faith in the people and faith in education, and he did not despair that without the proposal of the hon. Baronet the evil which it sought to repress would be removed.

MR. STANSFELD: Sir, like my right hon. Friend the Member for Bradford (Mr. W. E. Forster), I have hitherto voted against the Permissive Bill, and shall do so again if that measure is re-introduced. But I intend to vote for the Resolution now before the House, and I trust the House will allow me briefly to explain why I do so. First of all, I take leave to congratulate the friends of temperance in this House upon the debate which we have had to-night, for I have noticed several features in the debate which I cannot but think a cause for congratulation to the friends of temperance. I think that on the whole, and I say it in spite of the remarks which we have just heard from the hon. Member for South Leicestershire (Mr. Pell), I think that on the whole there has been a growing feeling in favour of the principle of local option, though there has been evidence of difference of opinion as to the conditions under which that local option should be exercised. But, at any rate, it cannot be denied that there has been strong evidence to-night from both sides of the House of a desire on the part of hon. Members that some further legislation should take place, and that some combined effort should be made, by discouraging the temptations to drink, to produce some beneficial effect on the drinking habits of the people. The hon. Baronet the Under Secretary of State (Sir Matthew Ridley) has gone further, and has intimated an intention on the part of the Government to legislate on the subject. I do not think I misinterpret his speech, when I say that he objects both to the Resolution and to the Amendment; he thinks it not wise to legislate until the time has come when the Report of the Lords' Committee on Intemperance can be considered. But the hon. Baronet not only maintained the necessity of further legislation from the point of view of the promoters of temperance, but he went so far as to indicate the lines of a possible future Government Bill. I understood him to say that he is of opinion, and I presume the Government are also of opinion, that grocers' licences should be placed under magisterial supervision. I understood him to suggest some greater measure of police supervision—some greater exercise of magisterial discretion; and he went further even than that, and suggested a somewhat novel, but I believe sound notion, of an increased rating upon houses occupied and used as public-houses. These, I think, are very good evidences of the state of opinion in the country and in the House; and whatever may be the fate of this Resolution, I think we may congratulate ourselves on the fact that the Government are disposed at some early period to deal further with the question. Well, now, Sir, it has been said that the Resolution of the hon. Baronet the Member for Carlisle (Sir Wilfrid Lawson) is a vague Resolution. The hon. Baronet the Under Secretary of State says that it is vague, it is abstract, and that it is unmeaning, and that, therefore, it is not fair, because it will cover every variety of scheme. Now, it appears to me that that criticism of the hon. Baronet is not itself a fair criticism. The Resolution is not a vague Resolution. It is true that it is a general Resolution; but that is a totally different thing from saying that it is a vague Resolution. It is a Resolution, no doubt, that would cover a variety of practical measures; but, on the other hand, it is one that contains within itself the expression of an object and of a distinct and intelligible principle. The object laid down by the Resolution is the promotion of temperance, by the removal of the temptation, of the opportunities for drinking; and the principle of the Resolution is that the inhabitants shall be consulted as to the amount of accommodation for the sale of drink which the locality really requires, and that they ought to be called upon to give their opinion on such a subject as that. Well, now, that is a principle the truth of which it is not possible for me to deny. I hold, and I always have held, although I have always voted against the Permissive Bill, that the people most entitled and most fit to pronounce upon the real requirements of a locality are the inhabitants of that locality or their representatives, however those representatives may be chosen; and if I am told that because the Resolution now before us is general, and because under it my hon. Friend might afterwards propose his Permissive Bill, I should therefore vote against it, I reply that I have quite as good a right to stand on this platform as he has, and that that, at all events, is no reason why I should deny the right of the inhabitants of a locality to exercise their judgment on the question of the amount of public-house accommodation required. The hon. Baronet the Under Secretary of State, in the course of his clear and unmistakable speech, laid down a principle which I confess I was surprised to hear enunciated by him, and one which I do not think will bear discussion in this House. It was the very broad principle that there should be no interference with any trade whatsoever save in the interests of public order. Now, if the Government are prepared to take that ground, it is a very strong and wide one, and it is undoubtedly a ground on which they are bound to object, not only to the Permissive Bill, but also to the Resolution of my hon. Friend. But I entirely take issue with them upon that ground, and I go further and say, if it is their ground, where is the justification for the Bill which was introduced by the hon. Baronet the present Secretary to the Treasury (Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson), by which he put the beer-houses under the magistrates? Surely they were not put under the magistrates simply on the principle of preserving public order. The view of my hon. Friend the Secretary to the Treasury and of the House was that the facilities with which licences were granted by the Excise multiplied the temptations to drink; and one object in view was the same as that which my hon. Friend the Member for Carlisle has—namely, to diminish the number of licensed houses, and so to diminish the temptations to drink. But everyone who knows the existing licence system knows very well that it is not only founded upon the idea that it is the duty of the magistrates to refuse licences with a view to the preservation of public order, but that it is a duty which the magistrates are supposed almost universally to fulfil, to consider the requirements of the neighbourhood, and not to grant licences in excess of those natural requirements. And I maintain that, whatever the principle and view of the Government may be, I do not believe they will find the House prepared to go with them in that enunciation of principle—that they should be guided by no other object than that of maintaining and promoting public order, and that in any legislation they proposed they should utterly disregard the question of diminishing the temptations to drink by diminishing the number of houses for the sale of drink. Well, but the hon. and learned Member for Leeds (Mr. Wheelhouse) did not say that the Resolution was vague; he said, on the other hand, that it was the Permissive Bill in disguise, and that is a view which has found repetition at the hands of various speakers to-night. Well, I do not think that that is a correct—I might almost say I do not think that that is a fair—view to take. So far as the speech of my hon. Friend the Member for Carlisle was concerned, nothing could be more candid, and nothing could be more explicit. He told the House distinctly —and he cut the ground from under his own feet if his hidden purpose is to re-introduce the Permissive Bill— he told us distinctly that though the Resolution would justify to his own mind the Permissive Bill, it would also justify other very various and different measures of local option which other hon. Members might prefer. And my hon. Friend was not content with that statement, but went further—and I confess I am surprised that no one who has followed him has yet alluded to this admission of his—when he said distinctly, as I understood him—and he will correct me if I am wrong—that if he could succeed in carrying his Resolution, the consequence would be—first of all that the Government would be bound to introduce some measure on the subject. I think we must all admit that, in such an event, the Government would feel under an obligation to take up the question and introduce some measure which might possibly fall within the four corners of the present Resolution. But, failing the action of the Government, what did my hon. Friend say further? Why, that it would be his consequent duty not to re-introduce his own measure, the Permissive Bill; he has failed in persuading the House to carry that; and he has candidly told the House that in consequence of that failure he has taken wider ground, and gone upon a platform upon which he invites others, who do not agree with him in the Permissive Bill, to join him. And he told us that, should he carry this Resolution, he should call his Friends together in this House, not out of it—those who had supported him upon the Resolution which he had carried, and in consultation and counsel with them he should propose, not the Permissive Bill, but some practical measure of licensing reform. Well, then, I think that it cannot be denied that my hon. Friend has dealt most fairly with the House, and that he has offered a common ground on which those who are very desirous of promoting the cause of temperance and who think it will be promoted by diminishing the temptations to drink, and who think, further, that that result may best be attained by giving the inhabitants of the locality some power by some efficient measure of local option of declaring the real wants of the locality may stand. But the Resolution of my hon. Friend is not the Permissive Bill, for another reason. It is not his own Resolution originally, and it is not the Resolution of the United Kingdom Alliance—it is the Resolution of a Committee of Convocation, and that is a body which has never to my knowledge committed itself to the Permissive Bill of my hon. Friend. There is certainly one addition to the Resolution which is not exactly part of the Resolution of the Committee of Convocation; but what is that addition? He has added to the Resolution of the Committee of Convocation a certain number of words by which he proposes that the power of the inhabitants of the locality to restrain the issue or renewal of licences shall be carried into effect "by some efficient measure of local option." Now, Sir, I say that these words, "by some efficient measure of local option," are a record upon the resolution by my hon. Friend of his intention and desire not to commit the House of Commons—not to commit those who may follow him on this occasion, to his own Bill or to any other specific measure, but only to commit them to the general proposition that by some efficient measure of local option, the particulars of which are in future to be discussed, the object and principles which he has at heart shall be maintained and carried out. I think, Sir, that the clear meaning of the Resolution is admirably described in a letter which I, in common, no doubt, with other Members of the House, have received, signed by H. J. Ellison, and addressed to the Editor of *The Church of England Temperance Journal,* in which he says—

> "It will, of course, be said that the Resolution is only the Permissive Bill in another shape. A little consideration will, I feel sure, show that it is not so. It proposes to give to the inhabitants a 'legal power' over the licences. What this power shall be—whether absolute or conditional—extending to actual prohibition, or limited to a gradual and larger restriction; whether it shall be exercised by direct vote of the inhabitants, or by duly elected representative bodies; whether, again, it shall go on to the entire control of the houses themselves, with their hours of opening and closing; and whether or no it shall be enabled to compensate deprived licence holders, and how—all these are details which Parliament, if it pass the Resolution, would still retain in its own hands, and which would become matters for subsequent legislation."

But before I sit down, let me go a little further for a few moments. I think the fairest thing I can do is to indicate, without intending to detain the House by exhaustive explanation or argument —to indicate the line on which, in my opinion, as a supporter of the Resolution, the work of practical legislation might be carried out. That, I think, is a course of proceeding which cannot be said to be deficient in candour on my part. I confess that one serious, and, as I have always felt it to be, fatal error in the Permissive Bill has been that, while it has professed to be a measure of local self-government, it has really turned against the principle of local self-government—because, though it professed to give an option to the inhabitants of a particular locality upon the accommodation to be afforded to the liquor trade, it in an arbitrary way restricted that local option. Under the Permissive Bill, all that the inhabitants or ratepayers are entitled to do from time to time is say "Aye" or "No" to this specific proposition — "Shall the liquor trade be entirely suppressed?" As we have been told already to-night by the hon. and learned Member for Louth (Mr. Sullivan), this is a defect, and I think we must all of us admit that in point of principle the Permissive Bill does not give what I call an efficient local option. Therefore, I say the Permissive Bill would not be the true consequence of passing this Resolution. The Resolution of my hon. Friend, if adopted by the House, would pave the way for an efficient local option, by enabling the inhabitants, whether by direct vote or through representative bodies, not only to determine whether they would suppress the liquor trade, or leave it as it is, but how, and to what extent, they would modify and control it. Well, Sir, I would give a power of that kind, and I would go further, and say in what way I would propose to give it. I think the true principle to adopt would be this—to sever what I would call the judicial function of the persons in the magistracy of deciding on the issue of individual licences from the more general function of deciding and authoritatively declaring the measure of the needs and requirements of the locality. I am prepared to admit to the hon. and learned Member for Leeds that if a scheme were proposed for the constitution of a representative body in a locality, which should not only determine generally the amount of the needs of the locality, but should also determine upon the issue or refusal of individual licences, that it would lead to a good deal of what we call "earwigging" and canvassing, and to some turmoil in local elections; and I, for one, am prepared to say that a measure of that kind would, in my opinion, have a very dangerous influence upon the local government elections of this country. But if you sever the special function from the general one in the way I have suggested, I think you get over that difficulty and that danger, because no individual interests would be directly affected, and in my belief almost any local governing body, whether a municipal corporation, or a local board, or a Board of Guardians, considering this subject, would be likely to come to a general conclusion that it was advisable to limit the amount of the opportunities for drinking. Now, the way in which a general resolution of that kind would operate is extremely easy to foresee. If the local governing body passed a resolution of that kind, the immediate consequence would be that the magistrates would cease to issue new licences. They might pass a resolution against their issue for a given number of years, or against it until the number of licences in the district was reduced to a certain amount. Besides the natural diminution in the number of houses which would arise from the acceptance of a Resolution of this kind, there are various practical measures not inconsistent with the rights and interests of those who hold property in licensed houses, which might be carried out with that object in view. We are, however, all agreed that the time has arrived when something should be done, and that we cannot rest content with the law as it stands at present. I believe that if this Resolution is adopted, we shall have taken a great step in advance, and that afterwards, not the Permissive Bill, but some practical measure of local option may be accepted by the House which would decidedly diminish the temptations and opportunities for drinking, and also—and this is, at least, of equal importance—eventuate in the creation, promotion, and consolidation of a public opinion in favour of order, of temperance, and of moderation, which would be productive of the most beneficial influences upon the drinking habits of the people.

SIR HENRY SELWIN-IBBETSON: I hardly know, Sir, whether the hon. Baronet who introduced this Resolution to-night (Sir Wilfrid Lawson) is to be sincerely congratulated upon the addition which he has received to the ranks of his supporters through the change of purpose which he has shown; because, if I look at the Resolution of the hon. Baronet, and then compare it with the speeches of those right hon. and hon. Gentlemen who have supported him on the present occasion, but who have constantly voted against his Permissive Bill, I think he can hardly congratulate himself on having attained that which I believe he has at heart. Let me look for one moment at what the hon. Baronet says, and at what is said by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Bradford (Mr. W. E. Forster). The right hon. Member for Bradford is prepared to support the Resolution, or, at all events, that part of it which goes to the creation of local option; but he says frankly, at the same time, that it must be accompanied by certain limitations which he has described as to the minimum and maximum of the number of houses in a district. Now, Sir, the principle of the Resolution moved by the hon. Baronet the Member for Carlisle is, as I understand it, that the locality shall have the power not only of restraining and limiting, but also of doing away with public-houses, because, beyond the fact of restraining the issue of new licences, the hon. Baronet's Resolution goes to the doing away with the renewals of licences in existing houses; and therefore, if his Resolution is adopted as it now stands, it will practically be the Permissive Bill in another shape, as it amounts not only to the dealing by local option with new licences, but also with the refusal to renew existing licences, and so far as it goes to that extent, I think I am entitled to say that the right hon. Member for Bradford would not support it. As to the hon. Baronet's other supporter, the hon. Member for Warwick (Mr. Arthur Peel), so far as I could gather from a speech to which I listened with some attention, he is only prepared to assent to the proposal if limited to local option of the most restricted kind; and he pointed to what he considered should be the proper system to be adopted, and that was the appointment of certain assessors to assist the magistrates in the exercise of their jurisdiction—in fact, agreeing in a great measure with the hon. Member for East Devon (Sir John Kennaway) in the Amendment which he has placed upon the Paper. We have listened now to the speech of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Halifax (Mr. Stansfeld); and there, again, that right hon. Gentleman tells the House that he adopts the Resolution, and will vote for it, because it is not the Permissive Bill; but that if it were the Permissive Bill he should not support it. Under these circumstances, although the hon. Baronet may gain a certain number of additional votes for the moment, he can hardly be supposed to have got that support which he was really aiming at—support for the Bill which he has constantly brought before us, and which he has always failed to carry. The hon. Baronet himself, even with regard to local option, seems to give rather an uncertain sound. At the commencement of his speech he described a number of measures submitted to the House, some of which had been passed by it, all of which contained, as he said, the principle of local option. He even went so far as to describe the Act that I myself carried in 1869 as containing the principle of local option. If that local option is the one which the hon. Baronet professes, I go heartily with him in the wish that it may be placed upon the Statute Book. What we have to consider, however, is whether local option, as a regulation, is a remedy for an evil which everyone admits, and which everyone wishes to see remedied. I venture to think there are other ways of dealing with this question than by the haphazard sort of Resolution placed before the House, upon which everybody may engraft everything they want. I have always felt, I confess, that while there is adopted in England a system of regulated monopoly, such as the licensing system, it cannot be intrusted to any other authority than the magisterial authority of the country. It must be remembered that the chief fault found with the magistrates, and the chief charge brought against their administration, is a fault inherent in the law itself. Under a system of regulated monopoly you have intrusted to the magistrates the power of dealing with full licences; but you have taken from them the discretion as to other licences. You have said to them—"While you shall use discretion with regard to full licences and the wants which they are supposed to meet, you shall have no such discretion as to the others." What was the result? From that time the magistrates have refused to increase the number of full licences, and during the last 10 years fewer of these have been granted than anybody is aware. Off licences, on the other hand, have increased very largely, and are increasing, and the magistrates are unable to check them. In the reported evidence of a Commission sitting in "another place," it is shown by several witnesses that the number of "off" licences is increasing with rapidity, and spreading in vast numbers in streets and towns; and it is on account of the immense increase in the facilities afforded for drink, which it is impossible for the magistrates to check, that the hon. Baronet persists in bringing forward this Resolution, which he believes will remedy the evil. I quite believe that if some years ago the attempt had been made, or rather had been sanctioned, to carry out in its entirety the discretion vested in the magistrates, by permitting the magistrates to deal with every class of licence, we should have heard far less of the complaints which are now so rife among us. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Halifax (Mr. Stansfeld), congratulated the hon. Baronet on the general opinion expressed during the debate that some legislation was necessary. I am not going to dispute it, for I hold some legislation, as shadowed forth by my hon. Friend the Under Secretary of State (Sir Matthew White Ridley), is legislation which must, before long, come under the notice of the House. What was hinted at—magisterial discretion, dealing with off licences, and increased qualification for licences—are all subjects to be considered and discussed. I do not agree with the right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Stansfeld) in the interpretation he put on the Act which I had the honour to introduce. The right hon. Gentleman said that beerhouses were put under the magistrates with the view of diminishing the number of houses; but that was the result of the legislation, rather than the intention of the Act. What was brought to the notice of the magistrates was that in beer-shops no police inspection was possible, and that, therefore, disorder of every sort and kind went on. It was only after they were brought under the magistrates, and, consequently, under constant police supervision, that a large diminution in their number took place, in consequence of their being so carefully looked after that a number were shut up. All licensing measures are carried out in the interests of order, and this particular trade is interfered with to protect the public from the disorders which may arise when materials so likely to produce it are constantly present. In looking at the Resolution of the hon. Baronet, I cannot separate from it the history of the past, and the fact that the local option he here proposes bears a very strong resemblance to the local option which appeared in his Permissive Bill. I am fully convinced that we have quite as effectual a remedy in our hands, if we choose to use it, by giving magistrates their proper function. I believe that the local option indicated in the Resolution must be illusory for the purposes we have in view. The hon. Member for Cardiganshire (Mr. D. Davies) drew attention to mines, and the possibility of creating on the borders of mines a public-house at which the miners would make themselves unfit for their dangerous work. But the hon. Member forgot that it would not be the owners alone who would have the option in deciding whether there shall be a public-house or not, but that the working men would have a part of the local option. It is because of the difficulties of local option that I object to it. What we want to get in the licensed victualler's trade, whether in full licences or in beerhouses, is men of sufficient capital and interest in the business to make it a loss to them if they misconduct themselves by running the danger of losing their licences. We do not want to bring into these houses, as conductors of the trade, men who, from the uncertainty of their position, and from their liability to lose their licences at any moment, would be making the best use of that movement at the risk of any amount of offences against their licences in order to make as much money as they could during the short time their licences last. I have always felt that our aim should be to bring into the trade as respectable a class of men as possible, with sufficient character and sufficient interest to make it certain that they will conduct their establishments properly, and to see that the police regulations are such that the trade shall be properly conducted, and that the law is properly observed; and, further, to give to the magistrates what they do not now possess—namely, full discretion in dealing with all licences so that they may do in the future—as they have in the past—in the full licences—regulate the number of licences to the requirements of the neighbourhood. A suggestion was made by my hon. and learned Friend the Member for Cambridgeshire (Mr. Rodwell) that the magistrates should be obliged to take evidence on the question of the wants of the locality. I see no objection to it, for, in my opinion, every facility should be given them of forming that opinion, and, if necessary, I would impose on them the legal obligation of doing so. With these additions to, and amendments of, the existing law, I believe you would obtain a system which would far better meet the requirements of the country than by any attempt to introduce a system of local option such as is suggested in the Resolution.

THE MARQUESS OF HARTINGTON: I rise with some reluctance to make one or two observations upon this question, which will be in a different sense from those which have been generally made from this side of the House. But as I am unable, after giving the subject the best attention in my power, to take entirely the view of the Resolution of my hon. Friend, or the view which has been taken by some of my right hon. Friends and hon. Friends, and as I believe there are also a considerable number of Members on this side of the House who have not spoken, and who yet take the same view that I do, I cannot reconcile it to my sense of duty to give a silent vote on this question. It has been repeatedly said to-night that this is not, and ought not to be, a Party question; and I may add that the tone of the speeches delivered on both sides of the House this evening have, at all events, shown a most laudable desire to avoid Party issues on this question. Indeed, I believe when we go to a Division some difference of opinion will be manifested upon that side of the House, and certainly there will be a very considerable difference of opinion on this. But, nevertheless, it is impossible for us to conceal from ourselves that this is a subject which it has not always been possible to treat as one devoid of a Party character. I am not making any complaint of this. All I wish to do is to put before the House how this has occurred, and what, in my opinion, ought to be the position taken in regard to this question of the Resolution of my hon. Friend by those who, like myself, have always been unable to support the principle of the Permissive Bill. It will be in the recollection of the House that the late Government introduced, in the year 1871, a Bill dealing very extensively with the licensing question. That Bill was considered by the licensing victuallers of the country to contain things unjust to them, and it was condemned by them, though my noble Friend (Lord Aberdare) stated at the time that he fully admitted the existence of an interest, although a qualified interest, on the part of those who hold licences, and that that interest ought to be clearly considered. The Bill never came to a second reading, much less to a careful discussion in Committee. Apparently, it was not possible to defend the equity of the provisions which were proposed by the Government; and it was not possible that these propositions should be amended in a way which was not unjust to their interests. In the year 1872 another Bill was introduced, which was passed into law. That Act, it is universally admitted, has not been injurious to the interests of the licensed victuallers, but has tended, on the contrary, to increase the value of their property in every case where the house was well conducted, or was even so tolerably well conducted as to avoid animadversion on the part of the police or the magistrates. Notwithstanding that, it is perfectly well known that we upon this side of the House were exposed at the last Election to the unmitigated hostility of almost the whole of the licensed victuallers' interest. Under these circumstances, I do not think the licensed victuallers can have any ground for complaint, if they find their interests are not very sedulously considered by Members who sit on this side of the House; and they cannot be surprised that considerable hostility is sometimes expressed against them and against their trade. I have always thought—and I have never concealed my opinion—that such considerations as these ought not to make any of us unjust towards the members of that trade. I look upon them as engaged in a trade which is both legal and legitimate. It is a trade which is exposed to a great many risks and a great many inconveniences, and to a great many circumstances, besides, which must be extremely disagreeable. It is one, therefore, which perhaps is not likely to tempt within it the highest class of those who are engaged in commercial or trade pursuits. Upon that account, and also on account of the very peculiar nature of the trade itself, I hold that it is perfectly legitimate and perfectly necessary for Parliament to legislate for that trade, to restrict it, and to impose burdens which would not be tolerated or dreamed of in the case of another trade, for the purpose of the protection of the public. But, at the same time, I think we ought to be just, and even conciliatory to the individuals who are engaged in the trade. I think it is not only to their own interests, but also to the interests of the public, that those who are engaged in that trade should be of such high respectability and position as can be secured. Now, I do not think it is calculated to secure the entrance into that trade of the most respectable or desirable persons that they should be continually made the subjects of attack, and should be perpetually threatened with legislation which there is no immediate possibility will be brought into operation. I am not going to speak on the subject of the Permissive Bill. The Resolution which is before us professes to be, and is, no doubt, intended to be, something entirely and distinctly different. The Resolution has been supported by my right hon. Friends the Members for Bradford (Mr. W. E. Forster), and for Halifax (Mr. Stansfeld), and by other hon. Members on this side of the House, as being one which solely points to some measure of local option. I understood that the Under Secretary for the Home Office (Sir Matthew White Ridley), and the hon. Gentleman who has just spoken (Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson), to speak somewhat strongly against the introduction of local option in any shape whatever. I am unable to agree with those hon. Gentlemen. The Under Secretary said he looked upon the licensing functions of the magistrates as of a judicial character. I am inclined to look upon them as rather of an administrative character, and I do not think they are functions which necessarily or inseparably are connected with the judicial capacity. The case is conceivable in which they would be better exercised by authorities of an administrative character. In fact, I need scarcely remind hon. Members that I have been myself, as a Member of the late Government, a party to a measure which proposed the introduction of a considerable extent of local option. That was the principle of the Bill to which I was a party. Therefore, I was not prepared then, nor am I prepared now, to controvert any proposition which may be made to the House which contains the principle of local option. Therefore, in the sense in which it is supported so strongly by my right hon. Friend the Member for Bradford, I am not disposed to oppose that Resolution. But then, in my opinion, the Resolution ought to be very clearly defined; and it ought to be shown that it does mean local option, and that it does not mean anything more. But this Resolution does not mean local option alone, and it does mean a good deal more. Much has been said to-night on the subject of abstract Resolutions. I cannot think that my hon. Friend (Sir Wilfrid Lawson) was very happy in the precedents which he quoted to the House. Those were very much more definite in character, and pointed much more clearly to the objects and the means by which they were to be attained, and I do not think they are very sensible precedents for his purpose. But the Resolution which is now before us appears to me to contain a vice which is not by any means inherent to abstract Resolutions in general, much as I have heard them condemned by a very high authority in this House. The general objection to an abstract Resolution I take to be that, while there is an agreement amongst a large number of Members in the House as to the object to be aimed at, there is a want of agreement, or, at any rate, a want of careful consideration of the means by which that object is to be accomplished. The means of accomplishing the desired object are too frequently either evaded or ignored in an abstract Resolution. But in this Resolution, not only are the means by which this object is to be accomplished not stated, but, so far as I can find, there is no agreement whatever between the supporters of this abstract Resolution and the object which it aims at. My hon. Friend the Member for Carlisle admits with great frankness—I did not expect less from him—that his Resolution would cover the Permissive Bill. He said also that it would not pledge anybody to the details of that Bill. In my opinion, the Resolution does cover the principle of the Permissive Bill; and when I first read the Resolution, my impression was that it meant the Permissive Bill. My right hon. Friend the Member for Bradford argued that the Motion is consistent with restriction, but not with prohibition. I do not feel so clear as to the meaning of the Resolution as my right hon. Friend does; but if he is right in his contention, it only increases the objection I have to a Resolution so vague as this. There are, in my opinion, three ways of dealing with what my hon. Friend the Member for Carlisle calls the drink question. The first is free trade; the second is regulation; and the third is prohibition. My hon. Friend the Member for Carlisle objects to the first two, and sees no virtue in anything but the third. My right hon. Friend who sits by me (Mr. W. E. Forster) does not believe in free trade, and he does not believe in prohibition; but he does believe in regulation. Both my hon. Friend and my right hon. Friend think that the principle of local option may be useful in support of the system which they desire to see carried into effect; and therefore they are both able to make what I must venture to think is a superficial agreement, the basis of which is but an adjunct and an accessory to the principle which they really have at heart, and which they wish to see put into action. I must say I cannot see what advantage is gained, either by my hon. Friend or by my right hon. Friend who supported him, by this Resolution. The hon. Baronet the Member for Carlisle has always been of opinion, and still is, I believe, of opinion, that all measures for regulating this traffic have failed. I read an article which he wrote in a magazine upon this subject only this month, and what he says, therefore, may be taken to be his very latest opinion upon this subject. Nothing can be stated more distinctly than the opinion there expressed that regulation is a failure, and must be a failure. He says—

> "In my humble opinion, all attempts to make the trade in a brain poison beneficial to the community must, from the nature of things, be a failure, for you cannot regulate an irregularity."

Having described the various attempts made to regulate this trade, he finishes by saying—

> "He would, indeed, be a careless observer who would say that if the liquor trade be injurious it is the fault of the men who have it in charge."

Then, he again repeats—

> "I have said that, in my opinion, the policy of legislative regulation has had a fair trial under the most favourable circumstances, and has broken down."

Very well, Sir. Then, what does my hon. Friend expect to gain for abandoning the position which he has always taken up—that prohibition is the only remedy for the evil of intemperance—and for obtaining the assent of the House to a Resolution which has been proved, by the speeches of its supporters, can be represented to be another attempt to regulate in a new way the trade which, in his opinion, is incapable of regulation? Then, Sir, what advantage does my right hon. Friend the Member for Bradford expect to get from this Resolution? He is extremely anxious that the principle of local control by the ratepayers should be adopted in some way or the other for the better regulation of the traffic in drink. In order to do this, he will have to go into the same Lobby as my hon. Friend, who candidly avows, as he always has avowed, that his desire is not to regulate, but altogether to suppress this traffic. I do not wish it to be supposed for a moment that I imagine the present law to be altogether and entirely satisfactory. I was extremely glad to hear the speeches of the Members of the Government opposite, in which they have stated that they cannot support the *non possumus* Amendment of the hon. and learned Member for Leeds (Mr. Wheelhouse). The Act of 1872 was a very important Act, and made very considerable changes in the law. It was not probable that those changes would prove to be in their operation immediately or altogether successful; there were some of them, to a very considerable extent, in the nature of experiment; and while many of them, I believe have worked very beneficially, it is not reasonable to suppose that they would actually put down the vice. Besides that, the Act of 1872 has been altered, though the opinion of most of us on this side of the House is that it was not amended. It is fair to say that. It is also a very fair subject for consideration whether these alterations are not also capable of being re-considered. But, Sir, what we want, in my opinion, for a satisfactory amendment of the law, are not abstract Resolutions, as to the meaning of which no two supporters of the Resolution are probably agreed, but some practical suggestion as to the working of the law in regard to the traffic in drink, and the failure of the present system. From this point of view, I must say I feel very considerable sympathy with the Amendments proposed to be moved by the noble Lord the Member for Bury St. Edmunds (Lord Francis Hervey), and the noble Earl the Member for North Northumberland (Earl Percy). I believe in the inquiry of the Committee of the House of Lords, and I do not desire to pledge the House as to what should be its legislation till the Report of the House of Lords' Committee is made, or till any other inquiry is made; but I believe that the inquiry of the Committee of the House of Lords has been conducted by very competent men—that they have taken a very great deal of time and a very great deal of trouble in the inquiry, and that they are now open to make their Report. I do not mean to say that we can accept any suggestions which that Committee may make without discussion or consideration; but I do think it is not unreasonable to expect that they will be able to make some practical suggestions in their Report, which may be of very great assistance to the House when it comes to re-consider this question. But, Sir, I must say that I am unable to see that a satisfactory solution will be, in the slightest degree, advanced by the passing of this Resolution. I will not say it is trifling with the House, because the tone of all the speeches made in its support have been so earnest, that no one can for a moment doubt that my hon. Friend and all those who have supported him are animated by the sincerest conviction of the evils brought upon the people of this country by intemperance. One cannot doubt that they look at the matter from the most serious and grave point of view; but, at the same time, I cannot think that the cause of practical legislation will be advanced, or practical legislation itself assisted, by passing a Resolution as to the meaning of which there is so much doubt, and as to which it has been so conclusively proved that those who are about to support it hold the most opposite and different views. I am unable, Sir, therefore, to support the Resolution of my hon. Friend; and it is scarcely necessary for me to add, even if the Government had not announced their intention of opposing it, that I shall vote against the Amendment of the hon. and learned Member for Leeds.

Mr. H. SAMUELSON, who spoke amid great interruption, said, as he was about to vote for this Resolution, he felt himself bound, in honour to his constituents, not to give that vote without explaining the reasons why he did so. ["Divide!"] He would do so as briefly as he possibly could. ["Divide, divide!"] It was his misfortune, not his fault, that he had not spoken at an earlier period of the debate; for he had tried during the last three hours unavailingly to catch the Speaker's eye. ["Divide, divide!"] He trusted that the House would now extend to him the indulgence it always gave to hon. Members who had to address it under similar circumstances. [*Cries of* "Divide!"] If hon. Gentleman were determined not to hear him, he would not persevere; but if he was not allowed to speak, it might prevent him giving a vote on the question before the House. ["Divide, divide!"] It appeared to him that the

House was so tired that it was impossible that the subject could be fairly discussed, and he should, if necessary, conclude his remarks with a Motion for the adjournment of the debate. He wished to place on record his opinion that the time had arrived when some attempt should be made to deal with the question as a practical one. He had never voted in favour of the Permissive Bill, nor could he do so now. He did not believe that that measure was likely to be carried in the end; but he wished to state his opinion that the present licensing system ought to be restricted. He did not believe in absolute prohibition; and in voting for this Resolution he did so without in the least endorsing the principle of the Permissive Bill. [*Great interruption.*] He would not persevere against the wish of the House; but he thought that it might have heard what he had to say. In yielding to the wish of the House that evening, he trusted that he should on some other occasion have the opportunity of stating his opinions on the subject.

SIR WILFRID LAWSON said, he did not desire to say a word more on the subject, for his Motion had been very fully discussed, and he was quite satisfied. But he did desire to make two statements by way of correction. He mentioned in a part of his speech that the Bishop of Peterborough gave his full adhesion to the Motion. From what his Lordship had since told him, he found that he did not convey his meaning with perfect accuracy. His Lordship never pledged himself to the exact words of the Resolution, but only to the object sought to be attained. He also mentioned some proceedings of the Presbytery of the Church of Scotland, when he found he should have said the Presbytery of Edinburgh. These were the only corrections he had to make.

MR. DODSON said, he would not attempt at that late hour to discuss the subject. He objected both to the Amendment of the hon. and learned Member for Leeds (Mr. Wheelhouse), and the Motion of the hon. Member for Carlisle. The strictly proper course in such a case was this—On the preliminary Question that the words of the Motion stand part of the Question to be submitted to the decision of the House, to vote with the "Ayes." Such a vote was presumed to be a vote against an Amendment, for the admission of which it refused to make an opening. Then, in the event of the original Motion coming to be put to the House, to vote against that; and this was the course he should adopt.

MR. SERJEANT SIMON begged to make an inquiry—— [*Cries of* "Spoken."]

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. and learned Gentleman has already spoken once in this debate.

MR. SERJEANT SIMON repeated that he merely wished to make an inquiry.

MR. SPEAKER: If the hon. and learned Gentleman has an explanation to make, no doubt the House will hear him.

MR. SERJEANT SIMON said, he merely wished to put a question as to a matter of form. As he understood, the Question put to the House would be—"That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question." He would like to know whether, in voting that these words should stand part of the Question, he was voting for the Motion of the hon. Baronet the Member for Carlisle?

MR. SPEAKER: The Question immediately before the House will be that the words of the Resolution proposed by the hon. Baronet the Member for Carlisle shall stand part of the Question. Supposing the House were to say "Aye" to that proposition, it would be carried. On the other hand, if the proposition were negatived, then the next proposition put to the House would be that the words proposed by the hon. and learned Member for Leeds (Mr. Wheelhouse) should stand part of the Question.

Question put, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

The House *divided*:—Ayes 164; Noes 252: Majority 88.

AYES.

Acland, Sir T. D.
Allen, W. S.
Anderson, G.
Ashley, hon. E. M.
Backhouse, E.
Balfour, Sir G.
Barran, J.
Baxter, rt. hn. W. E.
Beaumont, Colonel F.
Beaumont, W. B.
Benett-Stanford, V. F.
Biddulph, M.
Biggar, J. G.
Blake, T.
Brassey, T.
Bright, Jacob
Bright, rt. hn. John
Brocklehurst, W. C.
Brogden, A.
Brown, A. H.
Bruce, Lord C.
Burt, T.
Cameron, C.
Campbell, C.
Campbell, Lord C.
Campbell, Sir G.
Campbell-Bannerman, H.

Chadwick, D.
Chamberlain, J.
Chambers, Sir T.
Cholmeley, Sir H.
Clarke, J. C.
Clifford, C. C.
Close, M. C.
Cole, H. T.
Colman, J. J.
Corbett, J.
Corry, J. P.
Cowan, J.
Cowen, J.
Cowper, hon. H. F.
Cross, J. K.
Dalrymple, C.
Dalway, M. R.
Davies, D.
Davies, R.
Dickson, T. A.
Dilke, Sir C. W.
Dillwyn, L. L.
Dodds, J.
Dodson, rt. hon. J. G.
Duff, M. E. G.
Dundas, hon. J. C.
Egerton, Admiral hon. F.
Ewart, W.
Ferguson, R.
Fletcher, I.
Forster, rt. hon. W. E.
Fry, L.
Gladstone, W. H.
Gordon, Sir A.
Gourley, E. T.
Gower, hon. E. F. L.
Grant, A.
Hamilton, Marquess of
Hanbury, R. W.
Harrison, C.
Harrison, J. F.
Havelock, Sir H.
Herschell, F.
Hibbert, J. T.
Hill, T. R.
Holland, S.
Holms, J.
Holms, W.
Home, Captain D. M.
Howard, E. S.
Hutchinson, J. D.
Ingram, W. J.
James, W. H.
Jenkins, D. J.
Jenkins, E.
Johnstone, Sir H.
Kay - Shuttleworth, Sir U.
Kenealy, Dr.
Kensington, Lord
Laing, S.
Laverton, A.
Law, rt. hon. H.
Leatham, E. A.
Leeman, G.
Lefevre, G. J. S.
Leith, J. F.
Leslie, Sir J.
Lewis, C. E.
Lloyd, M.
Lusk, Sir A.
Mackintosh, C. F.
M‘Arthur, A.
M‘Clure, Sir T.
M‘Lagan, P.
M‘Laren, D.
Maitland, W. F.
Marling, S. S.
Massey, rt. hon. W. N.
Matheson, A.
Middleton, Sir A. E.
Milbank, F. A.
Morgan, G. O.
Morley, S.
Mundella, A. J.
Mure, Colonel W.
Noel, E.
O'Clery, K.
O'Conor, D. M.
O'Donnell, F. H.
O'Neill, hon. E.
O'Reilly, M.
Otway, A. J.
Palmer, C. M.
Palmer, G.
Parker, C. S.
Peel, A. W.
Pender, J.
Pennington, F.
Philips, R. N.
Potter, T. B.
Power, J. O'C.
Rashleigh, Sir C.
Richard, H.
Roberts, J.
Russell, Lord A.
Rylands, P.
St. Aubyn, Sir J.
Samuelson, B.
Samuelson, H.
Sinclair, Sir J. G. T.
Smith, E.
Stansfeld, rt. hon. J.
Stevenson, J. C.
Stewart, J.
Stewart, M. J.
Stuart, Col. J. F. D. C.
Sullivan, A. M.
Talbot, C. R. M.
Tavistock, Marquess of
Temple, right hon. W. Cowper-
Tracy, hon. F. S. A. Hanbury-
Trevelyan, G. O.
Villiers, rt. hon. C. P.
Vivian, A. P.
Vivian, H. H.
Waddy, S. D.
Watkin, Sir E. W.
Wedderburn, Sir D.
Whitwell, J.
Whitworth, B.
Whitworth, W.
Williams, B. T.
Wilson, C.
Wilson, I.
Wilson, Sir M.
Wilson, W.
Young, A. W.

TELLERS.

Birley, H.
Lawson, Sir W.

NOES.

Agnew, R. V.
Allcroft, J. D.
Allsopp, C.
Allsopp, H.
Arbuthnot, Lt.-Col. G.
Arkwright, F.
Ashbury, J. L.
Astley, Sir J. D.
Bailey, Sir J. R.
Balfour, A. J.
Baring, T. C.
Barrington, Viscount
Barttelot, Sir W. B.
Bass, A.
Bates, E.
Beach, rt. hon. Sir M. H.
Beach, W. W. B.
Bentinck, rt. hon. G. C.
Bentinck, G. W. P.
Beresford, Lord C.
Birkbeck, E.
Blackburne, Col. J. I.
Boord, T. W.
Bourke, hon. R.
Bousfield, Col. N. G. P.
Bowen, J. B.
Brassey, H. A.
Brise, Colonel R.
Bruce, hon. T.
Bruen, H.
Bulwer, J. R.
Buxton, Sir R. J.
Callan, P.
Cameron, D.
Cartwright, F.
Cartwright, W. C.
Cavendish, Lord F. C.
Cecil, Lord E. H. B. G.
Chaplin, Colonel E.
Charley, W. T.
Childers, rt. hn. H. C. E.
Christie, W. L.
Clive, Col. hon. G. W.
Clowes, S. W.
Cobbold, T. C.
Cole, Col. hon. H. A.
Colebrooke, Sir T. E.
Collins, E.
Colthurst, Colonel
Coope, O. E.
Cordes, T.
Cotton, W. J. R.
Crichton, Viscount
Cross, rt. hon. R. A.
Cubitt, G.
Dalkeith, Earl of
Davenport, W. B.
Deedes, W.
Denison, W. E.
Dickson, Major A. G.
Digby, Col. hon. E.
Dyke, Sir W. H.
Eaton, H. W.
Edmonstone, Admiral Sir W.
Egerton, hon. A. F.
Egerton, hon. W.
Elcho, Lord
Elliot, Sir G.
Elphinstone, Sir J. D. H.
Emlyn, Viscount
Errington, G.
Estcourt, G. S.
Evans, T. W.
Ewing, A. O.
Fawcett, H.
Fellowes, E.
Fitzmaurice, Lord E.
Fitzwilliam, hn. W. J.
Forester, C. T. W.
Forster, Sir C.
Forsyth, W.
Fremantle, hon. T. F.
Freshfield, C. K.
Galway, Viscount
Gardner, J. T. Agg-
Garfit, T.
Garnier, J. C.
Gathorne-Hardy, hn. A.
Giffard, Sir H. S.
Giles, A.
Goddard, A. L.
Goldney, G.
Goldsmid, Sir J.
Gordon, W.
Gore-Langton, W. S.
Goschen, rt. hon. G. J.
Grantham, W.
Greenall, Sir G.
Gregory, G. B.
Grey, Earl de
Grosvenor, Lord R.
Hall, A. W.
Halsey, T. F.
Hamilton, Lord C. J.
Hamilton, I. T.
Hamilton, right hon. Lord G.
Hamond, C. F.
Hankey, T.
Harcourt, E. W.
Hardcastle, E.
Hartington, Marq. of
Harvey, Sir R. B.
Hay, rt. hn. Sir J. C. D.
Heath, R.
Herbert, hon. S.
Hervey, Lord F.
Heygate, W. U.
Hick, J.
Hicks, E.
Hill, A. S.
Holker, Sir J.
Holland, Sir H. T.
Holmesdale, Viscount
Hope, A. J. B. B.
Hubbard, E.
Jackson, Sir H. M.
Jervis, Col. H. J. W.
Johnson, J. G.
Johnstone, H.
Johnstone, Sir F.
Jolliffe, hon. S.
Jones, J.
Kavanagh, A. MacM.
Kingscote, Colonel
Knightley, Sir R.
Lacon, Sir E. H. K.
Lawrence, Sir T.
Learmonth, A.
Lechmere, Sir E. A. H.
Legard, Sir C.

Leighton, Sir B.
Leighton, S.
Lennox, Lord H. G.
Lewisham, Viscount
Lindsay, Col. R. L.
Lindsay, Lord
Lloyd, S.
Locke, J.
Lopes, Sir M.
Lowe, rt. hon. R.
Lowther, rt. hon. J.
Macartney, J. W. E.
M'Garel-Hogg, Sir J.
Makins, Colonel W. T.
Manners, rt. hn. Lord J.
Marten, A. G.
Master, T. W. C.
Mellor, T. W.
Merewether, C. G.
Mills, A.
Mills, Sir C. H.
Monckton, F.
Montgomerie, R.
Montgomery, Sir G. G.
Morgan, hon. F.
Muncaster, Lord
Muntz, P. H.
Naghten, Lt.-Col. A. R.
Newdegate, C. N.
Noel, rt. hon. G. J.
Northcote, rt. hon. Sir S. H.
O'Donoghue, The
O'Leary, W.
Onslow, D.
Paget, R. H.
Parker, Lt.-Col. W.
Pell, A.
Pemberton, E. L.
Pennant, hon. G.
Peploe, Major D. P.
Percy, Earl
Phipps, P.
Plunkett, hon. R.
Polhill - Turner, Capt. F. C.
Powell, W.
Praed, C. T.
Puleston, J. H.
Raikes, H. C.
Read, C. S.
Rendlesham, Lord
Repton, G. W.
Ridley, E.
Ridley, Sir M. W.
Ritchie, C. T.
Rodwell, B. B. H.
Rothschild, Sir N. M. de
Russell, Sir C.
Ryder, G. R.
Salt, T.
Samuda, J. D'A.
Sanderson, T. K.
Sclater-Booth, rt. hn. G.
Scott, M. D.
Seely, C.
Selwin - Ibbetson, Sir H. J.
Severne, J. E.
Sheridan, H. B.
Shute, General C. C.
Simon, Serjeant J.
Simonds, W. B.
Smith, A.
Smith, F. C.
Smith, S. G.
Smith, rt. hn. W. H.
Smollett, P. B.
Somerset, Lord H. R. C.
Spinks, Serjeant F. L.
Stanhope, hon. E.
Stanhope, W. T. W. S.
Stanley, rt. hn. Col. F.
Starkey, L. R.
Starkie, J. P. C.
Steere, L.
Sykes, C.
Talbot, J. G.
Taylor, rt. hon. Col.
Tennant, R.
Thornhill, T.
Thwaites, D.
Thynne, Lord H. F.
Torr, J.
Torrens, W. T. M'C.
Tremayne, A.
Tremayne, J.
Wait, W. K.
Walker, O. O.
Walker, T. E.
Wallace, Sir R.
Walsh, hon. A.
Walter, J.
Watney, J.
Welby-Gregory, Sir W.
Wellesley, Colonel H.
Wethered, T. O.
Williams, W.
Wilmot, Sir H.
Woodd, B. T.
Wroughton, P.
Wyndham, hon. P.
Wynn, C. W. W.
Yarmouth, Earl of
Yorke, J. R.

TELLERS.
Isaac, S.
Wheelhouse, W. S. J.

MR. SERJEANT SIMON begged to move the Amendment which stood in his name on the——

MR. WHEELHOUSE rose to Order.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. and learned Gentleman is out of Order. The Motion having been rejected, the Amendment of the hon. and learned Member for Leeds must be put to the House.

MR. DODSON said, in the event of these words being rejected, he presumed it would be open to anyone to move the addition of other words?

MR. SPEAKER: Undoubtedly.

MR. SERJEANT SIMON asked whether, in the event of the Amendment being carried as a substantive Resolution, he could then move his Amendment?

MR. SPEAKER: If the Amendment be carried, no other Amendment can be moved, except in the form of an addition to those words.

MR. WHEELHOUSE said, with the permission of the House, he proposed to withdraw his Amendment. ["No, no!"]

Question,

"That the words 'it would be most undesirable and inopportune to change the arrangements now legislatively provided for the regulation of the trade carried on by the Licensed Victuallers of this Country, because any tribunal snbject to periodical election by popular canvas and vote might, and in all probability would, lead to repeated instances of turmoil, and thus be detrimental to the peace and quietude of every neighbourhood in England,' be there added,"

—put, and *negatived.*

LORD FRANCIS HERVEY then moved his Amendment—

"That it is undesirable for this House to commit itself to legislation on the subject of licensing till the Select Committee of the House of Lords on Intemperance have published their final Report."

He merely wished to say, as a correction to the statement of the hon. Baronet the Member for Carlisle, that the Select Committee had not yet laid their Report on the Table of the House.

Amendment proposed,

To add, after the word "That" in the Original Question, the words "it is undesirable for this House to commit itself to legislation on the subject of licensing till the Select Committee of the House of Lords on Intemperance have published their final Report."—(*Lord Francis Hervey.*)

Question put, "That those words be there added."

The House *divided*:—Ayes 121; Noes 169: Majority 48.—(Div. List, No. 41.)

MR. HEYGATE moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That this House do now adjourn."—(*Mr. Heygate.*)

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER said, there was still some Business on the Paper which the Government were anxious to dispose of. He did not know whether it might not be a wise arrangement to move the adjournment of the House; but he thought it would be undesirable to adjourn the House.

Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

MR. SERJEANT SIMON begged to move his Amendment.

Amendment proposed,

To add, after the word "That" in the Original Question, the words "in the opinion of this House, among the conditions prescribed by Law for the granting of new Licences for the Sale of Intoxicating Liquors, it should be expressly provided that the licensing authority shall take into consideration the population and the number of existing licences in the district, and shall find as a fact, upon sworn evidence, that new licences are required for the necessary convenience of the public."—(*Mr. Serjeant Simon.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there added."

MR. ASSHETON CROSS: I do not wish to make a long speech on this question; but I want to point out that in any improvement of the licensing laws we should aim to find some authority which, without the bias produced on one side or the other by popular clamour, would come to a just decision on any particular case. The great vice of the Resolution of the hon. Baronet the Member for Carlisle was that it would give to the ratepayers, who would be the electoral body, the power of settling by popular vote that which ought to be decided by calm judgment. I have an equally strong objection to appointing a number of persons by the vote of the inhabitants who are to be judges *ad hoc.* I object absolutely to settling questions of licensing, or ecclesiastical questions, or legal questions, in this way; and I especially object when it is a matter of great public interest that has to be dealt with. Instead of having persons coming by calm judgment to a wise conclusion, we should have it settled by persons elected *ad hoc;* and I am sure the effect would be that their decisions would not be just in any sense of the word. They would be mere delegates. I am afraid that was the case of some of our Committees in the old days—they were persons elected with a bias on one side or the other. That, to my mind, is entirely opposed to the position which a man ought to occupy in dealing with this question. Therefore, I objected to the Amendment proposed by the hon. Baronet the Member for Carlisle, on the ground that there is a vice in his proposals as to the tribunal which should judge this question. My hon. and learned Friend, in the Amendment now before us, has started on a different theory. I do not say I agree with the exact words of his Motion, and if we come to debate it, I shall have a good deal to say as to that; but his principle I take to be that he wants judges, and impartial judges. The word "impartial" is the word I want to impress on the House. My hon. and learned Friend says, in effect—"I am not content with the present system because I do not think the judges who have to decide this question have ample and sufficient evidence brought before them; and therefore I want to devise some system or other by which those who have to judge, and judge impartially, shall have every possible information brought before them." In that principle I most entirely agree. Having had considerable experience as a magistrate in these matters, I may say that I have always endeavoured, as far as possible, to give as much weight as I could to evidence of the kind to which he points. I should like to go one step further. I should like these memorials of the ratepayers to be admissible as evidence before the judges, so that these judges, as impartial judges, should form an opinion upon all the merits of the case. I would go one step further still. I am bound to say I think it a great hardship, if I have an estate where I do not wish to build a public-house, that somebody else who has a piece of freehold in the midst of it should come and build one in spite of me. I think that a great hardship, because it goes dead against the rights of owners of property; and I should be very glad to see some provision made by which anybody, before he applied for a licence, would be bound to procure the assent of adjoining owners, in order that the judges might be satisfied that there was no serious objection to the public-house. By the principle of the Amendment you will not get judges who are either elected *ad hoc* for the purpose of voting on this question, or as they are delegated to do; but you will have impartial judges. You do not say whom they shall be; but they shall be judges who shall have all the information brought before them in a legal and a proper form, and further information than is afforded them at the present moment. That being the principle, I should support the Amendment.

SIR GEORGE CAMPBELL said, the Amendment now before the House placed the question in an entirely new light, which had not yet been debated at all, and which the House might like to discuss fully. He would therefore move the adjournment of the debate.

MR. MORGAN LLOYD said, he would second the Motion, because he would at present feel very considerable difficulty in voting on the question before the House.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Debate be now adjourned."—(*Sir George Campbell.*)

SIR WILFRID LAWSON thought it was by far the best thing they could do at that hour.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER said, he quite agreed with the hon. Baronet.

MR. C. S. PARKER wished to ask if the Government——[" Divide! "]

Motion *agreed to.*

Debate *adjourned* till *Tuesday* next.

ORDERS OF THE DAY.

HABITUAL DRUNKARDS BILL.

(*Dr. Cameron, Mr. Clare Read, Mr. Ashley, Sir Henry Jackson, Mr. Edward Jenkins, Mr. William Holms, Mr. O'Shaughnessy.*)

[BILL 47.] CONSIDERATION.

Bill, as amended, *considered.*

SIR MATTHEW WHITE RIDLEY moved to insert the following Clause:—

(Apprehension of habitual drunkard escaping from retreat.)

"If an habitual drunkard escapes from a retreat or from the person in whose charge he is living, under section seventeen of this Act, it shall be lawful for any justice or magistrate having jurisdiction in the place or district where he is found, or in the place or district where the retreat from which he escaped is situate, upon the sworn information of the licensee of such retreat, to issue a warrant for the apprehension of such habitual drunkard at any time before the expiration of his prescribed period of detention. And such habitual drunkard shall after apprehension be brought before a justice or magistrate, and may, if such justice or magistrate should so order, be remitted to the retreat from which he had so escaped, there to be detained during a period equal to so much of his period of detention as remained unexpired at the time of his escape."

Clause *agreed to,* and *added* to the Bill.

Amendments made.

Clause 9 (Persons may be admitted to retreats on their own application).

MR. DILLWYN moved, in page 4, at beginning of line 9, to leave out " the," and insert—

"By a personal interview with the applicant unaccompanied by any other person they have satisfied themselves that the said."

His object simply was to insure that this was the voluntary act of the habitual drunkard, and that he was not acting under the pressure of any of the persons who accompanied him. He wanted him, at the time he signed this paper, to be out of the control of any person. He took the opinion of the Committee on this question, and was defeated by so small a majority that he felt justified in raising the question again.

Amendment proposed,

In page 4, at beginning of line 9, to leave out the word "the," and insert the words "by a personal interview with the applicant unaccompanied by any other person they have satisfied themselves that the said."—(*Mr. Dillwyn.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'the' stand part of the Bill."

MR. DALRYMPLE admitted that the Amendment had been defeated in Committee by a narrow majority; but he hoped that the House would adhere to the decision then arrived at. He thought that the restrictions in the Bill were already in excess of the enactments, and with the provisions inserted by the Home Office the Bill was rapidly becoming an inoperative measure. This Amendment would really render the Bill nugatory; and he trusted that the House would adhere to the decision of the Committee. If the words were inserted, they would go far to defeat what still remained of value in the measure.

DR. CAMERON said, he voted for this Amendment in Committee; but the number of protections introduced by the Home Office since that time were quite sufficient to prevent any infraction of the liberty of the subject. He thought the Amendment would go far to render the Bill useless, and he should oppose it.

Question put, and *agreed to.*

Mr. DILLWYN next moved, in page 4, line 10, after "retreat," to add "and was of sound mind." This Amendment was suggested to him by a very eminent medical gentleman, in order that there should be no danger of persons really of unsound mind being sent to these retreats, which were already *quasi*-lunatic asylums, and he wanted them hedged round with provisions to prevent them from being used as lunatic asylums.

Amendment proposed,

In page 4, line 10, after the word "retreat," to insert the words "and was of sound mind." —(*Mr. Dillwyn.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Sir MATTHEW WHITE RIDLEY said, this was more than two Justices could be expected to do.

Dr. CAMERON said, the presumption was that a man was sound until the contrary was proved.

Sir MATTHEW WHITE RIDLEY said, he would consider the matter, and deal with the question at a future stage.

Mr. PAGET said, if there was any suspicion of unsoundness, a person should not be admitted to these retreats.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Other Amendments made.

Bill to be read the third time *To-morrow.*

FRIENDLY SOCIETIES ACT (1875) AMENDMENT BILL.—[Bill 85.]

(*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson.*)

COMMITTEE.

Bill *considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Clause 1 (Intrepretation of s. 30 of the Friendly Societies Act, 1875) *agreed to.*

Clause 2 (Construction of Act).

Sir ALEXANDER GORDON moved to add at the end of the Clause—

"Provided that any regulations proposed to be made under the authority of this Act shall first be submitted to the approval of the Registrar General of Births, Deaths, and Marriages, in England and Wales, with the view of securing that such regulations are in accordance with the provisions of the Acts of Parliament on the subject."

By this Bill, the military authorities were empowered, in effect, to alter the Acts of Parliament which now existed, with reference to births, marriages, and deaths, and there would thus be two authorities on the same question, acting without any concert. The Registrar General was responsible to Parliament for carrying out these Acts, which were very numerous and intricate; while, by this Bill, the Secretary of State for War was to make regulations with regard to births, marriages, and deaths without any concert with the Registrar General. He thought it would give much greater security if it were provided that the Registrar General was to be consulted, as otherwise there would be no security that the existing Acts were complied with, and that the regulations were in accordance with the Acts.

Colonel LOYD LINDSAY thought the difficulty raised was not likely to ever arise in practice, while the effect would be to allow the Registrar General to over-ride the regulations of the Secretary of State. He thought it would be better that the hon. and gallant Gentleman should not insist on his Amendment. Of course, the regulations would be made under proper advice, and in conformity with the law.

Sir ALEXANDER GORDON said, Her Majesty could, of course, make no regulations contrary to the law. He only wanted the Registrar General consulted. These regulations would affect his Office; and yet this Bill had been prepared without any consultation with him. However, if the Government would not accept the Amendment, he must withdraw it.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Bill *reported,* without Amendment; to be read the third time *To-morrow.*

MOTIONS.

CO-OPERATIVE STORES.

Select Committee *appointed,* "to inquire into the constitution and operations of certain trading societies, trading under the name of Co-operative Stores, and to ascertain whether they are exempted from taxes and imposts to which the trading community are liable."—(*Sir Charles Russell.*)

MUTINY ACT (TEMPORARY) CONTINUANCE BILL.

Resolution [4th March] read;

"That a number of Land Forces, not exceeding 135,625, all ranks, be maintained for the Service of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, at Home and Abroad, excluding Her Majesty's Indian Possessions, during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1880."

On Motion of Mr. Secretary STANLEY, Bill to continue for three months the Act of the Session of the forty-first and forty-second years of the reign of Her present Majesty, chapter ten, intituled "An Act for punishing Mutiny and Desertion, and for the better payment of the Army and their quarters," *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. Secretary STANLEY, The JUDGE ADVOCATE, and Colonel LOYD LINDSAY.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 99.]

MARINE MUTINY ACT (TEMPORARY) CONTINUANCE BILL.

On Motion of Mr. WILLIAM HENRY SMITH, Bill to continue for three months the Act of the Session of the forty-first and forty-second years of the reign of Her present Majesty, chapter eleven, intituled "An Act for the Regulation of Her Majesty's Royal Marine Forces while on Shore," *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. WILLIAM HENRY SMITH, Mr. ALGERNON EGERTON, and Sir MASSEY LOPES.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 98.]

House adjourned at
Two o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Wednesday, 12th March, 1879.

MINUTES.] — SELECT COMMITTEE—Commons, *nominated.*

First Report—Public Accounts [No. 96].

PRIVATE BILLS (*by Order*)—*Second Reading*—*Referred to Select Committee* — East Indian Railway.

Withdrawn—Cambridge Tramways (No. 2) *.

PUBLIC BILLS — *Ordered* — *First Reading*—Supreme Court of Judicature (District Courts) * [100].

Second Reading—Medical Act (1858) Amendment [2], *debate adjourned;* Clerical Disabilities [18], *put off;* Petty Customs (Scotland) Abolition Act Amendment * [91]; Mutiny Act (Temporary) Continuance * [99].

Third Reading — Habitual Drunkards * [47]; Friendly Societies Act (1875) Amendment * [85]; Registration of Births, Deaths, and Marriages (Army) * [95], and *passed.*

ORDERS OF THE DAY.

MEDICAL ACT (1858) AMENDMENT BILL.—[BILL 2.]

(*Dr. Lush, Sir Trevor Lawrence, Sir Joseph M'Kenna.*)

SECOND READING.

Order for Second Reading read.

DR. LUSH, in moving that the Bill be now read a second time, said, that since he had introduced it circumstances had very much changed, as the Government had brought in a Bill in "another place;" but, notwithstanding that, he did not feel justified in withdrawing this Bill for the reason that there were some points dealt with by it which made it a different measure from that of the Government, which he supposed they would see in that House at no distant date. The introduction of the measure of the Government had had the effect of postponing one of the most important provisions of the Bill which he proposed, and probably it would have the effect of postponing it altogether. He understood from the statement made the other day by the noble Lord the Vice President of the Council, that the only point which the Government would agree to refer to a Select Committee was the constitution of the Medical Council, and the mode in which the Medical Profession were represented upon it. They would, he thought, have shown greater wisdom if they had made a larger concession, and consented to the whole question involved in the Bill being referred to a Select Committee, in order that this important question, which deeply affected the public, might be once for all settled on a satisfactory basis. He would just observe that he had seen in the papers that morning that a Member of the Government in high position had stated that unless the Government Bill were passed substantially as it was it would be dropped, and he regretted that such a statement should have been made public, because it might tend to prevent a settlement of the question this Session. During the past year there had been a growing feeling in favour of alteration in the law. Even the Government Bill of last year, when it was returned from the House of Lords, was not the same

Bill as was introduced by the Vice President. The Government had conceded the point that the minimum qualification of medical practitioners should be ascertained by a joint board; but the point in regard to the admission of women to the Profession was still *sub judice.* The hon. and learned Member for Dewsbury (Mr. Serjeant Simon) had given Notice of a Motion for the rejection of the Bill, having a strong feeling upon the subject. There was one important point included in his (Dr. Lush's) Bill which was not embraced in any other measure—namely, the prevention of the signature of certificates of death by unqualified persons. At present it was a common practice on the part of duly qualified medical men to sign blank forms, which were afterwards filled up by unqualified persons. Some amendment of the law in that respect was absolutely necessary for the protection of the public. Again, by a recent Act, no person was allowed to open a shop for the sale of drugs unless he had a special licence or certificate from the Pharmaceutical Society. He could not see why there should not be a similar law in relation to the Medical Profession. Before a man practised medicine, he should be required to give proof to a competent body that his education in surgery and medicine was such as to justify the confidence of the public in his qualifications. Turning to the constitution and functions of the Medical Council, he maintained that the representation of the Profession in that body was now inadequate and unsatisfactory. It no doubt consisted of very able men; but, as a matter of fact, it had become a lesser Parliament, and practical work was sacrificed for ornate eloquence. The members of the Profession had paid the Council something like £200,000 in the shape of fines, and they had got very little in return for their money. He had no objection personally to the members of the Council; but he submitted that they did not perform their duties satisfactorily. If the whole question embraced in this Bill, together with the Bills of the hon. Member for Exeter and other hon. Members, was referred to a Select Committee, carefully chosen so as to be capable of examining the subject without partizanship or bias, a just and proper solution might be arrived at. He begged to move the second reading of the Bill.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."—(*Dr. Lush.*)

Mr. Serjeant SIMON, in moving an Amendment that the Bill be read a second time that day six months, said, he did so purely upon public grounds, and if his hon. Friend had accepted certain Amendments which he had suggested he would not have opposed the Bill. Indeed, if it were the general wish of the House to refer the Bill, along with others, to a Select Committee, he should not be disposed to press his opposition. His hon. Friend (Dr. Lush) had said that the Bill was designed to meet a growing wish and a growing feeling on the part of the public; but he (Mr. Serjeant Simon) would be glad to know how his hon. Friend was justified in saying that, for he was at a loss to see that there was any growing wish or feeling in the country for the measure. If there had been a growing wish or desire for it, as had been alleged, the fact would have been indicated to the House by the presentation of Petitions; whereas the only Petition on the subject was the Petition just presented by the Attorney General for Ireland, and that was against the Bill. His hon. Friend complained that the Council had received £200,000 in the way of fines from the members of the Medical Profession, and he seemed to think that there ought to be some return for these fines in the way of protection to the Profession. He protested against the idea that there ought to be special protection for any Profession. It was too late in the day to attempt to re-enact such a principle. It had been long repudiated both in commerce and in other avocations of life. He did not deny the right of Parliament to prescribe a standard of qualification for the Medical, as well as for other Professions, but they ought not to protect any special interest—their duty being to protect the public, and the public only. This Bill was clearly not introduced in the interest of the public, but in the interest of a Profession, and at the instance of a narrow section. He did not see why only qualified persons should be allowed to give certificates of death. But by this Bill, if a man did not believe in the present principles of medical practice, he would be acting illegally in being attended by anyone not a member of the Profession, and if the patient should die the certificate of such a person would not be valid, and without a certificate the man could not be buried until an inquest had been held. A few years ago a dead set was made against the homœopathists; but notwithstanding the persecution to which it had been subjected, and the opposition and prejudice which it had to encounter, homœopathy had made great way, and had effected a remarkable change in the practice of medicine. It had been proved that those strong doses of purgatives which used to be given under the old system were positively injurious, and the most eminent medical men were content to use drugs sparingly, and to leave nature mostly to effect the cure. If he objected to be dosed with mineral poisons and preferred to go to a herbalist, he wanted to know what right Parliament had to stand in the way? Suppose he broke a leg, or dislocated a limb, and he went to a bone-setter who had done wonderful things, what right had Parliament to interfere and say that he should not? This was what this Bill asked Parliament to do. He contended that if he preferred to call in a blacksmith to attend him, Parliament had no right whatever to interfere. Under this Bill it would be made penal for any man to assume a title that would imply that he was a legally qualified practitioner. If that were all, he should not object; but it was proposed that anyone not being a legally qualified medical practitioner should, if he practised any branch of medicine or surgery for gain, be subject to a fine of £20. By that section the public would be deeply injured. The herbalists had a standard of qualification among themselves in order to prevent incompetent persons from being employed by the public, and he urged that they had earned a title to be allowed to practise for profit, and to grant certificates in cases of death. A large number of the working classes and friendly societies did not believe in medical men; but they did believe in herbalists. [*A laugh.*] The way to meet an argument was not by a laugh. In these matters experience was the only test. Friends of his own had gone to a herbalist after having tried members of the Medical Profession in vain, and to a bone-setter after trying a surgeon. With that knowledge, he did not feel that he ought to allow the Bill to pass without protest. There was another point. The prevention of anyone but a duly qualified practitioner giving a certificate of death amounted to saying that a man should not be attended by a herbalist in illness, as he might die, and no certificate would be given of his death. The measure was a mischievous one. It asked Parliament to take steps in a direction against which Parliament had for a long series of years protested; it was not asked for by the public, and it was not for the interests of the public that it should be passed. For these reasons, he felt compelled to oppose the Bill.

MR. BURT, in seconding the Motion for the rejection of the Bill, said, he opposed it entirely on public grounds. No doubt, a great deal of mischief was done by incompetent persons; and if a Bill were to be passed to exclude those, and those only, such a Bill would do great public service by checking those birds of prey that flitted about from place to place living on the gullibility of the public. But this Bill would go a great deal further than that. He was acquainted with many herbalists who had done much to benefit the community. Within a few hundred yards of his own residence in Newcastle was one who had practised for 25 years, and to whom numbers of people came because they found themselves benefited. That man was typical of thousands of others. There was no pretence for saying that there was the slightest imposition on the part of such men, or that they practised under false pretences. These men did not profess to have received a thorough medical education—in fact, many of them had never seen either the inside or the outside of a College; but they had a special aptitude for treating diseases, and having devoted a great number of years to the study of the subject were successful in doing so. People who were ill wanted to be cured, and did not care whether it was by an educated or an illiterate person. If the class of men to whom he referred were prevented from giving certificates of death, they would be prevented from practising medical treatment. He could bear his testimony to the popularity of these men with friendly societies. For these reasons, he should give his utmost opposition to the Bill.

Amendment proposed, to leave out the word "now," and at the end of the Question to add the words "upon this day six months."—(*Mr. Serjeant Simon.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question."

SIR JOSEPH M'KENNA, in supporting the second reading of the Bill, said, he could not join in the feeling of confidence in herbalists, as expressed by the Mover and Seconder of the Amendment, considering that they were not required to produce any test of competency or knowledge in medical science, or that they had been shown to have seen either the inside or the outside of a Medical College. He did not think that an ignorant man, almost *in articulo mortis*, should, on the ground that it was his own choice, be exposed to the danger of being attended by a person who had not received any medical education. The pleas put forward on behalf of the herbalist were equally applicable to the defence of those who practised charms and witchcraft, for those who were practised upon were consenting parties. This was what he would suggest. There were several Medical Bills before Parliament, and all his hon. Friend desired was that all of them should be referred to the same Select Committee, so that whatever was best in each might come again before the House on the Report of the Committee.

MR. ERRINGTON said, he defended the Bill as the only one which included in a complete form the various reforms which were necessary. It was a peg to hang inquiry upon, and therefore the House ought to give it a second reading. There was the greatest possible demand for medical reform. Some years ago a Bill was introduced by Lord Ripon which proposed to deal only with the subject of medical education; but that was only a portion of the question which this Bill raised. Lord Ripon's Bill was defeated, and Her Majesty's Government introduced what was precisely the same measure, but it also failed. As soon as the question was raised of reforming that particular portion of the medical system which those Bills dealt with, it became evident that there were many other matters which also required reform. Last year, he and others brought forward a series of Bills, hoping to get the whole question referred to a Select Committee, which would take evidence in time to obtain the views of the medical institutions, and proceed to legislation in the present Session. But the Government seemed to have come to the conclusion—first, that there was virtually only one large question requiring to be dealt with—namely, the educational portion of the system, ignoring altogether the re-organisation of the Medical Council, which was at least so much desired; and second, that the particular plan which they had adopted was not only the most satisfactory plan that could be produced, but was, in fact, the only plan. But in reality it was only one among many plans that had been suggested. It dealt in a summary way with vested interests; and the Corporations and individuals affected, when they became conscious of the immediate approach of legislation, were anxious to be heard. It would, therefore, be a great advantage to refer to the Select Committee, not the limited question suggested by the noble Lord (Lord George Hamilton), but the whole question, so as to have a complete and satisfactory settlement. It might be said that there would be great delay if such an inquiry as was asked for should be assented to. But, as there had already been so much delay, a further delay of a few months, or even a year or two, would be as nothing compared with the advantages which would result from effectually dealing with the whole matter. The question was divided into two branches, with one of which only the Government proposed to deal; and if the Government Bill were allowed to pass, while the other portion of the question were referred to a Select Committee, probably no more would be heard of it. There were many points in the Government Bill which were suited for consideration by a Select Committee, and if those points had to be considered in a Committee of the Whole House, the noble Lord opposite scarcely knew how great the delay might be. He earnestly appealed to the noble Lord to re-consider the decision which it was understood had been come to by the Government, and to allow the Reference of which he had given Notice to be enlarged so as to include the whole of the questions which had been raised. He had a Bill of his own, which represented a totally different principle from that of the Bill of

Her Majesty's Government and the Bill of his hon. Friend, and the advantage of referring all the Bills to a Select Committee would be that the various principles which they embodied would have an opportunity of being fully considered.

MR. COWPER-TEMPLE said, that the hon. Gentleman proposed by his Bill to amend the Medical Council. The Medical Council had very well and wisely fulfilled the task imposed upon them 20 years ago; they had succeeded in greatly improving both the teaching and the examination of the licensing bodies. He did not deny, however, that the constitution of the Medical Council might be improved by including representatives of all the licensing bodies. With reference to the pains and penalties inflicted on persons who might do injury to the public by their practice, he did not think the House would be prepared to prosecute herbalists, however much hon. Members objected to homœopathy. He hoped they would not agree to pass any Bill that would impede the freedom every man had of trying to get cured in the way which best suited his own notions, and that the public would not be brought by compulsion under the despotic rule of even so important a body as the Medical Profession. What was right to be done was, as indeed the law now stood, that no person who might be designated a quack was entitled to adopt any name or title which did not belong to an unauthorized and unexamined person, so that the public should clearly distinguish between those having qualifications and those who had not. He was glad to hear that it was the intention of the noble Lord to appoint a Committee which might inquire into those points of principle on which there was a difference of opinion; but he did not think it necessary to examine points of detail. A Bill had been introduced by the Government in the other House, and when it came down it would furnish them with an ample opportunity of discussing details. The result of the Committee would be a guide to the House.

DR. CAMERON strongly supported the second reading of the Bill, and maintained that the objections which had been offered to it were utterly misleading. It had been urged that it was a protective measure, intended to hedge round the privileges of the Medical Profession and curtail the liberties of other persons in the practice of herbalism, bone-setting, &c. But that was a great misapprehension. A single clause of the Bill might possibly be open to such a construction; but that clause was susceptible of different meanings, and legal Members disagreed among themselves as to what it really did mean. Certainly it was not the intention of the promoters of the Bill to curtail the freedom of trade in the practice of bone-setting or herbalism, but only to do in the Medical Profession what was done in the case of manufacturers—to institute, as it were, a system of trade marks which could be registered, and which would give the owners of the trade marks a property in them. The promoters of the Bill were not even responsible for the wording of the clause, for they had taken it from the Bill of the Government, and under any circumstances it was only a matter of detail, which could easily be modified in Committee, if necessary. Objection had also been raised to the proposal that unqualified persons should be precluded from giving certificates in case of death; but he thought that a very valuable provision. A certificate of death was not indispensable, and in Glasgow, for example, at the present moment, a large percentage of the population died and were registered without certificates, being registered as "non-certified;" and he asked what use there was in keeping up a large and expensive machinery for throwing light on the conditions of mortality, if certificates of death were to be taken from persons who might know nothing whatever about the disease that had caused the death. And there was surely no hardship involved to the relations of the deceased, if the cause of death was registered as uncertain. The great advantage which he found in the present Bill was that it was an eclectic measure. It was the best of all the Medical Bills now before the House for the purpose of reference to a Committee, because it had selected whatever was good from every other of those Bills, and consisted of a collection of all that was valuable in the Bill of the Government, in the Bill of the hon. Member for Exeter (Mr. Mills), or in the former Bills of the hon. Member for Salisbury (Dr. Lush) himself. There had been three leading proposals in regard to medical reform, and they consisted—First, of a proposed reform of the Medical Council, that great body which had the control of medical matters, and which at present consisted of the representatives of various licensing and educational medical corporations, with a few representatives nominated by the Crown. The second proposal was that instead of degrees and licences to practise medicine and surgery being granted by 19 different licensing bodies, those bodies should be grouped together and Conjoint Boards formed for examination, so as to insure greater uniformity in the qualifications demanded for the securement of degrees and licences, and to do away with the prevailing competitive under-selling of medical degrees and titles. The third proposal was for the repression of the assumption by unqualified persons of medical titles. In his opinion, the first proposition—the proposal for the reform of the Medical Council—was by far the most important. Unless they began by attempting to reform the Medical Council, everything else would be in vain. The anomalies, to remedy which medical legislation was at present demanded, need not have existed if the Medical Council had done what it had power to do. The power of conferring civil right to practise medicine and surgery had been given by the State to 19 more or less responsible bodies. Some of them granted licences in medicine, and some in surgery. Now, the separation between medicine and surgery was entirely artificial. It originated in an Edict of the Council of Tours. Previously to the 12th century, medicine and surgery were practised almost exclusively by clerics; but at the Council of Tours it was declared that the Church abhorred the shedding of blood, and the consequence was that the practice of surgery was relegated to the barbers. He did not mean to say that a man might not practise medicine or surgery as a speciality, or the medicine and surgery of some paticular organ as a speciality; but what he said was absurd was that a licence to practise medicine and surgery, such as was conferred by any registrable diploma or licence under the present law, should be granted on an examination solely, or almost solely, in one of these branches. This Bill proposed to remedy that; and the Government Bill had also a remedy for it. There would have been no necessity at all for a legislative remedy if the Medical Council had done their duty, as they should have done, and had insisted that the examinations for every registrable diploma should include both medicine and surgery. Another great evil lay in the fact that there were 19 licensing bodies, which competed with one another. It was notorious that, when a man was doubtful about passing one examination, he at once found an easier one; and in that way competition among licensing bodies was calculated to do great harm, and to lower the status of medical knowledge. But not only did they undersell each other in the ease with which they granted licences, but they also entered into competition with themselves. It might be that when an University, whose degrees held a high reputation, saw itself being undersold by another Corporation, if it had the power under its charter of inventing a new licence, it did so, and gave the new licence under easier terms. In that way, no fewer than 50 or 60 different documents were registrable. These licences and diplomas were granted after examinations conducted altogether differently, after different periods of residence, different degrees of study, and different requirements of preliminary education. Men in very high positions had again and again protested against this. If the Medical Council had done its duty under the existing law, all these discrepancies might have been done away with long ago. They had the power to call the attention of the Privy Council to the fact that this or that body was granting degrees on lower terms than was desirable, and that the Privy Council ought to interfere. To turn to the measure before the House, the Government, in their proposal, accepted the principle of a conjoint scheme. The logical basis upon which one would like to urge the proposal for a conjoint scheme would be that there should be but one Examining Board for the whole of the United Kingdom; but for convenience—and, no doubt, for the purpose of conciliating jealousies—that proposal had been departed from, and a separate Conjoint Board was proposed for each part of the United Kingdom. These Conjoint Boards were undoubtedly a step in the right direction. Why had they not had these conjoint schemes long ago? The reason was that the various licensing bodies had been unable, through jealousy, to enter into them. They had gone on competing with each other for candidates for their degrees and diplomas, and yet the Government now proposed to intrust to the representatives of these very bodies the carrying out of what constituted really the whole substance of the Government Bill. The reform should have been carried out long ago, and it was useless to pass a Bill now which would merely enable the Medical Council to do what they or their constituents should have done already. How were they to improve the Medical Council? He believed the whole voice of the Medical Profession demanded that the general body of practitioners should be represented. He believed that if they were to allow the Profession at large to send representatives to the Council, the result would be that they would introduce into it an element the object and sole interest of which would be but to raise the status of the Profession, and to carry out any needed reform without being hampered at every turn with the consideration of how it would affect the private interest of this or that Corporation. In fact, he believed that as an almost indispensable preliminary to any real reform they must commence by re-constituting and re-modelling the Medical Council. The Council was composed very often of men of very high eminence, and that was especially the case with the representatives of those bodies who were conveniently near the place where the Council sat; but as regarded bodies situated in remote parts of the country, men in active work as practitioners or professors could not find the time to come up to take part in the debates. Hence several members of the Council were gentlemen who had practically retired from active professional life, and found it almost as much as they could do to undertake the journey. Much energy could not be expected from a body so constituted. If they had, on the other hand, a Medical Council with representatives sent by the Profession at large, they would have it considered a great honour to be elected by the Profession of England, or Scotland, or Ireland, and they would have the very best men, and they would have men who were constantly in contact with the constituencies, and who knew exactly what the constituencies desired and required; and they would find that with such a body it would be possible to do a vast amount under the existing legislation—much more than, he feared, would be effected with the existing Medical Council under any legislation. He had said the proposal of Conjoint Boards was a step in the right direction; but they must be careful it did not effect some mischief. It would reduce to one level minimum the standard of medical education. On that ground, the University of Edinburgh had petitioned against the Bill, and the University of Glasgow had also expressed its hostility to it. The Conjoint Board which was to examine for the whole of the country could hardly take the highest standard; therefore, there was a considerable danger that the high standard at present exacted by some licensing authorities would be reduced. Another important detail was the system on which it was proposed to divide the fees, which under the conjoint scheme were to be paid into a common purse. There seemed to him a danger of all interest being taken away on the part of the licensing authorities, who would find it much simpler to give their degrees and take their share of the proceeds; and unless they proceeded very carefully and knew what they were about a tendency to lower the standard must be apprehended. Again, a large number of men became licentiates of the London College of Surgeons, for example, and then went to Scotland, and took a medical degree at one of the Scotch Universities. The benefit of studying medicine in more than one place was very great, for the reason that instead of a man being sent forth to practise when indoctrinated with the crotchets of one set of teachers, he saw what was common to various sets of teachers, and what was exceptional to each, and, therefore, was better fitted for this work than if his education was limited to the teachings and crotchets of only one school; but no doubt the present Bill would discourage such migrations, and a man would be almost compelled to take his qualifications from the medical authorities of his own particular portion of the country, whether England, Ireland, or Scotland. Then there was the question of the Branch Councils of the three Kingdoms being allowed to make special rules; for what was to prevent these conglomerations of corporations from competing with each other in a degrading sense as to facility of examination? Still, he thought the Bill now before the House was the best of all those before Parliament, so far as its principle was concerned, inasmuch as it embraced everything that was important in all the other Bills; and under these circumstances, he should give his hearty support to the second reading, on the understanding that it was to be referred to a Select Committee. Of this he was convinced, that to intrust the task of medical reform to the Medical Council, as at present constituted—a body which had for 20 years neglected to exercise those powers which it possessed—would be as unsatisfactory as the experiment of putting new wine in old bottles. The first thing to be done, therefore, was to impart some vitality into the Medical Council, as was proposed by this Bill.

Dr. O'LEARY said, the debate was almost as lively as one he remembered hearing in that House on the subject of hypothec. He did not agree with the details of the Bill, but he fully concurred in the principle of it. In England there were certain bodies giving licences to practise surgery; and in Ireland and Scotland it was the same; but while in Dublin and London the fees were nearly equal, they were very much lower in many Colleges in Scotland, and, besides that, there was a difference in the number of years of study, so that, on the whole, there was a great discrepancy between arriving at the Medical Profession in Scotland and in England and Ireland. The scheme before the House was intended to put all the bodies on an equal footing, so that all medical men should possess the same qualification; but the Bill did not carry that intention out, and failed miserably and lamentably in the attempt. A meeting of the College of Surgeons in Ireland had been held a few days ago; but they had not had time to urge their very strong objections to the scheme, and had authorized him specially to speak in their name on the subject. The Irish College of Surgeons and College of Physicians differed essentially from the same bodies in England. In the latter country they had large endowments, direct and indirect, sufficient to enable them to maintain their museums, but in Ireland they had no such endowments; no private money had been left to them, and the consequence was that one of the most magnificent museums in the world—the surgical museum which existed in Dublin—had to be maintained by the savings out of fees for the examination of the students. By the present scheme that fund was abolished, so that there would not be sufficient to pay the rent and taxes of the College, or the curator, and the library would have to be closed. It was very difficult for Members to appreciate the technical details of a conjoint scheme of examination, and he thought the Bill should be read a second time, in order to refer it to a Select Committee, which was the only possible way in which the subject could be dealt with. Reference had been made to the herbalists, but the Bill said nothing about them, unless they happened to be dealt with in the class of unqualified persons who assumed the title of doctor, physician, apothecary, or surgeon. A great majority of the cures effected by those men was the result of the confidence of the patients, and he would not duly tolerate, but would protect that class. He sympathized with them, and with the poor people who believed in them; and he repudiated, for his own part, any narrow feelings against such men, who did a great deal of good. Of course, a higher state of medical science now prevailed than there did 40 years ago, and greater advances had been made in that time than in the previous 1,500 years. In 1834, when a conflict arose in the House between the real practitioners and herbalists, and others, a Select Committee was appointed, in the face of the difficulty, and there was far greater reason now for a similar course being adopted. He appealed now to those in power not to object to the second reading of the Bill, with the distinct understanding that it be referred to a Select Committee. He would not vote for the Bill as it stood, for it was imperfect; but on the pure ground of referring it to a Select Committee he would support its second reading, and he considered the Government ought to do the same, or make some alternative proposal of their own on the subject.

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON said, the hon. Member for Glasgow (Dr. Cameron) had made out a clear case why pressure should be brought to bear upon the Medical Council to induce them to improve the education of medical students and raise the standard of examination. He had also stated with ability and clearness the faults of the present system, which promoted competition between the different licensing bodies and lowered the standard of examination. During last year the Lord President of the Council and himself were in consultation with the Medical Council and the various licensing bodies, and also received communications from persons outside these bodies on this subject. The general result was in the direction of the proposals contained in the Bill which the Lord President introduced into the House of Lords some time back. There was also the Bill of the hon. Member for Exeter (Mr. Mills) down for second reading this day, and they had also the fresh Bill—one by the hon. Member for Salisbury (Dr. Lush). These three Bills were almost identical in respect to the proposals for insuring greater uniformity in the examinations, and a more correct registration of the persons who passed them. But there was one subject which the measure of the Government did not take up that the Bills of his hon. Friends proposed to deal with, and that was the reform of the Medical Council. On this matter the Government had always used the same language. That body was composed of most eminent men. In fact, it would be difficult to select gentlemen more widely known, both for their ability and their great practice, than those who held seats on that Board; but there were, no doubt, many who thought that the Medical Council had sometimes been somewhat in error. There were, no doubt, those who thought that some of its members had not always been as active as they might have been; but, if that were so, he believed their inactivity would be found to be due to the difficult circumstances with which they had to contend. The Government had looked over the names of those who composed the Medical Council; and they did not feel justified in proposing in their Bill any alteration in the existing constitution of that body. Still, as there was a strong wish, both in the Profession and outside it, that that question should be considered this year, the Lord President had no objection to the appointment of a Committee to investigate the subject, and to decide as to whether any measures were necessary for the reform of the Council. He had abstained from putting a Notice on the Paper for the appointment of a Committee until Monday last, in order not to prejudice the discussion of that day. There was a strong reason for referring only a part of the subject to the Committee. There was a consensus of opinion about educational reform; but if that were referred to the Committee, it would probably be unable to report in time for legislation this Session, unless it merely went through the clauses of the Bill and suggested changes which would not obviate subsequent discussion in the House. It was a question on which the Government ought to legislate, if possible; and though, under ordinary circumstances, a few months might be a matter of small importance, account must be taken of the length of the existence of the present Parliament; for if they did not succeed in passing a Bill this Session, there was little prospect of one being passed during the life of the present Parliament. If a Select Committee made a full inquiry and Report, the next Parliament would, perhaps, not be satisfied with it, and everything would have to be done over again. He should be very reluctant to oppose the second reading of the Bill now before the House. At the same time, he must point out that it embodied the principle that the Medical Council must be reformed, that members of the Profession outside must be directly represented upon it, and that that object must be achieved by diminishing and curtailing the amount of representation at present enjoyed by the Medical Corporations. Anyone who had been long in the House knew how strong—he did not say, too strong—all vested interests were, and he believed that if the Government were to consent to the second reading of the Bill which was at present under discussion they would arouse such a spirit of opposition as would, in all probability, prevent their legislating this Session. Under these circumstances, the course he would suggest to the hon. Member for Salisbury (Dr. Lush) was that he should, with the leave of the House, consent to the adjournment of the debate. If his suggestion were adopted, he would undertake to-morrow to move the appointment of a Committee to inquire into the constitution of the Medical Council. That Committee would, no doubt, report within a short time, and its recommendations might be embodied in the Government Bill which was to come down from the other House. He would undertake that the Government Bill should not be received in that House until the Committee had reported. By the adoption of this proposal he believed legislation on the subject would be materially facilitated, and that it would also be rendered more complete and thorough than it would otherwise be. If the hon. Member would not adopt this course, he (Lord George Hamilton) feared that he must vote for the Amendment of the hon. and learned Member for Dewsbury (Mr. Serjeant Simon), which he did not wish to do, as he had no sympathy with the hon. and learned Member's argument. The hon. and learned Member had misapprehended the intentions of the Bill. There was nothing in it to prevent him, if he broke his leg, calling in a blacksmith to set it. It only provided that the blacksmith should not add such a designation to his name as would make people believe him qualified to practise surgery. To refer all three Bills on the Paper to a Select Committee would simply, in his opinion, be a waste of time. On the part of the Government, he had to say that they had endeavoured to give due weight to the interests of the public on the one hand, and to the wishes of the Medical Council on the other, and that their measure would be found to contain, at all events, the groundwork of a reform, the necessity for which had been felt for some time past.

Mr. LYON PLAYFAIR said, the discussion had ranged into the whole question of medical reform; but the House was not in the position to enter into any such discussion with advantage, and he, therefore, did not intend to weary the House by going over the same ground. Let hon. Members consider the position they were in. They had on the Orders of the Day three Bills on this subject, and they knew there was a Government Bill travelling down to them from "another place," which must give rise to a discussion upon the whole question. To-morrow the question of the constitution of the Medical Council might come before the House on the proposal of the noble Lord. He reserved what he had to say of the general subject of medical reform till the serious battle that would come on when the Government Bill was presented to them. The Rules of the House, indeed, prevented them alluding to any Bill except that of the hon. Member for Salisbury (Dr. Lush). This Bill certainly covered the whole ground—for, first, it profoundly changed the constitution of the Medical Council; then, it provided for Conjoint Boards of Examination; and, finally, for the registration of qualified practitioners. To the construction of the Medical Council his hon. Friend attached the greatest importance. He (Mr. Lyon Playfair) had tried to discover a principle in his plan, but in vain. Did he represent institutions and corporations in proportion to the great medical schools, or to the number of licences or graduates? Certainly neither of these principles was involved. The great medical school of the University of Edinburgh—probably the most important professional school in the world—had 1,200 students, and produced as graduates in medicine a large number of most qualified practitioners. But by the Bill it was only to have one-fourth of a member in the Medical Council, whilst the University of London, producing only 20 or 30 graduates, and teaching no students, was to have one member to itself. Indeed, such medical corporations of secondary rank as the Apothecaries' Company and the College of Surgeons of Glasgow were each to have a member of the Medical Council, while the Universities of Scotland, which last year produced 210 graduates, were only to have one member for the whole four. He did not agree with his hon. Friend about the uselessness of the Medical Council. He (Mr. Lyon Playfair) had been a medical examiner for many years, and he knew that the Medical Council had done admirable work in improving medical education, and raising the standard of examination. At the same time, he admitted that there was a strong desire on the part of the Medical Profession to have direct representation on the Council, and with this view he had considerable sympathy. But his hon. Friend forced every University Member in the House to vote against the second reading of a Bill in which the principle of direct representation was involved. He could not be surprised at this, when he considered what was the main danger of examination by a Conjoint Board. Such examination must always represent a minimum amount of knowledge. Suppose it represented a maximum, like the examination of the University of London. The result would be that only 20 or 30 medical practitioners could be licensed in a year to supply the waste by death and wear and tear of the Medical Profession. Unquestionably, a uniform pass must be on a minimum standard of knowledge and skill. The Universities were expected to counteract this tendency, and to keep up the qualifications of medical men by elevating their standards for degrees, so as to induce men of talent to add them to the lower pass examination. But while the Universities of the United Kingdom were expected to serve this important purpose, his hon. Friend proposed to degrade them in public estimation by giving to them only a small fractional representation on the Medical Council. The debate to-day was on a false issue. He was prepared, when the Government Bill came down, to discuss it fully on its own merits, and for this purpose the three Bills now before the House would be very useful to enable them to examine the whole issues involved. He trusted, therefore, that his hon. Friend would consent to the adjournment of the debate. The whole question of medical reform was vastly important to the community at large, and should receive long and full discussion before the House. The proposed Committee on the constitution of the Council was only one part of the subject, and they should not be called upon to consider the Government Bill until the Report of the Committee was in their hands. He understood that the noble Lord promised the House that he would postpone the Bill until the whole question could be discussed on its merits. This would give ample time to the various bodies interested in the changes contemplated to represent their views on the main question, for they did not feel called upon to do so on the side issue of this Bill.

MR. MOWBRAY joined in the remonstrance of the right hon. Gentleman against the way in which it was proposed to deal with the Medical Council by the Bill, and said he trusted the hon. Member would not attempt to force a Division to-day. He altogether objected to the joining together of the Universities of Oxford, Cambridge, and Durham for the purpose of electing a member on the Council. Oxford and Cambridge were only a short distance from London, and, as a matter of fact, the delegates from these were among the most regular and attentive members. Moreover, he thought there was a great advantage in having on the Council men who were not taken from the actual ranks of a busy Profession, but who came from the Universities. If the hon. Member proceeded with the Bill, he should feel obliged to give his most strenuous opposition to those parts of it which dealt with the constitution of the Medical Council.

MR. PLUNKET expressed a hope that the hon. Member for Salisbury would accept the advice which had been given, and consent to the adjournment of the debate, otherwise he should certainly feel bound to oppose the Bill, which he considered was crudely and hastily drawn. He complained that the University of Dublin and the Queen's College, which had been soldered together in the Bill, were not properly treated. It was stated in one of the clauses that they should be represented by one person collectively; but no provision was made for the case of these bodies disagreeing in their choice. The College of Physicians and the Apothecaries' Hall were also joined together to elect a collective representative respectively, and that was scarcely an intelligible way of dealing with such an important question.

MR. MITCHELL HENRY said, he thought the proposal of the noble Lord was most practical. The two subjects dealt with in the Bill—the examination of candidates and the constitution of the Medical Council—were totally and entirely distinct, and he advised the hon. Member for Salisbury to accept the suggestion of a Select Committee. The great improvement which had recently taken place in all departments of the Medical Profession had not been owing to the Council, which had done little besides forming a register of practitioners. It seemed to him that when medical reform was taken seriously in hand it would not be at all necessary to continue this great, unwieldy, and expensive Council. It was too much to expect the Medical Profession to continue to pay these large fees for the expenses of the Council. When the Government Bill came down, and if a well-selected Committee were appointed, he imagined that some facts would be produced which would modify the opinion of the House of Commons as to the question of continuing that body in its present condition. There was no doubt that the variety of entrance examinations had been a great advantage to the Profession; but if Corporations which had hitherto opposed each other, and refused under any circumstances to adopt this conjoint scheme, continued their unwillingness, because it would interfere with their emoluments, he did not see why, with any efficient examination, the Council should be kept up. He did not think fees should be altogether diverted into a common fund; for if they were, many valuable collections and museums would be lost, but he had a very strong sympathy with those who objected to the enormous tax put on the Profession by keeping up the Council. When once there was a scheme of examination, properly supervised, there would be no necessity for anything but a small Council, the Members of which should be frequently changed, for it was not at all necessary that the Universities and Corporations should all be represented at the same time on the Council. If the proposal for a Select Committee was not accepted, there would be no legislation on medical reforms this year; and if the House continued next year there was little hope of the subject being taken up by a moribund Parliament.

Mr. BERESFORD HOPE, as Representative of the University of Cambridge, did not like to appear indifferent on this subject. He thought the hon. Member had failed in his Bill to grasp the *raison d'être* of the separate representation of the Medical Council of the various Universities. There was an impression in unenlightened places that one University was very much like another; but the hon. Member for Salisbury could not have fallen into that error. Each University had a distinctive teaching of its own, which was a valuable contribuent to what ought to be a union of deliberative strength. Without disrespect, also, to the University of Durham, he could say that it was not so old, large, or influential as those of Oxford and Cambridge, and that afforded another reason why it was a decidedly unsatisfactory arrangement that all three of them should be equally joined together for the purpose of representation on the Medical Council. Such a proposal was about as reasonable as would be a proposal, in a Bill for the re-distribution of seats, to give one Member to the two cities of Salisbury and Durham.

Dr. LUSH acknowledged the courtesy with which his proposals had been received. He must, however, deny that he had any wish to establish trade unionism in the Medical Profession. He might also be permitted to state that the ridicule of the Bill by the hon. and learned Member for Dublin University (Mr. Plunket) was founded upon a misprint. As advised, he was quite willing to accept the assurance that the Government Bill would not be proceeded with until the House had before it the recommendations of the Select Committee which the noble Lord proposed to have appointed. He, however, trusted that the noble Lord would consent to enlarge the scope of the Committee so as to include the question involved in his Bill.

Dr. BRADY moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Debate be now adjourned."—(*Dr. Brady.*)

Motion *agreed to.*

Debate *adjourned* till *Wednesday* 26th March.

CLERICAL DISABILITIES BILL.

(*Mr. Goldney, Mr. Hibbert, Sir Windham Anstruther.*)

[BILL 18.] SECOND READING.

Order for Second Reading read.

Mr. GOLDNEY, in moving that the Bill be now read a second time, said, he would not at that late hour (a quarter to 5 o'clock), for an obvious reason, occupy the attention of the House for more than a very few minutes. The object of the Bill was to amend, by extending the principle of the Act of 1870, which had been as a Bill introduced by his hon. Friend the Member for Oldham (Mr. Hibbert). He would remind the House that, previous to the passing of the Act of 1801, which was popularly known as Horne Tooke's Act, the Clergy were not debarred of the privilege of sitting as Members of the House of Commons. They had in the reign of Charles II. surrendered their right of taxing themselves in Convocation, and thereby becoming, as they did, subject to the liabilities of all other members of the community as regarded the public burdens, they were accorded the right of choosing Members of Parliament to represent them, and, with that right, of becoming Members of Parliament themselves. The latter privilege was questioned in the year 1785, when Mr. Rushworth, a clerk in Holy Orders, was returned for Newport, Isle of Wight. The objection to the return was that Mr. Rushworth was a clergyman; but a Committee of the House of Commons reported that he was duly elected. So the law remained till the year 1801, when Mr. Horne Tooke was elected for Old Sarum, and the validity of his return was questioned on the alleged ground that he was a clerk in Holy Orders, and that clergymen might resume the right to tax themselves in Convocation. It was well known, however, that the real objection to Mr. Horne Tooke was that he was a strong adherent to the Opposition and a strong opponent of the Government of the day, and the result was the passing of an Act excluding clerks in Holy Orders from the privilege of becoming Members of Parliament. That it was a personal Act was shown from the fact, among others, that it was universally known as Horne Tooke's Act. Between 1801 and 1870 nothing was done to remove the disability; but in the latter year the hon. Member for Oldham passed a measure, which to a certain degree placed the Clergy in the same position as other members of the community, provided they voluntarily relinquished their office as ministers of the Church. He did not see why the same privilege should not be extended to Clergymen, who, while they renounced all preferment in the Church, retained the right to occasionally discharge their sacred functions, and who discharged all the duties of citizenship. The Bill would, in fact, be applicable only to those who from conscientious scruples did not wish to hold their benefices, but yet were not prepared altogether to divest themselves of their sacred functions. Under the Irish Church Act, clergymen of the Disestablished Church were eligible to become Members of that House, and he trusted that the House would agree to the extension of the principle of the Act of 1870, which the Bill would sanction, and to which his hon. Friend the Member for the University of Cambridge (Mr. Beresford Hope) had expressed himself favourable during the debates which were held in reference to that Act.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."—(*Mr. Goldney.*)

MR. BERESFORD HOPE, in moving that the Bill be read a second time that day six months, pointed out that the present state of things was very different from that which prevailed when the Act of 1870, to which his hon. Friend had referred, was passed, and when he himself had made the speech in question. The absolute inability of clergymen to sit as Members of Parliament was then the law; but under the Bill of the hon. Member for Oldham, which thus passed into law, a clerk in Holy Orders who, so to say, unfrocked himself, became entitled, like any layman, to seek a seat in Parliament. As it left the House of Commons, it embodied a machinery for clergymen who had availed themselves of its provisions to abandon their new civil privileges and to resume their sacred character, which was, to his great regret, struck out in the House of Lords. The very last Division of the Session was an unavailing effort of his own to re-instate it. He did not pretend to like the measure in any shape, but this recognition of the enduring character of Orders was a mitigation of its other provisions; and he was bound to thank his hon. Friend the Member for Oldham for the friendly spirit with which he accepted its being put in the Bill. In all which he himself said at the time, he concluded that this provision would in some shape or other be retained. Such, however, did not prove to be the case; and now this anomalous capricious Bill of his hon. Friend the Member for Chippenham (Mr. Goldney) contained no such provision. The state of things had been entirely altered now that the Act of 1870 in its latter shape had become law; and the passing of the present Bill would, he believed, not only not mitigate a grievance which he found in their present circumstances, but would considerably aggravate it. As the law stood, the clergyman who desired to come into Parliament had to renounce the outward exercise of his clerical office; but the present Bill would extend to him that privilege, provided only he engaged to hold no preferment. But under the present Bill the occasional performance of the services of the Church would not be a disqualification to sit in Parliament. Indeed, if it passed, they could hear with great benefit the Chaplain of Mr. Speaker read prayers before the Business of the evening commenced, and hear the same reverend gentleman, he had no doubt with great pleasure and advantage, dilating upon a political subject. It would allow a clergyman on Sunday to defend his speeches by his sermon, and during the week to defend his sermon by his speeches. The reverend Member of Parliament would be absolved from the painful sobering work by the beds of the sick and wretched, which made up the round of pastoral duty to the vicar and his curate; but the enjoyments of the sacred profession would still be his. He would still be eligible to take part in musical Church service, to display his reading of the ornate Rubric, and have the pleasure of listening to his own voice in the pulpit, even in these days of depression, when no constituency would lend its ears to his charming. Let the House have a care lest it should, by passing the Bill, create a, so to say, *dilettante* class of clergymen, always in unrest, always dreaming that their eloquence was wasted in the pulpit, but would be productive of great public advantage if heard in the House of Commons in reference to some Bill on a Wednesday or to some Motion on Friday. He believed that if the measure were passed, it would introduce a fresh source of strife into the Church; for, instead of adding to the elasticity on which so much of the good working of the Church depended, the effect would be to substitute a rigid system of repression and suspicion. As things were, nothing could be more precise than the law which compelled the clergyman who acted as a curate to do so with the Bishop's formal licence; while, on the other hand, nothing could be more liberal or sensible than the manner in which this provision was in practice relaxed. But if this Bill passed, such relaxation would become impossible, for the Bishop could not tell whether the virtual curate might not expand into an epicure statesman. It would lead to a disturbance and dislocation of things all round. He was surprised to hear the assertion that a clergyman of the Disestablished Church of Ireland was eligible for a seat in that House, any more than the Clergy of the Church of Rome, or the ministers of the Scotch Episcopalian Church, and of the Scotch Established Church, were. No such right had been claimed, and he believed no such right existed. If the disabilities were removed from one class of clergyman, as this Bill contemplated, they ought to be removed from the other. The irregular curate had no right to shoulder out the regular curate, nor either of them to slip in before their rector; while it would be against all equity to create a privilege for the Clergy of the Church of England which was refused to those of the Church of Rome. If at last they saw a Bishop's Bench in this House, it would be the legitimate result of the hon. Member for Chippenham's action. By the passing of the Bill the Clergy would be divided into political and non-political representatives of their order. That would be a very undesirable state of things, and he hoped the House would support the Amendment he now moved—namely, that the Bill be read a second time that day six months.

Amendment proposed, to leave out the word "now," and at the end of the Question to add the words "upon this day six months."—(*Mr. Beresford Hope.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question."

Mr. HIBBERT thought the hon. Member for Cambridge University (Mr. Beresford Hope) was very hard to please. The hon. Gentleman had objected to the measure of 1870, because it would not enable a clergyman to enter the House without divesting himself of his clerical robes; and now, when a Bill was introduced which did propose to do that, he still objected. It was very little this Bill proposed to do; it was but very few persons it would ever admit to the House. If the proposal, however, was a just one, there was no reason why it should not become law. He did not look upon the measure as being at all antagonistic to the spirit of the Act of 1870, which he had the honour of introducing to the House. It was in his view, however, a step in advance, and he should therefore support it. It would allow a clergyman to sit in the House without having unfrocked himself and become a layman. Lay Members of the House could preach occasionally if they pleased, and he saw no reason why clergymen should not sit in the House if, during the time of their occupying the position of a Member of the House, they gave up their preferments. The presence of clergymen in the House would add much to the intelligence of the debates on county and local matters, and he saw no reason why the constituencies should be debarred from selecting their representatives from the most intelligent class of the community. To fight against the proposal of the hon. Member for Chippenham (Mr. Goldney) would be to fight against a shadow, and he hoped the Bill would be allowed to pass.

Admiral Sir WILLIAM EDMONSTONE seconded the Amendment. He said, he should not have done so if it were not for the fact that the proposition was so objectionable to his mind, that he did not feel justified in giving a silent vote. He had been asked by a friend—"What have the parsons done to you, that you wish to keep them out of the House?" It was quite the other way. He had so strong a regard for the sacred character of a clergyman, that he should be extremely sorry to see him brought from the Church to take part in the proceedings of the House of Commons. The possibility of a clergyman administering the holy rites of religion to him one day, and then making his appearance on the floor of the House of Commons the next, was utterly repugnant to his feelings. It was quite enough that he should hear his clergyman in the pulpit without hearing him there. The hon. Member for Oldham (Mr. Hibbert) had referred to the possibility of a Dissenting minister sitting in the House and preaching out-of-doors as well. That might be so; but it was no justification for the present proposition, nor was he (Sir William Edmonstone) influenced by the consideration also mentioned by the hon. Member, that Clergymen in Lancashire took an active and important part in the management of the county business. He felt that they had no right to sit in that House. He hoped they would never be allowed to do so, and he should certainly do his utmost to keep them out.

Mr. NEWDEGATE believed there was only one person actively stirring in this matter, and was sorry to say this was a Friend of his. He regretted, on this account, that he felt obliged to oppose the Bill; but no consideration of friendship would induce him to fail in opposing a Bill which involved so large a principle. The Bill itself was in very few words, but its principle was a very comprehensive one. Under the Act, passed through the House of Commons by the hon. Member for Oldham, but altered by the House of Lords in 1870, it was perfectly competent for a gentleman in Holy Orders to become a Member of the House of Commons, by absolving himself from the obligation of those Orders; but the proposal of this Bill was to retain that obligation—so that, under this Bill, Members might be returned to this House fettered by Orders and their inherent obligation of obedience to the higher officers of the Church; future Members of the House might, and probably would, if this Bill were to pass, occupy seats in that House on terms different from those upon which other Members, who were free from any such obligations, sat in that House. This would be importing Clerical Orders, and the obedience they entailed, into the House of Commons. Let the House look at this question from another point of view. Reference had been made to the fact of Bishops sitting in the House of Lords. The Bishops sat in the House of Lords by virtue of their baronies, which were, in principle, equivalent to the benefices held by the priests of the Church of England. The House was, by this Bill, asked to treat the holding of benefices as a disqualification, which, as a qualification, were equivalent—though neither in rank they would confer, nor in value, yet, still, in principle, equivalent—to the qualification by which Bishops sat in the House of Lords. But the two cases were entirely different. By the constitution of the House of Lords, the fact of being in Orders was not a disqualification; whereas the House of Commons had, by repeated decisions, held that it was inconsistent with the constitution of that House, in which they had no Bishops, inconsistent with the equal freedom of those admitted to it, that any man claiming to remain under the obligation of Orders should be admitted to a seat in that House. The principle upon which Parliament with respect to that House had invariably acted was, he believed, a sound principle. Parliament had, by the Act of 1870, afforded to any clergyman, who chose to avail himself of it, the opportunity of taking his seat in the House of Commons by repudiating the obligation of his Orders; and if a man said, "I will not repudiate the obligation of his Orders," by refusing to avail himself of this provision of the Act of 1870, the person interested raised up against himself a barrier, which had always been held sufficient to exclude from a seat in the House of Commons, even before the case of Mr. Horne Tooke, who was enabled to take his seat through an uncertainty in the terms of the Statute used to express the law. An Act was passed in consequence, which still declared the law. There was another point. No person, being a Noncomformist minister, was thereby disqualified from sitting as a Member of the House of Commons—and very justly; because not one of the Protestant denominations held the indelibility of Orders. It was otherwise with the Church of England, and otherwise with the Church of Rome. In both cases, the vast majority of the Clergy held that their Orders were indelible—that the obligation to obedience under the Orders of their Church was life-long. If clergymen of the Church of England were to be allowed, on the terms proposed in the Bill, to sit in the House of Commons, there could be no reason why priests of the Church of Rome should not also have the same right to be elected and to sit. He thought the Clergy of the Church of England were right in holding, as the majority of them did, that they were bound to obedience during life; and if they acted consistently with the doctrines and constitution of their Church, the priests of the Church of Rome were still more stringently bound for life also. That being so, he regretted that any attempt should have been made to enforce the admission of clergymen to the House, in spite of this life-long obligation under their Orders. Prizing, as he did, the character of this House, and the freedom of its Members under the law, subject only to the obligation of loyalty to the Sovereign, but free in other respects to exercise their judgment, and speak their minds without other restraints than those imposed by the House itself, he should heartily vote against the Bill, as being thoroughly inconsistent with the principles of the constitution of the House.

Mr. Goldney having briefly replied,

Mr. ASSHETON CROSS said, he deeply regretted that he could not support the Bill of his hon. Friend the Member for Chippenham. He could not help thinking that if clergymen wished to come into Parliament, they ought to do so by means of the Act which had already been passed. There was, so far as he could see, no sufficient reason for passing the Bill; and, on the other hand, he thought it was fraught with much of difficulty and danger. ["Divide, divide!"]

Sir JOSEPH M'KENNA said, after what had fallen from the Home Secretary, hon. Gentlemen might rest assured he would not talk out the Bill; he would only say a few words. The Act which had enabled clergymen of the Church of England to divest themselves of Holy Orders went very far; but this Bill proposed to do what was far worse, by permitting clergymen to retain their sacred character and to engage in utterly incompatible pursuits. He looked upon the measure as one fraught with great danger to society, and one which ought not to have been sprung upon them at the end of a Morning Sitting.

Question put.

The House *divided*:—Ayes 66; Noes 135: Majority 69.—(Div. List, No. 42.)

Words *added.*

Main Question, as amended, put, and *agreed to.*

Second Reading *put off* for six months.

MOTIONS.

COMMONS.

Select Committee on Commons *nominated*:—Mr. Spencer Walpole, Mr. Leveson Gower, Sir Walter Barttelot, Mr. Fawcett, Mr. Pell, Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice, and Five by the Committee of Selection:—Power to send for persons, papers, and records; Five to be the quorum.

SUPREME COURT OF JUDICATURE (DISTRICT COURTS) BILL.

On Motion of Mr. JOSEPH COWEN, Bill to amend and extend the Supreme Court of Judicature Acts 1873 and 1875, and to make provision for the better local administration of justice, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. JOSEPH COWEN, Mr. RIPLEY, Mr. EUSTACE SMITH, and Mr. ROWLEY HILL.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 100.]

House adjourned at five minutes before Six o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Thursday, 13*th March*, 1879.

MINUTES.] — REPRESENTATIVE PEER FOR SCOTLAND—Earl of Dundonald, *v.* Earl of Lauderdale, deceased (*Certificate*).

PUBLIC BILLS—*First Reading*—Bankers' Books (Evidence)* (24); Friendly Societies Act (1875) Amendment* (25); Habitual Drunkards* (26); Registration of Births, Deaths, and Marriages (Army)* (27).

Second Reading—Committee negatived—Considered —Third Reading—Exchequer Bonds (No. 1)*, and *passed*.

Committee—Bankruptcy Law Amendment (8).

Committee—Report—Debtors Act, 1869, Amendment* (9); Supreme Court of Judicature Acts Amendment (11).

Third Reading—Consolidated Fund (No. 1)*, and *passed*.

REPRESENTATIVE PEER FOR SCOTLAND.

The Clerk of the Crown in Chancery delivered his certificate that the Earl of Dundonald had been elected a Representative Peer for Scotland in the room of the Earl of Lauderdale deceased.

SOUTH AFRICA—THE ZULU WAR—THE REINFORCEMENTS.

OBSERVATIONS.

EARL CADOGAN: My Lords, it may be convenient I should state to your Lordships that a telegram has been received at the Colonial Office to-day from the Officer administering the Government of the Mauritius. It is dated March 3, and in these terms—

"Tamar, from Ceylon, with reinforcements for Natal, arrived this morning. She leaves at daylight to-morrow with two officers 60 men Royal Artillery and mountain guns from this garrison, in addition to troops brought from Ceylon."

EXCHEQUER BONDS (No. 1) BILL.

(*The Earl of Beaconsfield.*)

On the Motion of the Earl of BEACONSFIELD,

Bill read 2ª (according to Order); Committee *negatived:* Then Standing Orders Nos. XXXVII. and XXXVIII. *considered* (according to Order), and *dispensed with;* Bill read 3ª, and *passed.*

BANKRUPTCY LAW AMENDMENT BILL.—(No. 8.)

(*The Lord Chancellor.*)

COMMITTEE.

House in Committee (according to Order).

Clauses 1 to 3, *agreed to*, with verbal Amendments.

Clause 4 (Interpretation of certain terms in the Act).

THE EARL OF POWIS: I have given Notice to omit the words in the Interpretation Clause relating to resolutions passed without proxies as the simplest mode of raising the question whether proxies should or should not be abolished. I have had a communication with the Associated Chambers of Commerce sitting last week at London, and have received some pamphlets expressing their opinions against abolition, but equally in favour of regulation. I have also received communications from Manchester that the largest houses connected with the home trade there are in favour of their retention. Your Lordships will observe that the creditors in a bankruptcy are essentially a non-resident constituency. In one case, cited by the Chambers of Commerce, the bankruptcy in South Wales, where there were 78 creditors, was removed to Manchester at a meeting where two creditors holding proxies attended. In another, where the debts were £81,000 and the assets £42,000, and where consequently the estate was worth looking after, 46 were London creditors, and 48 country, including one in Switzerland and one in Australia. Then, again, as almost every County Court is a bankruptcy court, a large house may have to look after half-a-dozen cases in as many counties at once. But this question not only affects commercial but agricultural interests. The farmer sells his corn to a corn dealer, the Suffolk farmer sells his malting barley to a large brewer at Burton. The Midland counties' farmer sells all his beasts to a salesman at Smithfield. The small Welsh farmer or local butcher sends the hind quarters of his Welsh mutton in the season to London, reserving the fore quarters for the local markets. If these are to leave their farms to look after their claims in a case of bankruptcy, it is obvious that they will be utterly disfranchised. The argument from abuse points to regulation, not to abolition. In your Lordships' House no Peer was allowed to hold more than two, and proxies were required to be entered a certain time before the debate. The picture of a Minister coming down to the House with a pocket full of proxies was nothing but a journalistic fiction. I have heard many vague statements as to abuse, but no instance except that of persons canvassing for votes for the appointment of trustees with a view to personal profit. Now, this abuse is much more effectually met by the clause which provides that a general meeting shall appoint a Committee of Inspection of five, who shall appoint the trustees. Again, when the interests are large, if proxies be abolished, it will be easy for those interested to pay the smaller creditors to go down and attend and vote as they are directed. The Bill does not state how far this exclusion of proxies is to be carried. It only mentions one question at one meeting in Section 21 where they are excluded. But it gives the Court an indefinite power under rules and orders of preventing their exclusion. This exclusion is a question not of detail for the Court, but of principle to be settled by the Bill. I trust your Lordships will decline to allow this disfranchisement at the discretion of the Court, and I beg to move the omission of the words of of which I have given Notice.

The LORD CHANCELLOR said, that his noble Friend mistook those provisions of the Bill which referred to proxies. The Bill did not abolish proxies, but regulated their use so as to prevent the abuse of them which was now complained of. The object was to prevent the discharge of a bankrupt without the mind of the creditors being expressly directed to that purpose; and this it was thought would be effected by the signature of a special resolution signed by a majority of creditors present at a meeting representing three-fourths in number and value. It would be in the discretion of the Court to allow or disallow voting by proxy for a special resolution.

LORD SELBORNE, agreeing in the object, thought the clause required amendment.

Amendment *negatived.*

Clause *agreed to.*

Clause 5 (Extension of companies and large partnerships) *agreed to.*

Clause 6 (Petition and Acts of Bankruptcy).

LORD SELBORNE said, he objected to this clause, on the ground he had stated on the second reading, that it afforded great facilities to a man to have himself made a bankrupt. Since 1869 that had not been allowed; and it was not good policy to allow a person to put an end in that way to his full liability towards his creditors. The sounder principle was to allow his creditors to avail themselves of their power to make him a bankrupt.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR said, that the proposal had been for a considerable time before the public, and that he had not heard from any quarter an objection to it, while he was aware that in many quarters it was highly recommended. It was quite true that under the existing law a person could not be declared bankrupt on his own petition; but, practically, he could do so by availing himself of the liquidation clauses of the Act of 1869, and so enjoy the sweets—if there were such—without tasting the bitters of bankruptcy. Why should not a man who could not pay his debts be able to tell that to his creditors in Court as well as at a meeting? It must be distinctly understood that under this Bill a petitioner could not obtain his discharge without the consent of a large majority of his creditors or the order of the Court. It would be much better to allow a man who could no longer go on with a fair prospect of paying his debts to make himself a bankrupt by direct means than force him to go from bad to worse in business, or to avail himself of such side means as those which were open to him under the existing law.

LORD SELBORNE said, that it appeared to him that under the operation of this clause a bankrupt would be absolutely entitled to his discharge—that, in fact, that would be his right from the Court.

Clause *agreed to.*

Clauses 7 to 16, inclusive, *agreed to.*

Clause 17 (Regulations as to first general meeting).

THE EARL OF POWIS said, it seemed to him that under the power given to the Court by this and Clause 18 to make rules, proxies might be abolished altogether.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR said, he would move an Amendment in the clause, which he thought would have the effect of preventing such a result.

Clause *agreed to.*

Clauses 18 to 20, inclusive, *agreed to.*

Clause 21 (Second general meeting).

(The clause provides that the Court may summon a second general meeting of the creditors, at which a report shall be made upon the affairs of the debtor; that the meeting may thereon determine that an adjudication in bankruptcy shall be made against the debtor, or the proceedings in bankruptcy be stayed and the estate wound up under a deed of arrangement; the creditors might also at this second meeting, by a special resolution made without proxies, determine that the affairs of the debtor had been sufficiently investigated, and that he might be discharged by the Court. If no such resolution should be passed, and it should appear to the Court that there was no reasonable probability of the confirmation of a deed of arrangement, the Court was to make an absolute order for bankruptcy against the debtor).

LORD SELBORNE said, that this clause of the Bill required the most mature deliberation.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR was understood to say that this clause should be further considered before the next stage of the Bill.

Clause *agreed to.*

Remaining clauses *agreed to.*

The Report of the Amendments to be received on *Thursday* next.

DEBTORS ACT (1869) AMENDMENT BILL.—(No. 9.)

(*The Lord Chancellor.*)

House in Committee (according to Order).

Bill *reported*, without Amendment; and to be read 3ª *To-morrow.*

SUPREME COURT OF JUDICATURE ACTS AMENDMENT BILL.—(No. 11.)

(*The Lord Chancellor.*)

COMMITTEE.

House in Committee (according to Order).

LORD SELBORNE said, it would be well to insert a provision to enable the Lord Chancellor to appoint one Judge to take the place of another in the case of sickness or the like emergency. He thought such a provision very desirable, for, otherwise, very important business might be delayed by some sudden sickness or accident befalling one of the Judges. What had happened recently to a Judge of the Chancery Division showed the necessity of something being done.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR said, that between the present time and the next stage of the Bill he would consider the suggestion of his noble and learned Friend.

Bill *reported,* without Amendment; and to be read 3ª on *Thursday* next.

CONSOLIDATED FUND (No. 1) BILL.

(*The Earl of Beaconsfield.*)

THIRD READING.

Bill read 3ª (according to Order), and *passed.*

House adjourned at a quarter before
Seven o'clock, till To-morrow,
half past Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Thursday, 13*th March*, 1879.

MINUTES.]—Private Bills (*by Order*)—*Select Committee*—Liverpool Lighting, *nominated;* Thames River (Prevention of Floods), Other Members *nominated.*

Public Bills — *Ordered* — *First Reading* — Teachers Organisation and Registration* [101].

Second Reading—Marine Mutiny Act (Temporary) Continuance* [98].

*Committee—Report—*Mutiny Act (Temporary) Continuance* [99]; Oyster and Mussel Fisheries Order (Blackwater, Essex) [76].

PRIVATE BUSINESS.

THAMES RIVER (PREVENTION OF FLOODS) BILL (*by Order*).

NOMINATION OF SELECT COMMITTEE.

Mr. RAIKES moved to nominate the Select Committee on this Bill.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Goldney be a Member of the Select Committee."

Mr. CUBITT moved that the debate be now adjourned. He said, he took that course, because he objected to the general constitution of the Committee. He saw that a Notice had been put upon the Paper by the hon. and gallant Member for Southwark (Colonel Beresford), to substitute for the name of the Chairman of the Metropolitan Board of Works that of one of the Members for the County of Surrey. He thought it invidious to object to the name of any particular Member, and especially that of the Chairman of the Metropolitan Board of Works, who from his position had considerable interest in the matter. It seemed to him, however, that there was a great omission in the constitution of the Committee, and that was the ground upon which he ventured to oppose it. There was no person upon the Committee who represented the interests of the South side of the River Thames. He saw that the Committee included the name of the hon. Baronet the Member for Chelsea (Sir Charles W. Dilke), who represented the Northern boundary of the Thames; but none of the Members who represented the South side were to be nominated—namely, the two Members for Lambeth, the two Members for Southwark, the two Members for East Surrey, and the two Members for Mid Surrey. Under those circumstances, he moved the adjournment of the debate, in order that the composition of the Committee might be altered, and the question be taken into consideration again to-morrow. The case was a very important one to the whole of the Metropolis; and it was undesirable that one of the great districts of London should be altogether unrepresented. He did not think it was necessary that he should enforce his position by any further argument. The locality for which he appealed was a large, populous, and poor district; and he thought it would be quite clear to the House that at least one of the Members charged with the representation of that district should have a voice on the Committee. He, therefore, begged to move that the debate be now adjourned.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Debate be now adjourned."—(*Mr. Cubitt.*)

Sir JULIAN GOLDSMID quite concurred with the Motion made by the hon. Gentleman opposite; but he objected to the constitution of this Committee for other reasons, and probably more personal reasons, than the hon. Member he referred to. This question of the prevention of floods in the Thames was considered two years ago by the House of Commons by means of a Committee, who investigated the matter very carefully, and arrived at a conclusion which, he understood, was in direct opposition to the Bill which the Chairman of the Metropolitan Board of Works was now endeavouring to promote as a Private Act. He saw, by the Papers published on this question, that the Metropolitan Board of Works declined to be bound in any way on the previous occasion by the decision of the Committee of that House, a decision which, he believed, was supported by the general feeling of the House. He was further given to understand that the whole object of this Bill was to reverse the decision of that Committee, and to return to the proposals which were rejected two years ago. The hon. Gentleman the Chairman of Ways and Means (Mr. Raikes), whose impartiality he, for one, was always ready to admit, had, he thought, made a mistake on this occasion in nominating a Committee which contained the name of the Chairman of the Metropolitan Board of Works. Now, he said this without reference to any personal qualification on the part of his hon. and gallant Friend the Member for Truro (Sir James M'Garel-Hogg), because he knew the great attention which his hon. and gallant Friend devoted to all matters of public discussion to which he was able to give his time; but, in this particular case, he contended that the hon. and gallant Baronet was in an official capacity compelled to support the proposition contained in this Bill when it came before the Committee; and as the Bill asked the House of Commons to revert to the proposal which it had already rejected, he did not think the hon. and gallant Member ought to be upon the Committee, seeing that he was not an impartial person. The idea of nominating a Committee containing the name of a Gentleman who was known not to be impartial appeared to him to be entirely erroneous. As a general principle, he thought his hon. Friend the Chairman of Ways and Means would agree with him in the proposition he advocated, and that was that if they were to respect the Reports and decisions of the Committees of that House, the Committees themselves should, as far as possible, be selected from persons of an impartial disposition, able to form an independent judgment upon all questions which would be brought before them. His hon. and gallant Friend, being the Chairman of the Metropolitan Board of Works, could not, of necessity, be impartial, but would feel it his duty to advocate a particular proposition. Under these circumstances, it appeared to him (Sir Julian Goldsmid) that the best plan would be to adjourn the nomination of the Committee, in order that the list of the Members of the Committee might be revised, and care taken that a more impartial tribunal should be nominated than would be the case if the name of his hon. and gallant Friend the Chairman of the Metropolitan Board of Works appeared upon it. With those remarks, he would support the proposition of the hon. Member for West Surrey (Mr. Cubitt) for the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. RAIKES thought that a rather unusual course had been taken on this occasion by his hon. Friend the Member for West Surrey (Mr. Cubitt). It was not, however, a very unusual thing to find a Motion, brought forward distinctly on one ground, supported by another hon. Member on the opposite ground. His hon. Friend the Member for West Surrey moved the adjournment of the debate, with the object of securing a better representation of the interests of Surrey and the South side of the river, and he was supported in his Motion by the hon. Baronet the Member for Rochester (Sir Julian Goldsmid), because he thought the Metropolitan element ought to be omitted altogether. This showed the difficulty there was in a matter of this sort in endeavouring to steer between two extremes, in order to settle who should or who should not serve upon a Hybrid Committee. If the House were to admit the views of the hon. Member for West Surrey, they would simply take upon themselves the duty of performing functions which were performed by the Committee of Selection; and, in that case, he ventured to submit to the House there would be no use whatever in appointing a Hybrid Committee, because all the work could be effectually done by the Committee of Selection. There were, however, others who held an entirely opposite view to that held by the hon. Member for Rochester, and who thought the Committee should consist, as much as possible, of partizans; and that, therefore, the Committee of Selection should not have any part in the matter, but that it should be left entirely to the House. The object of appointing a Hybrid Committee was to have Members who were acquainted with, and took an interest in, the subject. At the same time, one particular element should not predominate; but it was desirable to have a Committee who would be entirely balanced, and who would carefully consider the two sides of the question. In selecting persons who were willing to serve upon this Committee, he thought he had arrived as far as possible at that result. He had placed upon it the name of the hon. and gallant Baronet the Chairman of the Metropolitan Board of Works, who had charge of the Bill to be referred to the Committee, and he had placed upon it also the hon. Baronet the Member for Chelsea (Sir Charles W. Dilke), who had given Notice of his intention to move the rejection of the second reading. He thought that if they had those two hon. Gentlemen on the Committee, they would ably represent the views, *pro* and *con*, of those interested in the Bill, and they would be posted with information which would enable them to aid counsel in eliciting important facts. He thought those two hon. Gentlemen, balancing each other, would be a sufficient representation of the antagonistic forces, and that the other four Members of the Committee should be selected from the interest they took in questions of this sort, and also from their entire indifference to the special and local interests affected by the Bill. If any hon. Member would refer to the list of the Committee, he would see that they were all Gentlemen who took an interest in questions relating to water and to rating, and on that ground they would command the confidence of the House. There was another point which must not be lost sight of, and this involved some little difficulty in the matter. It was important to bear in mind the malfeisance of the Board of Works on a former occasion, when the Board refused to act on the Report of the Committee of the House. It appeared to him that if the Board of Works was to be subjected to anything like moral pressure on the part of the House, that pressure would be stronger if the Committee did not consist of any Gentlemen who sat on the former Bill; and, that being so, he had eliminated all the names of Gentlemen who had sat before, with the single exception of the hon. and gallant Member (Sir James M'Garel-Hogg) who had charge of the Bill. He thought that was a course which would commend itself to the House. It was certainly of very great importance that if the Report arrived at in the last instance was to be re-affirmed, it should be re-affirmed by an entirely independent body, and by entirely fresh minds. If, on the other hand, the circumstances of the case were such as to induce the Committee to arrive at a different conclusion, it would be very much easier for a new Committee to take that course than a Committee who were already pledged to the former decision. That being so, he had thought it necessary to dispense with the services of several Members of the House, whose services would have been exceedingly valuable, because he thought it better, as he had already explained, to have an entirely new Committee on this occasion. The adoption of this course had deprived him of the services of his hon. Friend the Member for Southwark (Mr. Locke), who served on the last occasion, and also of the services of the hon. Member for East Surrey (Mr. Watney), whom he would greatly have liked to have had. His hon. Friend the Member for West Surrey complained that the interests of Surrey were not adequately represented on the Committee. He (Mr. Raikes) could only point out that if he placed on the Committee another Gentleman representing the interests of Surrey, who was adverse to the Bill, it would be necessary to put also upon the Committee another Gentleman who was favourable to the Bill. The result would have been that he would have had four out of the six Members of the Committee pledged to a particular view before they entered the Committee-Room, and he did not think that would be a desirable result. If, however, the hon. Member who proposed the adjournment of the debate would withdraw that Motion now, he would be quite ready to consult with him whether it would be possible to add to the Committee at a subsequent time; and if he found an opportunity of placing upon the Committee two additional names which would satisfy the parties respectively interested, he would be willing to take that course. He should be glad if the House would now so far proceed in the matter as to say that the names he had ventured to submit were proper names to be adopted. He had only one word more to say in regard to the position of the hon. and gallant Baronet the Member for Truro (Sir James M'Garel-Hogg). Of course, he knew that in a Private Bill it was not in an ordinary case the rule to appoint as a Member of the Committee the Gentleman whose name was on the back of the Bill, unless it was an unopposed Bill; but in this case they were dealing with a matter more in the interest of the public than in those of private parties, and they were nominating Gentlemen to serve upon the Committee, not on the nomination of the Committee of Selection, but of the House itself. It was said that it was a thing unheard of to place the Gentleman in charge of a Bill upon the Committee appointed to consider it. The House, however, must bear in mind that the hon. and gallant Gentleman who had charge of this Bill represented a very large and important public body; and he thought the Committee would be greatly open to the animadversion of the ratepayers of the Metropolis if the hon. and gallant Member the Chairman of the Metropolitan Board of Works was excluded from it. He hoped the suggestions he had ventured to throw out would be adopted by his hon. Friend the Member for West Surrey (Mr. Cubitt), and that his hon. Friend would withdraw the Motion he had made, and allow the Committee to be formed, with a view, if possible, to adding to their numbers at a subsequent time.

COLONEL BERESFORD said, he had placed a Notice on the Paper of his intention to move the omission of the name of the Chairman of the Metropolitan Board of Works, in order to substitute that of his hon. Friend the Member for East Surrey (Mr. Watney). He thought the attention of the House ought to be drawn to the mode in which this important Committee had been constituted on the present occasion. On former occasions there had been two or three Committees appointed, in which the Metropolitan Board of Works were the promoters, or were otherwise deeply interested. In the present instance, there was not a single Metropolitan Member nominated on the Committee, with the exception of the hon. Baronet the Member for Chelsea (Sir Charles W. Dilke). If they went back to the year 1862, when the Thames Embankment Committee was appointed, they would find upon it Sir John Shelley and Sir Samuel Morton Peto, both of them Metropolitan Representatives. In the year following, 1863, another Metropolitan Committee was appointed, and two of the Members of that were Mr. Cox and Mr. Doulton, both of them Metropolitan Representatives. Since then Committees had been appointed to inquire into the Toll Bridges Bill, which affected the Metropolis, and there were appointed upon it three Metropolitan Members from the North side of London, and two Members from the South side. Under these circumstances, he felt it was right now that some Metropolitan Members should be placed upon this Committee. The question had now been in agitation for something like a fortnight; and he thought the House must have been taken by surprise yesterday morning when they saw the names placed upon the Paper by his hon. Friend the Chairman of Ways and Means (Mr. Raikes). He (Colonel Beresford) had been under the impression that, as his proposal to refer the Bill to a Select Committee had been accepted by the Government, he would have been entitled to nominate three of the Committee. He believed, at all events, it had been usual to accede to some of the names proposed by an hon. Member in his position. He strongly objected to the name of the hon. and gallant Member the Chairman of the Metropolitan Board of Works. He did not think it right that any paid member of the Metropolitan Board should be a Member of the Committee. He did not know what the rules were in circumstances of this kind; but he certainly objected to the Committee on that ground. He had received a letter from a firm of solicitors, asking him to bring the matter before the House, and a large number of Petitions had been presented against the Bill from the South side of the Thames. The Petitioners strongly objected to the Bill in the shape in which it had been pressed forward; and, for these reasons, he should support the Motion of his hon. Friend the Member for West Surrey.

SIR UGHTRED KAY-SHUTTLEWORTH hoped the Chairman of Ways and Means would not yield to the appeal which had been made, and add to the number of interested Members on this Committee. He thought it was a matter which the House might consider with advantage, whether the very best method was adopted in the appointment of Hybrid Committees, especially in regard to Committees appointed to deal with Metropolitan questions. He believed that Committees dealing with other questions of a hybrid character, and appointed in the same manner as the present Committee, were not constituted as these Metropolitan Hybrid Committees were. For instance, the Committee upon the Manchester Corporation Water Bill, upon which he had served last year, was a Hybrid Committee, and it was appointed by the House he (Lord Robert Montagu) would like to know how the business of the Committee was to be conducted? In the event of certain evidence being brought before the Committee which rendered a compromise necessary, if the hon. and gallant Baronet was not present, who was to make the compromise? If, however, the hon. and gallant Baronet were sitting on the Committee, he would be authorized in such a case to say that as the evidence was different from what he had anticipated he would accept the compromise, and agree to it on behalf of the Metropolitan Board. That question would, consequently, be finished; the difficulty would be disposed of, and the Committee would be able to go on to the next point; but, as the Chairman of Ways and Means had told the House, if they placed the Chairman of the Metropolitan Board on the Committee, they must, in order to put the different interests upon a footing of equality, also place upon it the hon. Member who was the most decided opponent of the Bill; and no more decided or able opponent could be selected than the hon. Baronet the Member for Chelsea (Sir Charles W. Dilke) who, on the second reading of the measure, had placed a Notice on the Paper for the rejection of the Bill. It seemed, therefore, that the Chairman of Ways and Means had taken the only course which he could have taken as Chairman of Committees. He suggested that the House should agree to the names placed on the Paper by the Chairman of Ways and Means until they came to his (Lord Robert Montagu's) name. That name might be omitted, and the further consideration of the matter left open until to-morrow, when the Chairman of Ways and Means would be able to bring forward two or three names to complete the composition of the Committee. He thought that was a course which would suit all parties, and he hoped that it would be followed.

Mr. WATNEY remarked, that as his name had been placed on the Paper by his hon. and gallant Friend the Member for Southwark (Colonel Beresford), he wished to make an explanation in order to prevent a misconception. The hon. and gallant Member for Southwark had put down his name without having consulted him, and he had no wish that his name should remain in opposition to the name of the Chairman of the Metropolitan Board of Works. With regard to the Bill itself, he certainly wished that either himself or some other Member representing the interests of Surrey should be upon the Committee. It was, however, a mistake to suppose that the inhabitants of Surrey desired to oppose the Bill; on the contrary, they were anxious to have it. Surrey, especially Lambeth, had been flooded over and over again, and the people living on the banks of the Thames were anxious to have some Bill which, in future, would prevent the damage which had so often been done. Considering the large amount of property in Surrey that was affected by the flooding of the Thames, and the heavy rating which the inhabitants had to pay, he thought it was not unfair to ask that some Member representing a Surrey constituency should be appointed upon the Committee, as Middlesex was represented by the hon. Baronet the Member for Chelsea. If the Chairman of Ways and Means would consent to add two additional Members to the Committee, one of whom should be a Surrey Member, he thought that would go very far towards meeting the merits of the case.

Sir JOSEPH M'KENNA thought there was a very strong objection to the proposal of the Chairman of Ways and Means to place the name of the hon. and gallant Baronet the Chairman of the Metropolitan Board of Works upon the Committee. The hon. and gallant Baronet was, in point of fact, a personally interested party. The Board of Works were the promoters of the original Bill, and the promoters also of the present measure. They could not divest themselves of their interest in the matter; and it appeared to him that full effect would be given to the demand of the Metropolitan Board if the Chairman of the Board were examined as a witness. If the hon. and gallant Baronet were placed upon the Committee, he would assume the twofold character of a witness and one of the jury. That, he thought, would be contrary to all judicial principles, and even to common sense. Questions would arise in considering the Bill as to taxation, as to who were the parties to be taxed, and to what extent and degree taxation was to be borne by the district, or whether it was to fall upon the Metropolitan Board of Works? Under such circumstances, the one man who ought not to be upon the Committee, in order to pronounce the judgment of the Committee, was the Chairman of the Metropolitan Board, who would find it impossible to divest himself of the interest which he had in the measure as Representative of the Board. In that capacity, of course, the hon. and gallant Baronet would have a direct interest in saving the revenues of the Board. No doubt, the revenues of the Board ought to be saved and economized as much as possible; but the Chairman of the Board was not, as between the Board and other contributaries, the best judge of the economy that ought to be exercised. His proper position in regard to a Bill of this kind was to be examined as a witness. The Committee itself should be composed of independent Members, who had no interest whatever in the measure, and whose only object would be to do that which was right.

Mr. MARK STEWART was certainly of opinion that his hon. and gallant Friend the Member for Truro (Sir James M'Garel-Hogg) ought to be upon the Committee. He (Mr. M. Stewart) had had the honour of serving upon the Select Committee which sat two years ago upon this very question. Although his views did not altogether agree with those of his hon. and gallant Friend, he had had great satisfaction in hearing the hon. and gallant Gentleman named upon the Committee. Upon the previous Committee the Chairman of the Metropolitan Board of Works certainly knew more about the question than anybody associated with him; and he was therefore able to give the Committee, not only good and valuable information, but to ask many useful questions. Under these circumstances, he (Mr. Stewart) should support the proposition that the hon. and gallant Member for Truro should be upon the Committee.

Mr. CUBITT said, he was willing to withdraw the Motion for the adjournment of the debate, on the distinct understanding that his hon. Friend the Chairman of Ways and Means would propose two additional Members of the Committee, one of whom should be a Representative of the Metropolitan part of the County of Surrey. He hoped, upon that understanding, that he would be allowed to withdraw the Motion.

Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Original Question put, and *agreed to.*

On Motion of Mr. Raikes, Mr. Alexander Brown, Sir Baldwyn Leighton, and Sir Charles W. Dilke nominated other Members of the Committee.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Sir James M'Garel-Hogg be a Member of the Select Committee."

Sir JULIAN GOLDSMID said, he felt bound to move, as an Amendment, that the name of the hon. and gallant Member for Truro be omitted. It was not from any personal feeling in regard to his hon. and gallant Friend that he took this step, but because this was a Private Bill, and he did not think that the principal promoter of it should be asked to serve upon the Committee which was to inquire into its merits. He knew that he would be met by the argument that this, although introduced as a Private Bill, was more in the nature of a public measure. Nevertheless, it was a Private Bill, introduced into the House in the ordinary form of a Private Bill; and he could not call to mind a single instance in which the promoters of a contested Private Bill had been placed upon the Committee to which the Bill was referred in order to report to the House upon its merits. The noble Lord the Member for Westmeath (Lord Robert Montagu) said that it would be of advantage to have the hon. and gallant Member for Truro upon the Committee, in order that he might be present to accept any compromise that might be offered. He (Sir Julian Goldsmid) wished to point out that that statement was altogether inaccurate, because the hon. and gallant Member for Truro had stated some time ago, in his place in the House, that he would be prepared, on the part of the Metropolitan Board of Works, to accept any decision the Committee might arrive at. At the same time, it was only right to say that he (Sir Julian Goldsmid) understood the Metropolitan Board had repudiated that promise made by the hon. and gallant Member, and had said that he had no authority to bind them to do what they thought was not desirable in this manner. It would, therefore, be much more preferable that the hon. and gallant Baronet should appear before the Committee as a witness, and not as a Member of the Committee itself. The Chairman of Ways and Means had himself used an argument which went against the nomination of the hon. and gallant Member for Truro. He said that it was desirable to have persons upon the Committee with impartial, unbiased minds. Nevertheless, the hon. Gentleman the Chairman of Ways and Means at once proceeded to nominate upon the Committee the one person who was the least impartial person who could be selected. The hon. Member opposite (Mr. Mark Stewart) also told the House that he was glad the Chairman of the Metropolitan Board was to be upon the Committee, because he knew more about the matter than anybody else. It was exactly because the hon. and gallant Member for Truro did know more of the matter than anybody else that he ought to appear before the Committee as a witness, and not as one of the judges. Under these circumstances, he deemed it right, in the interests of the public, to oppose the nomination upon the Committee of his hon. and gallant Friend the Member for Truro.

Mr. RAIKES thought he might fairly appeal to the House to support him in his endeavour to secure a sufficient representation of those who took a lively public interest in the matter, without allowing the Committee to degenerate into an arena for partizan warfare. The hon. Baronet the Member for Chelsea (Sir Charles W. Dilke), who was just as much opposed to the Bill as the hon. and gallant Member for Truro was in its favour, was already upon the Committee, his name having been agreed to. These two Gentlemen had been placed upon the Committee, on the understanding that the views of one would counterbalance those of the other. Neither of them were interested in the matter in any sense that could be called private interest; but the interest they took in the question was altogether in a public capacity. The hon. and gallant Member for Truro was nominated because, as Chairman of the Metropolitan Board of Works, he had charge of the Bill, and the hon. Member for Chelsea was nominated because he had moved the rejection of the Bill. It would, therefore, be an unfair proceeding to strike off the name of the hon. and gallant Member for Truro, now that they had already confirmed the name of the hon. Baronet the Member for Chelsea.

Mr. LOCKE strongly objected to the appointment upon the Committee of the hon. and gallant Member for Truro, and wished to call attention to what was done on a former occasion. Some time ago, a Committee was appointed upon this very question. He did not know who the Members of the Committee were, except that his hon. and gallant Friend the Member for Truro was one of them. Well, that Committee arrived at a certain decision, and what was then done by the hon. and gallant Member opposite? He stopped the further progress of the Bill altogether. Nothing more was done in the matter; and his hon. and gallant Friend was allowed to do precisely what he liked. The state of things which it was the object of the previous Bill to remedy had since been allowed to go on for a considerable time, and he failed to see what was to be the end. He did not know what the opinions of his hon. and gallant Friend were; but it appeared to be the fact that Parliament was able to do nothing, if the Metropolitan Board of Works chose to stop the way. What was the position of the question, and what was the former attempt to settle it? It was held that as both sides of the river would be benefited by preventing the overflow of the Thames, and that great damage to property which periodical floods occasioned—it was held that both sides of the river should contribute equally to the cost of the necessary works. But what did the body say, which was represented by his hon. and gallant Friend opposite? They said—"We will not contribute any of our money," notwithstanding the fact that both sides of the river would receive advantage. His hon. and gallant Friend contended that, although this was undoubtedly the case, the parts benefited should be called upon to bear the expense. The result was that the matter had remained unsettled, and the House was called upon to consider a scheme precisely similar to that which was inquired into, and reported upon, some years ago. If it had not been for his hon. and gallant Friend, and some others, who endeavoured to keep their money in their pockets, all that was necessary would now have been carried out. He must say that, in his opinion, his hon. and gallant Friend was one of the last men who ought to be allowed to sit upon the Committee. He was at the head of the Board who were promoting the Bill, and, in that capacity, he might again feel it right to do that which was opposed to the interests of everybody else. If anybody was to be eliminated from the Committee, it was certainly the hon. and gallant Member the Chairman of the Metropolitan Board of Works.

Sir JAMES M'GAREL-HOGG remarked that his name had been so prominently brought forward in the course of the discussion, almost by every speaker, that he felt it impossible to sit entirely quiet. He should not, however, have risen to address the House, if it had not been for the numerous mistakes the hon. Member for Rochester (Sir Julian Goldsmid) had made in the two speeches he had addressed to the House. The only excuse that could be made for the hon. Member was his ignorance, which was abundantly manifested in the two statements he had made. The hon. Member said that the Metropolitan Board declined to accept the decision of the previous Committee of the House. That statement was somewhat inaccurate, and it was proved by the present Bill, which was brought in in order to meet the views of the Committee. The Bill, it was true, did not cast the whole cost over the Metropolis, a particular portion of it being thrown upon the riparian owners; but the other portion—namely, that for compensations—fell upon the Metropolitan Board. He therefore contended that the Metropolitan Board had shown a deference to the views of the Committee. Then, again, the hon. Member said that when he (Sir James M'Garel-Hogg) brought in the Bill the other day, he promised that the Board should acquiesce in any decision the Committee might arrive at. Now, what he said was that, as far as he had any influence with his Colleagues, he would do everything he could to induce them to accept the decision of the Committee. Of course, he would be glad to have an impartial Committee; and it would be in the recollection of the House that when he brought in the Bill he asked for an impartial tribunal that should inquire into the merits of the Bill, although it was only a Private Bill, as if they were a jury. When the House expressed an opinion that there should be a different tribunal from that to which Private Bills were usually referred, he at once bowed to its decision. The hon. Member for Rochester was now kind enough to inform him and the House that the Metropolitan Board had repudiated what he (Sir James M'Garel-Hogg) had said. The hon. Member was entirely incorrect. The Board had said nothing upon the matter. He had not asked his Colleagues their opinion on the subject, and the Board had not attached any blame to him. He would advise his hon. Friend, before he again got up to make statements to the House, to be quite sure that the statements he was about to make were accurate.

Mr. RITCHIE said, he was not usually the champion of all the proceedings of the Metropolitan Board of Works; but, on this occasion, he thought the objection taken to the Chairman of the Metropolitan Board of Works was altogether unjustifiable and without foundation. It would almost seem, from the conversation which had taken place, that there was no part of London, except that part of it which was bounded by the Thames. He begged to remind the House that a large portion of London had really very little interest in the question of the embankment of the river, but had a great deal of interest in the question how the expense was to be spread over the Metropolis. At present, what was their position? In the names already appointed upon the Committee was that of the hon. Member for Chelsea (Sir Charles W. Dilke), who had already expressed his views as to how the mode of payment should be adjusted over the Metropolis; and the hon. Baronet, therefore, could not be said to be altogether an unprejudiced Member of the Committee. Then they had an offer made, and accepted, as he understood, that an hon. Member should be placed on the Committee who represented Surrey. They would thus have on the Committee the hon. Baronet the Member for Chelsea, who directly represented the interests of a water-side constituency and was interested in having the cost spread over the whole of the Metropolis, and they would have a Member for Surrey, who would also have a direct interest in having the cost spread over the whole of London, and not confined to the localities which would derive most advantage from the

Bill. What was proposed now? Simply that his hon. and gallant Friend the Member for Truro should be put on the Committee. His hon. and gallant Friend had charge of the Bill, and was also the mouthpiece of a body which consisted of Representatives from every part of London, so that he might be said to represent a large district which might probably be called upon to contribute to the cost without participating directly in the benefit. It certainly appeared to him (Mr. Ritchie) that if they did not place upon the Committee the hon. and gallant Member for Truro, or some Representative of the Metropolitan Board of Works, the Committee would be unfairly constituted. For his own part, he should be glad that neither the hon. Member for Chelsea, nor the hon. and gallant Member for Truro, nor a Member for Surrey, should be put on the Committee, and that the whole question should be submitted to the investigation and decision of a thoroughly impartial tribunal. But if they were going to have two Members on the Committee who were directly interested in having the expense of the works spread over the whole of London, they ought at least to have one Representative who, from his position, would be able to speak for the other parts of the Metropolis. Upon these grounds, he should vote for the nomination of his hon. and gallant Friend the Member for Truro.

Sir JULIAN GOLDSMID hoped he might be allowed to say a word in explanation. His hon. and gallant Friend the Member for Truro said the statement he had made was totally inaccurate. He begged to say that he was informed, on the best authority, that a Member of the Parliamentary Committee of the Board of Works, of which his hon. and gallant Friend was Chairman, did find fault with his hon. and gallant Friend's conduct in the matter. He believed he would be confirmed in this statement by the very best authority, however much the hon. and gallant Gentleman might deny it.

Sir JAMES M'GAREL-HOGG trusted he might be allowed to give the strongest possible denial to every word the hon. Member had uttered.

Colonel BERESFORD remarked, that in 1877 the proposal of the Board of Works was treated as a Public Bill; but this year it was brought in as a Private Bill, in order that it might be pushed forward. So far as he was personally concerned in the matter, he believed that he had taken a right course. His hon. Friend the Chairman of Ways and Means had put his name down as one of the Members to be nominated upon the Committee; but he had declined to act, on the ground that he was a riparian Member. Yet the hon. and gallant Gentleman the Member for Truro came forward as the proposer of the scheme which was rejected in 1877, and he did not think his name should be placed on the present Committee.

Motion *agreed to.*

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Lord Robert Montagu be a Member of the Committee."

Motion *agreed to.*

QUESTIONS.

PRISON RULES—REPORTERS OF THE PRESS.—QUESTION.

Mr. W. M'ARTHUR (for Mr. P. A. Taylor) asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether the new rules affecting the admission of reporters within prisons permit their presence at coroners' inquests held within the walls; and, if he has any objection to lay a Copy of those Rules upon the Table of the House?

Sir MATTHEW WHITE RIDLEY, in reply, said, that there were no new Rules on the subject. He had made inquiries of the Prison Commissioners, and he was informed that, so far as they knew, no application had been made for the admission of reporters to be present at the coroners' inquests, and no orders had been issued one way or the other.

AFGHANISTAN AND KHELAT—TREATIES, &c.—QUESTION.

General Sir GEORGE BALFOUR asked the Under Secretary of State for India, If he will place in the Library of the House, for the perusal of Members, the Records relating to the Treaties of 1854 with the Khan of Khelat, those of 1855 and 1857 with Dost Mahommed, and the Papers relating to the 1856 proposal to advance into Central Asia, including the Report of the late Sir Henry

Durand, which he made by the direction of Lord Canning, together with Lord Canning's decision on that proposal?

MR. E. STANHOPE: Sir, the particular Report referred to by the hon. and gallant Member cannot be found in the India Office Records. As regards the other Papers, they are contained in many large folio volumes, which include also other Papers of a confidential character; and I am afraid, therefore, that they could not be placed in the Library of the House for perusal.

GENERAL SIR GEORGE BALFOUR: I shall repeat my Question in another form, so as to admit of an explanation.

ARMY—LINKED BATTALIONS.

QUESTION.

COLONEL ALEXANDER asked the Secretary of State for War, Whether it is the case that a regiment on foreign service is kept below its regulated establishment of subalterns, if the regiment with which it is linked has supernumeraries of that rank, in consequence of its establishment being reduced?

LORD EUSTACE CECIL, in reply, said, it was the case. The supernumerary officers of the linked regiment, in all instances where the establishment was reduced, were made available if required.

ARMY—THE STAFF COLLEGE—VACANCIES.—QUESTION.

MAJOR NOLAN asked the Secretary of State for War, If he can inform the House on what principle the vacancies occasioned in the Staff College by the departure of several officers for Natal have been or will be filled up.

LORD EUSTACE CECIL: I beg to say that the vacancies in question have not been filled up, and I understand there is no intention at present to fill them up.

RAILWAYS (INDIA)—THE INDUS AND THE BOLAN PASS.—QUESTION.

SIR HENRY HAVELOCK asked the Under Secretary of State for India, Whether the construction of a Railway from the Indus to the Bolan Pass has been urgently pressed upon the Viceroy of India for military considerations; what decision the Viceroy has arrived at; and, whether any Minutes or Correspondence on this subject have been received at the India Office and can be laid upon the Table?

MR. E. STANHOPE: We have not at present received any official information from the Indian Government on this subject.

ARMY—OFFICERS' TRAVELLING EXPENSES.—QUESTION.

MAJOR O'BEIRNE asked the Secretary of State for War, Why officers returning from India to England on medical certificate are excluded from the benefits of the Travelling Warrant dated 1st April 1872, which allows the claim to travelling expenses of officers returning to England on medical certificate from Malta, Gibraltar, and the Colonies?

LORD EUSTACE CECIL, in reply, said, that the Warrant in question was only applicable to officers at home and in Colonial garrisons, and did not apply to the officers of the Indian Establishment at all.

SOUTH AFRICA—EXPORT OF MUNITIONS OF WAR FOR MOZAMBIQUE.

QUESTION.

MR. RITCHIE asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether any information has been received to the effect that a consignment of rifles and ammunition has left this Country for Mozambique; if so, whether he can state by whom they have been shipped, and whether Her Majesty's Government have taken any steps to prevent the consignment from reaching the Zulus?

MR. BOURKE: Yes, Sir, we have received information that 831 muskets and 50,000 lbs. of gunpowder were shipped last week from Cardiff, in a French ship, called the *Argus*, for Mozambique. My hon. Friend asks me who shipped these munitions. The firm that shipped these articles is Messrs. Hutton, of Manchester, Dale Street; as well as Messrs. Hutton, of Temple, Liverpool. Sir, we have communicated with the Portuguese Government on this subject, and we have also taken other measures with the view of preventing these munitions of war from reaching the Zulus. As I have mentioned the Portuguese Government, I think I may state that we have every reason to believe that this Government will act in this case, as in other cases of a similar character—that is, they will do their best to prevent these warlike stores from reaching the Natives who are at war with this country.

GRAND JURY LAWS (IRELAND)—LEGISLATION.—QUESTION.

Mr. O'SHAUGHNESSY asked the Chief Secretary for Ireland, If, having regard to the necessity of giving the Irish Constituencies an opportunity of considering the proposed changes in the Grand Jury Laws, he will introduce the Grand Jury Laws Amendment Bill and cause it to be printed before Easter?

Mr. J. LOWTHER: Yes, Sir, I hope to be able to adopt the course suggested.

ARMY (INDIA)—PAY OF LIEUTENANTS. QUESTION.

Colonel NAGHTEN asked the Under Secretary of State for India, Whether the Government is prepared to give to officers, on being appointed as Lieutenants in India, full Lieutenants pay as in England?

Mr. E. STANHOPE: I can only at present say, in answer to my hon. and gallant Friend, that the question of applying to India the Royal Warrant regulating the pay of lieutenants is still under the consideration of the Secretary of State in Council.

IRELAND—TOWN INSPECTORSHIP OF BELFAST.—QUESTION.

Major NOLAN ashed the Chief Secretary for Ireland, Is it true that the town inspector of Belfast has been asked to delay his resignation in order that Mr. Reid may qualify for the post, to the exclusion of one of the thirty-five constabulary officers years senior to Mr. Reid?

Mr. J. LOWTHER: I have only been able to communicate by telegraph with Dublin since the hon. and gallant Gentleman gave Notice of his Question, so that I am not in possession as yet of many details relating to the subject. For instance, I am not aware what the age is of the Mr. Reid to whom reference is made, or what degree of qualification he would require to go through for any such post as the one alluded to. In fact, I do not happen at this moment to know anything at all about him. I understand, however, that the Town Inspector of Belfast was requested to defer his resignation on the ground that it was considered undesirable in the interests of the Public Service that a change should occur at the time that it was first mooted.

INSPECTORS OF COAL MINES—THE REPORTS.—QUESTION.

Mr. STEVENSON asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether he will instruct the Inspectors of Coal Mines to give in their reports, not only as at present the dates of all fatal explosions, but the dates of all explosions, whether fatal or not, and also the dates on which mines have been in a dangerous state from the abundance of gas without explosion occurring, in order to accumulate facts to show the influence of atmospheric conditions on the safety of mines?

Sir MATTHEW WHITE RIDLEY: I am afraid it will be impossible to give instructions in order that the information should appear in this year's Report. That is already in print, and it is required by the Secretary of State to be in the Home Office by the 31st of March; but there will be no objection to giving the information in future.

THE TREATY OF BERLIN—THE DESPATCH IN "THE TIMES" OF MARCH 12TH.—QUESTIONS.

Lord ROBERT MONTAGU asked Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Whether the version of a despatch of Lord Salisbury to Lord A. Loftus, dated January 26th (as given in the "Times" of March 12th), is substantially correct; and, whether he will lay it upon the Table, with any reply which may have been sent.

Mr. BOURKE: The copy of the despatch in *The Times* is substantially correct, though not verbally so, being apparently a translation from the German.

Lord ROBERT MONTAGU: Will the despatch be laid on the Table?

Mr. BOURKE: I did not know the noble Lord was going to ask me the Question, and I am not prepared to answer that part of it; but I have no doubt it will be laid on the Table very shortly.

LORD ROBERT MONTAGU: Perhaps the Chancellor of the Exchequer can answer the Question?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: No doubt, the despatch will be laid on the Table with the other Correspondence; but perhaps the noble Lord will repeat his Question.

SOUTH AFRICA—THE ZULU WAR—THE DEFEAT AT ISANDULA.—QUESTION.

DR. KENEALY asked the Secretary of State for War, If he will state to the House the exact number of men slain or missing on the English side in the late Zulu ambuscade at Isandula?

LORD EUSTACE CECIL: This information has already been proposed to be moved for by the hon. and learned Member for Limerick (Mr. O'Shaughnessy); but I am sorry to say that I am not now in a position to give the information, as we have not yet received the official Returns. The information which has already appeared in the Cape papers is, no doubt, in the possession of the hon. Gentleman. As soon as the official Papers from the Cape arrive they will be communicated to the House. If the hon. Gentleman will repeat his Question, perhaps the Secretary of State for War will be prepared to answer it.

CRIMINAL LAW—CASE OF THE REV. H. J. DODWELL.—QUESTION.

DR. KENEALY asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, If he will lay upon the Table of the House, on an early day, that part of the Lunacy Commissioners' Report which relates to the case of the Reverend H. J. Dodwell?

SIR MATTHEW WHITE RIDLEY, in reply, said, the Report had been received at the Home Office last evening. By the Act of Parliament, it would be necessary to lay it on the Table within 21 days of its being received; but, so far as he had been able to ascertain, there was no special mention in it of the case of the Reverend H. J. Dodwell.

SOUTH AFRICA—THE ZULU WAR—THE REINFORCEMENTS—COALING OF TRANSPORTS.—QUESTIONS.

MR. GOURLEY asked the First Lord of the Admiralty, If it be correct, as reported in a telegram to the "Standard" from St. Vincent, dated Tuesday last, that the transports "Russia," "England," "France," "Egypt," and "Spain," have been prevented from proceeding on their voyage to the Cape in consequence of the want of proper facilities for coaling, and why, seeing the emergency of the employment, the vessels were not coaled for the Cape direct?

MR. A. F. EGERTON: I am sorry to have to inform the hon. Member that it is true, as stated, that these five steamers, the *Russia*, *England*, *France*, *Egypt*, and *Spain*, have been detained for several days at St. Vincent; but we have not been informed whether that was through stress of weather or from want of facilities for coaling. It appears, however, that the whole of the coaling facilities at St. Vincent have been placed at the disposal of the Admiralty. It is understood that more than 1,000 tons of coal a-day can be shipped each day; but that quantity, it seems, has not been sufficient. It would have been impossible for steamers to have taken on board sufficient coal for the voyage, between decks being filled with stores, camp equipage, &c., and also in consequence of its being necessary to take a quantity of ballast. The transport officers considered that question, and considered it absolutely necessary that these vessels should call at St. Vincent.

MR. GOURLEY: Has the Secretary to the Admiralty any information as to when the transports are likely to be able to leave St. Vincent? Will he also give instructions that steamships engaged to carry coal to the Cape shall call at St. Vincent on the way out?

MR. A. F. EGERTON: All the information that we have is that the *Russia* arrived on the 6th at St. Vincent and left on the 12th—a long time to be delayed—and that the *England* arrived on the 7th and sailed on the 12th. As to the other vessels, which arrived on the 7th and 8th, we have no further information.

MR. GOURLEY: The hon. Gentleman has not answered the latter part of my Question—whether coal transports bound for the Cape will be instructed to call at St. Vincent to supply the transports?

MR. A. F. EGERTON: I cannot answer that Question. Perhaps the hon. Gentleman will repeat it to-morrow.

EGYPT—MR. RIVERS WILSON.

QUESTION.

Sir GEORGE CAMPBELL asked Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Whether there is any truth in the allegation in the Paris correspondence of the "Times" of Wednesday, that Mr. Rivers Wilson had pledged himself to great financial bodies holding enormous quantities of Egyptian Stock not to reduce the interest before a certain date; and if it is in consequence of any such engagement that the pay of the Native Egyptian officials was withheld?

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER, in reply, said, he was not in the least aware of any such promise as that referred to having been given by Mr. Rivers Wilson; and no communication had been made to the Government on the subject.

ORDERS OF THE DAY.

* * *

SUPPLY.—COMMITTEE.

Order for Committee read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair."

THE FRANCHISE AND THE CITY GUILDS.—RESOLUTION.

Mr. W. H. JAMES rose to call attention to the proceedings of the Court of Aldermen on the 18th of February, and to move—

> "That the sale of the Parliamentary franchise by the City Guilds with the consent of the Court of Aldermen is an abuse and should be abolished."

The House had already on two occasions discussed the question of faggot votes as acquired by individuals; but the importance of the subject was greatly enhanced when the system was openly recognized by a Corporation so wealthy and holding a position so illustrious and honourable as that of the City of London. He did not hesitate to say it was one of the greatest abuses in the whole of the three Kingdoms. In such a case the practice must be generally, he might say universally, condemned. On the face of it, the Companies and the Corporation had in their hands both the Parliamentary and municipal suffrage. The Companies could not, therefore, be considered private bodies. It appeared that the Master and Wardens of the Company of Fanmakers, which had reached its full number of 60 members, had presented a Petition to the Court of Aldermen stating that a number of respectable persons wished to become freemen of the Company; that the increase of the Livery would conduce to the advantage of the Company and of the City of London; and requesting permission to add their names to the roll. After a somewhat lively discussion the request was granted. *Primâ facie*, there could be no possible objection to any addition to the members of the Company. The Company, which was established at the commencement of the last century, was a very respectable body, and a year ago they had rather an interesting exhibition, which was attended by many Members of Parliament, and not a few ladies. But why were the Company so desirous to make more Liverymen, except for the purpose of acquiring the Parliamentary vote? He held in his hands a Circular which he understood had been sent to various hon. Members by the clerk of the Company, in which he called upon Members of the House to vindicate the Livery's rights; and it was a remarkable thing that since he (Mr. James) had come to the House that afternoon, one of his hon. Friends had informed him that he had that day received two letters, one of which was the Circular he had spoken of, asking him to attend in his place that evening in opposition to this Motion, and another later in the day, inviting him to a dinner-party the following week, that the Company might have the pleasure of entertaining him. The clerk of the Company in his Circular said there had been no sale of the Parliamentary franchise. He (Mr. James) could not see what else it was. Was it barter, or traffic, or negotiation? The clerk of the Company pointed out that the Corporation had power over these Companies, and could increase the number of the Livery. But when this was increased, the number of persons would increase also, who could exercise the Parliamentary franchise. There was no doubt that the continued existence of this anomaly was due to an omission in the Reform Bill of 1867, and that on a future occasion it would be swept away, along with other peculiar privileges, like that at Newcastle-on-Tyne, where the possession of a share in the Theatre Royal gave a vote for the Southern Division of the County of Northumberland. It was impossible that such privileges could be sustained. Mr. Sewell, the clerk to the Fanmakers' Company, denied that the Company was a political Company, and said that the application to the Court of Aldermen was made for the purpose of increasing the interest in the trade. But he (Mr. James) absolutely denied that. It was rather interesting to notice what happened on a previous occasion, when the Needlemakers' Company applied with a similar object, and their request was granted. He then looked at the *City Directory*, and when he saw who were the gentlemen who took an interest in the Needlemakers' Company—prominent amongst whom was the hon. Member for North Durham — he came to the conclusion that there was no knowing what support a new Needlemaker might be to the Conservative Party. These votes could only be defended on the ground he once heard taken by a wealthy banker in the City, who thought the best way to have a satisfactory form of representation and a good House of Commons was by putting the seats of hon. Members up to auction. The population of the Metropolis, within the City, was constantly decreasing; and one would have thought that, so far from there being any grounds for increasing the numbers of Liverymen, there were the strongest possible grounds for diminishing them. Perhaps it might be said that he had brought a small and trumpery matter before the House; but he must take exception to that. The Lord Mayor of London, who was chosen by the Liverymen, held a very important position; he had great influence, social and otherwise; and, recognizing these facts, he could not help remembering a meeting held last year, at the Cannon Street Hotel, and then adjourned to the Guildhall, under the auspices of the then Lord Mayor, Sir Thomas Owden, which was said to have strengthened the hands of the Government, but of which he could speak, from his own observation, as one of the most discreditable and disgraceful scenes ever witnessed in the City. If the system of election had been placed on a more satisfactory footing, he could not help thinking that a fairer and more just expression of public opinion at that time might have taken place. In connection with his Motion, he could not but refer to the entertainment which gave so much influence both to the Corporation and also to Companies, which formed one of its most prominent parts. Of these, the most mischievous was the dinner given by the Sheriffs in the dining-room of the House itself. Whenever they presented a Petition or introduced a Bill into the House, Members who came from different parts of the Kingdom received invitations to dine with them, and then when the question of reform came forward they were reluctant to vote against the Corporation. He expressed a hope that, at no distant day, the House would put an end to what he could not but term a flagrant abuse. He begged to move the Resolution of which he had given Notice.

SIR WILFRID LAWSON seconded the Motion.

Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "the sale of the Parliamentary Franchise by the City Guilds with the consent of the Court of Aldermen is an abuse and should be abolished,"—(*Mr. James,*)

—instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

MR. ALDERMAN COTTON said, he begged to give a complete denial to the statement of the hon. Member for Gateshead that the Corporation of London sold votes. Such a statement was altogether without foundation. The Guilds of the City of London existed for the purposes of good-fellowship and hospitality. He was sorry the hon. Member for Gateshead had not availed himself of some of the invitations with which he had been honoured by those Bodies in the course of his political career. As it was, he watched over the affairs of the City of London, and viewed some of them in the blackest possible light. One would suppose, from the argument of the hon. Gentleman, that all the City Guilds were Conservative, and that every new vote created was a Conservative vote; but the hon. Member ought to know that the Fishmongers' Company—one of the most celebrated—was a Liberal Guild, and that Liberal demonstrations took place there frequently. A vote was not conferred by the taking of the Livery, but by a man becoming a freeman of a Guild; but no one could become a member of a Guild unless he were a man of credit and respectability. His character would be well looked into before he was admitted. One of the motives for increasing the number of the Fanmakers' Company was that ladies were to be admitted as honorary freemen. He was obliged to say "freemen," because the term freewomen was not analogous in meaning. It was the right of the Aldermen to increase the Livery; and he hoped Liberal Members would not conclude for one moment that every freeman and every Alderman of the City was Conservative, although he should be exceedingly glad if they all were. In the olden days the majority of Guilds were Liberal, as were also a long succession of Lord Mayors, and it was only recently that there had been a change in the politics of the Chief Magistrate. He regarded the Motion as frivolous, and unworthy of the hon. Member who had taken in hand the great cause of the reform of the City Corporation. There could be no difference between allowing a man to become a voter by paying a fee and his acquiring a vote by taking a house through a landlord. He would undertake to say that two-thirds or three-fourths of the freemen had votes independently of their freemanship in respect of premises they occupied in the City. Therefore, there was no ground for the wholesale assertion that a number of faggot votes had been created. He trusted that if the Motion of the hon. Member was put to the House it would be rejected by a large majority.

Mr. CHARLEY observed, that great latitude was allowed in giving Notices of Motion in that House; but if the hon. Member for Gateshead were to write a letter to the papers containing the same statements, he would expose himself to an action for libel, if not to an indictment. The franchise complained of by the hon. Member was the ancient franchise of the City of London. Down to the time of George I. it was the only franchise. He could not conceive any fancy kind of franchise that was preferable to this. It was preserved by the Reform Act of 1867. It was a mistake to suppose that a Liveryman received his appointment for life, as if he ceased to reside within 25 miles of the City he ceased to be a Liveryman. The number of voters in the Fanmakers' Company had, no doubt, been increased recently; but the increase was made by a vote of the Court of Aldermen, and among those who supported it were some of the most active Liberals of the City of London. It was, therefore, absurd to say that those votes had been created in the Conservative interest. It was also perfectly incorrect to allege that there had been any sale of the Parliamentary franchise. It might be said with equal justice that a landlord sold votes to his tenants because he let houses to them, or that keepers of lodging-houses sold votes to those who resided within their dwellings. If the hon. Member for Gateshead wished to assist the Conservative cause in London, he could not do so more effectually than by Motions of this sort. He could not sit down without asserting, in opposition to the statement of the hon. Member, that the meeting at Guildhall to which he referred in terms of such sweeping condemnation, was of a perfectly spontaneous character, and was in no way open to the strong remarks he made upon it.

Sir CHARLES W. DILKE wished to observe, as the hon. and learned Member for Salford (Mr. Charley) upheld the character of the Guildhall meeting in question, that on a former occasion he (Sir Charles W. Dilke) had stated that artizans from Woolwich Arsenal disturbed the meeting, and he stated the sums which some of them were paid for disturbing it. Those statements had never been contradicted —so much for the spontaneity of the meeting. The hon. and learned Gentleman also said that such statements as those of his hon. Friend might expose anyone making them to an action for libel, or possibly to an indictment; but, if so, that would be on the principle of "the greater the truth the greater the libel," for there was not a word of the statement made by the hon. Gentleman the Member for Gateshead (Mr. James) that was not truth. With regard to his argument relative to the faggot votes, there was this difference in the two cases—that a landholder could not pick out certain tenants to give the franchise to, refusing it to the rest; whereas that was precisely what had been done by the Company. He supported the Motion.

MR. J. G. HUBBARD said, he could not see that there was any reasonable pretence for the Motion, and he thought that it ought to be withdrawn. What did the hon. Member mean by "the traffic in votes?" To whom could a vote be sold? The hon. Member seemed to have forgotten that the ballot was in operation. The gentlemen who had been admitted to the freedom of the Fanmakers' Company had made a sacrifice to obtain a right of voting for a representative of the City of London—in his (Mr. Hubbard's) estimation a very legitimate object of ambition, but one absolutely distinct from a sale of votes. He could only characterize the attack on the Company as trifling and offensive.

MR. HERSCHELL thought that if his hon. and learned Friend (Mr. Charley) had not believed that the Conservative cause would have been benefited by what had been done, he would not have supported it so strongly. The Motion of his hon. Friend (Mr. James) was directed to an abuse, and the question which it raised was simply this—was it expedient or desirable that the Court of Aldermen should have the power of choosing and determining whether a number of persons, who could not be otherwise voters for the City, might become voters by procuring the franchise by purchase? He (Mr. Herschell) conceived that after the admission which the right hon. Gentleman the Member for the City of London (Mr. Hubbard) had just made, there could be no doubt that there had been a purchase of votes in the City. The matter was one well worthy of consideration.

COLONEL MAKINS wished to take exception to a remark which had been made by the hon. Alderman who represented the City of London (Mr. Alderman Cotton), that the Livery Companies existed for the purpose of the promotion of good-fellowship and the exercise of hospitality. They existed for very different purposes. Many of them had special duties to perform. For instance, the Goldsmiths' Company had the supervision over the Hall-Marking of all the plate in the Kingdom. The Fishmongers' Company seized and destroyed all fish which was, when exposed for sale, unfit for human food; and the Clothmakers' Company—of which he was himself a member—encouraged technical education in Yorkshire, and other clothmaking districts. But, as had been said, it was only an incidental consequence of membership of one of these Companies that it conferred a vote. Whether language was given to men to conceal their thoughts might be a matter of doubt; but it was certainly an abuse of language to characterize the conduct of the Corporation of the City in this matter as a selling of the right of voting. If the City of London had been represented by three Liberal instead of three Conservative Members, nothing would have been heard of this matter.

SIR TREVOR LAWRENCE said, that the truth was that the Fanmakers' Company was a very poor one, and that they had increased their numbers with the view of obtaining a little more money. In order to calm the fears of hon. Members opposite, he might inform them that two-thirds of the Court of that Company were, he was told, Liberals. All these Companies had done much for the advancement of technical education in their particular branches of trade.

Question put.

The House *divided:*—Ayes 153; Noes 114: Majority 39.—(Div. List, No. 43.)

Main Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair."

EGYPTIAN FINANCE.—OBSERVATIONS.

SIR GEORGE CAMPBELL, who had given Notice that he would move—

> "That it is not desirable that Her Majesty's Government should do anything to facilitate the raising of new loans by Oriental Governments which have failed to meet the old ones,"

said, that although he was precluded by the Rules of the House from making his Motion, he wished to draw attention to the subject to which it referred. He was in hopes that the proposal that Her Majesty's Government should intervene in the raising of a loan for Turkey had gone off and would not come up again, so he need not say very much on that. But in regard to Egyptian transactions of that kind, he was afraid that our Government were venturing upon dangerous and slippery ground, which might give way beneath them. The House knew that various Missions had been sent out to improve the financial condition of

Egypt, and, among other things, to enable her to pay her debts honestly. After the Missions of the right hon. Members for Shoreham (Mr. Stephen Cave), and for the City of London (Mr. Goschen), came that of Mr. Rivers Wilson. Mr. Wilson had, in one respect, been much more successful than his predecessors, because his proceedings had had the effect of largely raising the price of Egyptian stock. It was a question, however, whether that result had been produced by fair means; and he (Sir George Campbell) confessed that he himself had grave doubts on that point. He should boldly and distinctly state that, in his opinion, the present attempt ostensibly to introduce good government into Egypt was nothing less than a great stock-jobbing operation to raise the price of Egyptian funds, and enable those interested in those loans to unload them on the general public. He had asked the Chancellor of the Exchequer whether Mr Wilson had pledged himself to great financial bodies in Paris, having great political influence, and holding enormous quantities of Egyptian stock, not to reduce the interest before a certain date? and the Chancellor of the Exchequer replied that no information had reached the Government upon the subject, though he did not say that the statement was not true. He (Sir George Campbell) had reason to believe that there was very considerable foundation for it. Those great financial bodies had very much burnt their fingers by meddling with Egyptian loans, of which they held enormous amounts, and unless they could put their bonds on the public above the rate at which they lately stood they were likely to lose millions. Under these circumstances, no doubt, it was a great temptation to do something to get those financial bodies out of their difficulties; and he had been given to understand that some arrangement had been made—he would not say a conspiracy, because that was an ugly word—by which those great financial bodies undertook that they would not throw their stock on the market, and so depress the stock, for a certain time, and that, on the other hand, the Egyptian Government undertook they would pay the interest for a certain period, in the hope —and that hope had been already realized—that the stock in the meantime would be run up, so that ultimately those financial bodies would be enabled to unload their stock on the public, who would be duped by the transaction. There was a general belief abroad, although it might be unfounded, that the policy which was being pursued by the present Finance Minister of Egypt, and which, as it now appeared, was to some extent supported by Her Majesty's Ministers at home, was distinctly opposed to the policy of Mr. Consul General Vivian, and the views he had expressed. The newspapers told them that the present Government of Egypt looked not to the interest of the bondholders only, but sought to reform the Administration in order to benefit the people. That he believed to be a mere sham and a blind. The proof of the pudding was in the eating. Had the people of Egypt been treated more fairly and kindly by the present than by the former Administrations of that country? The truth was just the contrary; they were now, he believed, quite as much, and probably more, ground down than they ever were before. If the English public persisted in supposing that the Administration had lately been carried on in Egypt with a pure and simple regard for the welfare of the people, they were not without the means of knowing better in the shape of the information given by able correspondents of *The Times.* Some very striking communications on that subject had appeared very lately in that journal. One letter in *The Times* of that day described the state of things in Upper Egypt. The writer said—

> "We rode on donkeys 200 miles through the more remote districts. Everywhere the most heartrending state of poverty was revealed. Taxation having taken from the Arab every reserve he may have saved in years of comparative prosperity, the failure of the dourra crop through the extensive inundation of this year deprived him of any possible means of subsistence. Near the sugar factories the famine was proportionately greater, as the drain upon the resources of the people is of course heavier where a large area of land has been seized for a crop which returns nothing to the actual cultivator, and where forced labour in the fields and factory deprives the peasant of his most valuable time. It was sad, in the midst of so much want, to see men driven with whips to labour for the English bondholder while the fields were lying untilled."

He was afraid there was too much truth in that. The same correspondent went down the Nile, and he said—

"The first news we heard when we reached Luxor was that the Viceroy had given a magnificent entertainment to the Europeans at Cairo. It is, of course, but right that money should be spent in Cairo, but the account of these festivities jarred unpleasantly on our feeling after the scenes we had witnessed during the past eight days. We next heard that the Khedive had sent two Englishmen to investigate the reports of the distress, and a few days later came the news that they had reported 'the accounts of the distress in Upper Egypt as greatly exaggerated.'"

That was, apparently, the evidence of an impartial witness. With respect to the late proceedings at Cairo, another correspondent of *The Times*, on Monday last, stated that, notwithstanding an authoritative declaration made last May that all the arrears of pay were to be paid, the claims of the Army were neglected, that that most dangerous element was brought to a state of almost excusable disaffection; that in vain Mr. Vivian had remonstrated against the dangerous folly of disbanding an unpaid Army; it was to be expected that an outbreak must result. He would ask—Was it true that the present Finance Minister of Egypt refused to pay the just dues of those officials, and that Mr. Vivian remonstrated against that refusal? Another correspondent said that all those men were in arrears of pay, some of them for a few months, some for a year, and some even for two years; that severe hardship and privation resulted to them and their families in consequence; that they had petitioned again and again peacefully for what was owing to them, and were told that there was nothing for them, because all the taxation was mortgaged to pay the Public Debt. Were Her Majesty's Ministers supporting a Government which, while it paid the bondholders in full, treated its own officials in that way? He was very much afraid that there was a great deal of truth in these assertions, and if Her Majesty's Government could not say that they had information in their possession which enabled them distinctly to contradict them, then he must believe that it was true, as stated by the correspondent, that for the last two years, the affairs of Egypt had been administered in a most monstrous and unjust manner, entirely for the benefit of the foreign bondholders, and not for the benefit of the inhabitants of the country. He was aware that Lord Salisbury had candidly avowed that Her Majesty's Government had become involved in their present policy because they found it necessary to stand well with France, but he hoped they would not persevere too far in the course they had adopted. He trusted the Government would hesitate before involving the country in a course which was not creditable to its position. If there were any truth in the universal belief that Mr. Vivian was of one way of thinking and Mr. Rivers Wilson of another, he would ask upon what ground Her Majesty's Government had supported the views of Mr. Rivers Wilson rather than those of Mr. Vivian? He wished to know, also, whether the Chancellor of the Exchequer considered the plans for the government of Egypt, which had succeeded in paying the coupons in full and in raising the price of Egyptian bonds in the market, were really good plans? His own apprehension was, that when the French financial bodies had been enabled, by the higher prices, to "unload" their bonds, they would snap their fingers at the Government, who would then be left face to face with the question of the government of Egypt. He hoped the Government would say something which would relieve the public from that apprehension. He should like to ask Her Majesty's Government on what general grounds they had thought it desirable, to a certain extent in the case of Turkey, and in a decided degree in the case of Egypt, to assist, by the appointment of Commissioners and others, those Governments, which had not been able to pay off their old loans, to raise new ones? Clever as Mr. Rivers Wilson undoubtedly was—and he (Sir George Campbell) gave him credit for that — he had raised the price of the bonds, not by any action of his own, but because it was generally believed that he had the support of Her Majesty's Government, and of the Government of France. Great was the responsibility of Her Majesty's Government if, by any action of theirs, they had led a credulous public into supposing that the Government of Egypt was solvent. A debate on this subject took place the other day, and he found that in *The Times* of the next morning there was attributed to the Chancellor of the Exchequer a very distinct and strong statement, to the effect that Egypt was a country whose resources would enable her to pay the whole of her debts, as well as everything else. He did not hear any such statement made by the right hon. Gentleman, but it had remained uncontradicted. A further statement had also been made which would lead the public to suppose that Mr. Rivers Wilson was, to a certain extent, a Representative of the British Government. He maintained that statements of that kind had a considerable effect in misleading the public, and he hoped Her Majesty's Government would inform the House that they did not countenance them. He trusted that the first object of Her Majesty's Government was the decent government and fair treatment of the unhappy people of Egypt, and that they regarded as a matter of only secondary importance the claims of the French and other foreign bondholders.

Mr. E. JENKINS said, he rose not so much for the purpose of discussing the very wide question raised by the hon. Member for Kirkcaldy (Sir George Campbell), as to endeavour to extract from Her Majesty's Government some information with reference to an even more important question—that was the finances of Turkey. At the same time, it could not be denied that, especially in the circumstances of the present Government, and in view of its financial history in connection with both Turkey and Egypt, the question raised was one of wide interest throughout the country, and deserved more discussion than it was likely to receive on that occasion. He rather thought that, if the Chancellor of the Exchequer were in a different position in the House from that he now occupied, there would proceed from the Opposition side of the House a very able exposition of the principle which the hon. Member for Kirkcaldy had endeavoured to illustrate. The proposition, as it appeared on the Paper, was, perhaps, not one to obtain the general assent of the House. The proposition was, that it was not desirable that Her Majesty's Government should do anything to facilitate the raising of new loans by Oriental Governments which had failed to meet their old ones—that was, their old loans. Of course, the House would at once recognize that there might be the doing something towards facilitating the raising of new loans, something in the nature of a political character, and animated by political relations to the Government putting forward the loan. There was no necessity to come to any immediate illustration which might not be of a very pleasant character to allude to, but he might take the relation between Russia and Turkey with regard to the indemnity. Undoubtedly, there was a relation of an international—a political — character, and which must be carefully discriminated from those existing between this Government and the French Government and Egypt in relation to loans which had been put forward by the Khedive of Egypt. He thought, therefore, he should be careful to guard against the general admission that under no circumstances was it possible for the Government of Great Britain to lend assistance to the placing of loans in view of certain political relations and international considerations. Having said that, he could not but join his hon. Friend in reprehending very much the attitude of the Government towards Egypt. No doubt, it was the Government's misfortune; for it could not possibly be their intention; but it was the fact that no Government which had ever existed had contributed as much as the present Government had done to favour stock-jobbing operations by the course they had taken in their action towards Egypt and Turkey and the purchase of the Suez Canal Shares. Unfortunately, their action in these matters had been foreseen by persons who were well able to discount beforehand the profits which would be made. He did not bring this as a charge against the Government; but it was their misfortune that when action was expected of them, such was the effect upon the Stock Exchanges of Europe. What, then, must be the effect if the Government admitted the principle of interfering on behalf of private creditors into the affairs of other nations? The House ought to have explicit information from the Treasury Bench as to whether the Government was contemplating any arrangements with regard to Egypt or Turkey which were likely to involve on the part of Great Britain the guarantee of loans which had been placed upon the market on behalf of the interest of private creditors, whether in England or in France. He asked the Chancellor of the Exchequer to state distinctly that it was impossible for the Government to contemplate such a course, because, as long as it was supposed that they were likely for one moment to aid in the guaranteeing of these loans—as long as there was supposed to be a chance of their guaranteeing the position of Egypt for the purpose of supporting the claims of the English, or the English and French, bondholders—so long would the supposition affect the Stock Exchanges, and could not fail to be disastrous and prejudicial to the prestige of the country. He hoped, therefore, the Chancellor of the Exchequer would get up and state distinctly that Her Majesty's Government had no such intention. As to Turkey, he was afraid Her Majesty's Government had placed themselves in a position in which it was almost impossible for them to avoid doing that of which his hon. Friend complained. He should like to know in what position they stood in with regard to the De Tocqueville scheme, and whether they contemplated entering in any way into any scheme for the rehabilitation of the finances of Turkey as they had done for the rehabilitation of the finances of Egypt? Were they prepared to appoint Commissioners, or any body whatever, under such a scheme as that? No doubt, the Chancellor of the Exchequer would find it very difficult to answer that question; and why? Because Her Majesty's Government had undertaken responsibilities with regard to Turkey which were of a political character, and one could not conceal from himself that, in regard to these responsibilities, very serious questions arose as to the financial condition of Turkey. If Asia Minor was to be reformed and organized in such a manner that it should be able to contribute to the defence of the territories of Turkey, to which Her Majesty's Government had pledged themselves, it of course followed that the whole financial Turkish system became a subject of interest and responsibility at once to Her Majesty's Government. But the Government could not at once assume and disclaim responsibility, and he wanted to point out the dangerous position in which this country was being placed. If the De Tocqueville scheme had been carried out, and an International Commission had been administering the finances of Turkey, there would have been nothing whatever left to enable Turkey to carry out that which she had engaged to do under the Anglo-Turkish Convention. The more closely they criticized that Convention—and especially in view of the present financial difficulties—the more impossible did it appear to them that it should ever become a practical fact, or that Turkey would ever be able to carry out the engagement into which she had entered. We were in this ridiculous position—that the Government must either undertake themselves to administer the whole of the resources of Turkey, or else they would be unable to secure that the Turkish Convention should be carried out. Turkey would probably go to other countries, and French financiers might, perhaps, find her money to go on for a few years. She would thus incur deeper obligations with the claim of Russia still in existence, and eventually the people of this country might find they were bound at any cost to defend the whole of the Turkish Empire against Russian aggression. He had endeavoured to sketch the situation to the House, and he would ask the Chancellor of the Exchequer to fill up the intermediate lines.

COLONEL ALEXANDER, said, that having only just returned from Egypt, he could confirm everything that had fallen from the hon. Member for Kirkcaldy (Sir George Campbell) as to the miserable condition of the people of that country, in consequence of the maladministration of the finances. While in Egypt he met the gentleman whose letter appeared in *The Times* of that morning, and that gentleman stated to him then exactly what had appeared in *The Times*. The hon. Member for Kirkcudbright (Mr. Maitland) accompanied him, and, were he in the House, could confirm what had been stated by the hon. Member for Kirkcaldy. One of the gentleman who had been sent to inquire into the condition of the people, and who, from his knowledge of Arabic, was admirably qualified to do so, was unfortunately taken ill of small-pox soon after leaving Cairo. But if anyone on the spot were to say the distress was exaggerated, he could not have made use of his eyes. In his (Colonel Alexander's) progress down the Nile, he stopped at various places, and all he saw there proved that the statement of the writer in *The Times* was by no means exaggerated. The people were so many living skeletons, resembling very much what they had heard as to the condition of the people of India during the Great Famine. He was in Cairo when the outbreak among the officers took place. There was no doubt that arrears of pay extending over about two years were due to these officers, and that the Government acknowledged the justice of their claims might be inferred from the circumstance that almost immediately after the outbreak, three months' arrears of pay were paid them. He was afraid that, as Mr. Rivers Wilson and M. de Blignières were Members of the Government, they had consented to the action of Nubar Pasha in withholding from these officers the satisfaction of their just claims. It was useless to look for improvement in the country as long as such things were done.

Mr. W. CARTWRIGHT said, he wished to know what was really the present position of Mr. Rivers Wilson, who went out to Egypt, having obtained leave from Her Majesty's Government for two years? He put a Question to the Government not long ago as to whether Mr. Rivers Wilson had tendered his resignation; but from all he had yet learnt about it, by means of public information, that gentleman was at the present moment holding an official position in Egypt. Was he holding that position by his own authority, or had he consulted Her Majesty's Government, and received instructions from them to remain in Egypt? If he had received such instructions, he was not the servant of the Khedive, but the Commissioner of England.

Mr. O'REILLY wished to elucidate the exact position of our Government in the transactions referred to. Most unfortunately the action of the Government had, perhaps unavoidably, been used for stock-jobbing. There were three steps which the Government could take for assisting a foreign Government by facilitating and raising of loans. The simplest thing was for our Government to guarantee the loan; but he presumed there was no question about that—that there was no intention on the part of England to adopt that course. Another way of supporting a loan, and of encouraging capitalists to invest their money for Her Majesty's Government to adopt, was to concur with a foreign Government in appointing an officer for the purpose of collecting the revenue appropriated to its payment. The strongest example of that course that could be taken was that taken by Her Majesty's Government in the instance of the Daira loans. Two gentlemen were appointed by the English and the French Governments at the suggestion of the Khedive, and a formal undertaking was given by the Egyptian Government that those gentlemen should not be removed from the administration of the Daira lands. That was clearly ensuring to the creditors that the revenues of that estate should remain in their hands, and that the creditors should get them; but a grave question might arise if the Khedive insisted on removing them. There was also a third way of backing up the credit of a foreign Government, and that was when that Government applied to our Government to recommend an official for the collection and administration of the revenue. An instance of this was the appointment of Mr. Rivers Wilson. In such a case there was no absolute security given to the creditors that the gentleman appointed might not be removed, and that the revenue might not be diverted from the purposes to which it ought to be applied. The appointment of Mr. Rivers Wilson by the Egyptian Government was looked upon with great confidence by the creditors and, as great anxiety existed in connection with the subject, it was extremely desirable that the Chancellor of Exchequer should point out the exact position which that gentleman and his colleagues occupied, and should inform the House whether they were removable by the Khedive or not. He wished also for some information from the right hon. Gentleman with regard to another matter. It was notorious that the Turkish Government were engaged in endeavouring to raise new loans, and that the first difficulty they had to encounter in doing so was the alleged priority of the claims of the Russian Government for precedence in relation to the War Indemnity. Now, he should like to know, whether Her Majesty's Government had any information as to whether any negotiation or inquiry had passed between the Turkish and Russian Governments on the subject, whether he could state what they were with reference to the priority claims, and to what extent that priority was claimed for the War Indemnity? If that difficulty was got rid of by the Turkish Government, the second difficulty, of course, was what security could they give for a new loan? Had any proposal for the appointment of Commissioners to collect certain Turkish revenues been made, or would such a proposition be entertained if made? Until they gave some satisfactory security, nobody would be likely to lend them the money which they wanted. It was believed that it had been proposed by the Turkish Government to allocate certain of their revenues—the Customs, the revenues from Cyprus, and others—to the payment of the interest on the new loan which was sought to be raised. It had also been thrown out that it would be a great inducement to capitalists to invest their money if the administration of the revenues in Turkey were placed in the hands of Commissioners nominated by the English and French Governments. Was Her Majesty's Government prepared to follow such a course? It was perfectly well known the Government would not guarantee a loan. Therefore, that was a point which it would be well to have cleared up; for the feeling was, he thought, entertained by many hon. Members on both sides of the House that it would not be wise for the Government, by entangling itself directly or indirectly by guarantees in any of the three ways he had specified, to encourage financiers to advance their money. The less they had to do with them, the better would it be.

Sir JULIAN GOLDSMID said, he trusted the Government would do nothing in the way of facilitating any foreign loan whatever, for he did not think it was in any way the business of our Government to go about as knight-errants seeking to remedy the financial difficulties of another country. He was of opinion that Her Majesty's Government would hereafter be called seriously to account for lending Mr. Rivers Wilson to the Khedive in the extraordinary manner they had done. The loans, he might add, on which that gentleman was now endeavouring to pay 7 per cent interest, had not been raised at par, and we were consequently assisting in the maintenance of an usurious rate of interest which the Government ought, in his opinion, rather to use its influence to reduce, seeing that the condition of the fellaheen was miserable in the extreme. If Her Majesty's Government were to proceed in a similar manner in other countries, they would entail a responsibility from which he thought England ought to shrink. It was also a matter worthy of consideration, how far the English public service was to be made use of for the employment of foreign Governments. We were maintaining upon our Civil Service a man who was in the service of a Government which was only half-civilized, and certainly despotic. He doubted whether the majority of the people of England, if they considered this question apart from the financial point of view, would wish one of our public servants to be employed for such a purpose. He hoped Her Majesty's Government would recall Mr. Rivers Wilson, or, although he received no salary, would ask him to resign his office in our public service, for his employment in the service of the Egyptian Government and in that of our Government were incompatible, and he (Sir Julian Goldsmid) strongly objected to it.

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER confessed that it was with some difficulty he rose to speak to the various questions that had been put to him in the course of that conversation. He would, however, endeavour, as well as he could, to answer those questions; but he must ask hon. Gentlemen to exercise a little consideration if he was not able to speak so fully as they might wish. With regard to the Motion which his hon. Friend the Member for Kirkcaldy (Sir George Campbell) would have moved, if it had been in his power to do so, he (the Chancellor of the Exchequer) was glad that that was a Motion which could not be submitted to the House, because it would have been difficult to have arrived at a satisfactory vote upon it. He sympathized with the views which he believed animated the hon. Gentleman, and he sympathized with the greater part of what had been said by the hon. Gentleman, and by others who had taken the same line with him. At the same time, to lay down so very broadly the proposition that it was not desirable Her Majesty's Government should do anything to facilitate the raising of new loans by Oriental Governments which had failed to meet the old ones, would, he thought, be to take a position which the House would find it rather difficult to maintain in all imaginable circumstances. On the other hand, to negative such a proposition would give rise to a very false impression in another way. An hon. Gentleman — he believed it was the Member for Dundee (Mr. E. Jenkins)— pointed out that such a Resolution would stand in the way of any step that might, in conceivable circumstances, be taken on political grounds for maintaining the financial credit of some country with which we were in alliance. For instance, take the case of the Guarantee that was given in 1855 to Turkey, in order to enable her to raise a loan at the time for the purpose of carrying on a war in which we were allied with her. That was an operation that gave rise to discussion at the time, and if such an operation were proposed again, no doubt it would be very seriously discussed. It was an operation against which Parliament would be slow to pledge itself, without duly considering all the circumstances of the case. There was another conjuncture which might occur. It might be that it would be possible to facilitate some operation by which a Power which had failed hitherto to pay its loans might pay them, and in that way to redeem its position from bankruptcy. He only gave these illustrations of cases in which it might be right for the Government to take a course which would be at variance with such a Resolution as that, but he wished it to be understood that he had not in his mind the idea that either the one or the other was likely to occur. They wished, however, to reserve entire liberty of action, in order that they might be free, if any case should arise, to come to Parliament and make such a proposition as might be suitable at the time. He had already stated that Her Majesty's Government would not, under any circumstances, pledge that House or pledge the country to any guarantee of assistance of that character without the previous consent of Parliament, and he could repeat that pledge with complete security. He had been asked a good many questions, some of them bearing upon political considerations, part bearing upon the condition of the population of Egypt, some of them bearing upon the effect of the conduct of Her Majesty's Government upon the stock-market, and some of them upon the particular question of the position of Mr. Rivers Wilson. He hoped he should not be required to go into the question which was raised by the hon. Member for Dundee, as to any correspondence between Russia and Turkey as to a priority of charge upon the revenues of Egypt. He should not be doing well if he were to enter upon that question at present. The House was quite aware that at the time of the Congress of Berlin the subject was mentioned and embodied in the Protocols. By referring to the Protocols, hon. Members would see what view was taken by Her Majesty's Government at the time, and that view was the view which they still maintained; but, at all events, he would rather not at the present time go more fully into that. He would wish next to refer to a matter of great interest, and although it was rather a bye-question, as regarded the Resolution on the Paper, it was one of considerable importance—he referred to the bearing of anything that had been done, or was contemplated, by Her Majesty's Government on the fellaheen of Egypt. There was an impression abroad, and it had been reflected in some of the speeches to-night, that the operations of the present Government of Egypt— he referred to the Government which had been revised within the last few months—had been calculated to place an increased pressure on the taxpayers of Egypt. It had been asserted by his hon. and gallant Friend behind him (Colonel Alexander), and by others who had either themselves witnessed the condition of the country, or who had received intelligence on the subject from trustworthy sources, that the condition of the population of Egypt was very miserable. Now, he was not disposed for one minute to question the perfect accuracy of those statements. He believed the position of that population was very depressed and mournful; and, though Her Majesty's Government could not go about like knight-errants, undertaking to remedy all that was wrong in the world, yet it had been an object of theirs, if possible, to accomplish an act, which in their opinion would be most beneficial—to improve the condition or lighten in some way the burden of this unfortunate people. He believed they were a most interesting people. He believed they were industrious, patient, and self-denying; but so far as he had been able to gain any information on this subject, he was inclined to believe that the present condition of these people was owing, not at all to any recent step which the Government of Egypt had taken, but to a long course of misgovernment. He knew that his right hon. Friend the Member for Shoreham (Mr. S. Cave), and Mr. Rivers Wilson, had both been struck with the evils of the present financial system as bearing upon the condition of the people, and an improvement in that system was desirable, not only on account of humanity, but also because it would contribute more than anything else to the prosperity of the country. They believed, and that belief had been confirmed by the opinions of most persons who had in any way studied the subject, that the distress of the population of Egypt was greatly caused by the exactions of subordinate officials, tax-gatherers, and others, who took a great deal more from the people than was paid into the Treasury, and often used violence to extract it. They also believed that one feature of the system of Egypt which caused great suffering was the administration of the Daira lands. The Daira was a landed estate, of enormous extent, belonging to the Viceroy. That estate was managed entirely by himself, of course, with the assistance of stewards and bailiffs, and not upon the system of leasing out any portion of it to anyone; and the result had been that they had an enormous estate spread over Egypt, embracing some of the most fertile and productive portions of the country, which had been administered upon the system of a single farm, and had been worked to a very great extent practically by forced labour. In old times the work was avowedly done by forced labour; latterly that had not been possible, but the system was still not satisfactory. The people had suffered very much indeed from the refusal of the Khedive to break up his estate into farms and small holdings and let them out to the people, who were obliged, therefore, to make a living by accepting labour not nominally forced, but which was very inadequately paid for. That had a great deal to do with the existing misery and poverty of the people, and that idea was borne out by the letter in *The Times* to-day. The impression formed by persons who had studied the subject was, that it would be of the greatest possible advantage to Egypt that the Daira should be taken out of the hands of the Khedive and out of the mischievous system in which it was, and that it should be let out in parcels to the people, who would then farm portions of it at a reasonable rent, and so make their profits by farming. This had been one great object to which Mr. Rivers Wilson and his colleagues had addressed themselves. After inquiry, the first thing that occurred to them was to get the Khedive to give up the Daira and allow it to be farmed. The whole of the history of the last few months centered in this—upon the pressure put on the Khedive to give up this personal administration of his, which, in the finances generally, and especially in regard to the Daira, was doing so much mischief — to give that up to proper authorities and so to enable proper reforms to be made. That was the object with which the Commissioners were working when they brought about the great change in the system of the government of Egypt; and he was convinced that if Mr. Rivers Wilson and M. de Blignières had fair play and were enabled to carry through their reforms, the great improvement in the Government of Egypt was an object which they might fairly hope to attain. He did not wish too strong a meaning to be attached to some words which fell from him the other day. He did not wish to express in a detailed manner an opinion, in a precise way, upon the extent to which Egypt was solvent. The country had great resources. Those resources were imperfectly developed because of bad government, and they would be developed if Egypt had fair play—that was, good government, good administration of its lands and of its taxes, and if, at the same time, the expenditure of the country were kept within limits. That was the point at which the Government of Nubar Pasha had been aiming; and he believed if that Government had time and fair play it might produce very considerable results. With regard to the fellaheen, he wished to impress upon the House that it was not the view of the Government that any pressure should be placed on the unfortunate taxpayers of Egypt; but, on the contrary, that such a system should be adopted as should at once improve the wealth of the country and relieve the pressure upon the people. He gave a flat contradiction to the idea that the Government had in any way pressed upon the Government of Egypt that they should oppress the taxpayers or should take steps of a character which was unfair to the officers or any others with a view to pay bondholders. The Government had done nothing of the sort; they had, neither directly nor indirectly, put any pressure on the Government of Egypt to pay the bondholders. That was not their business. He was speaking now of recent proceedings, because he understood that an impression of this kind had gone abroad. With regard to the May Coupons that was a different matter, and he had explained the other day how it was that Her Majesty's Government had supported the French Government, to a certain extent, in the representations made by France in May last. Those representations were made under the belief that there was money, which it was necessary to put pressure on the Khedive to get from him—that it was a case where he could pay if he chose. But the Government had also joined in the demand, that M. de Blignières should represent to the Khedive that he would not be justified in taking any steps to increase the burdens of the people for the purpose of paying that Coupon. Their impression was that there was painful extravagance. One form of that extravagance was in building palaces. Money was spent in building and enlarging palaces really of no use at all, and they did not hold that that was an expenditure which justified the refusal to pay the claims of the creditors. But it never was in the view of the Government that any additional pressure should be put on the taxpayers to provide these funds. The hon. Member for Longford (Mr. O'Reilly) put questions, which raised in a legal form the questions which the Chancellor of the Exchequer had to consider. He said there were three ways in which one Government might assist another to raise a loan. First, there was a direct guarantee. He agreed with the hon. Gentleman that that plan was entirely out of the question in the present circumstances. They never thought of such a thing. But, in saying that, however, he guarded himself with the general observation which he made in the beginning —that he did not intend to tie up the hands of the Government, in case circumstances should arise which rendered it necessary to make any proposals to the House. At present, however, the idea was entirely out of the question. There was no question of giving a guarantee. Then the hon. Gentleman said we might adopt a second course, which was a less strong form of guarantee, but which gave considerable support. "You may," he said, "adopt a system similar to that under which administrators and receivers are appointed for the Daira lands." Well, they all knew what the object of that system was—the object was to get the Daira lands out of the hands of the Khedive. When the Government of Nubar Pasha had persuaded the Khedive to resign the whole of the Daira lands for public uses, it occurred to them that the best use to which they could immediately apply this property which came into their hands was to raise upon it a loan by mortgaging it, so as to enable them to meet the pressing demands of Egypt—to pay off debts running at high interest and to pay officers and others whose salaries were due. In order to raise that loan the Government of Nubar Pasha addressed themselves to leading financiers, and those gentlemen said—"The security you offer is in itself ample, the lands are sufficient to cover the loan; but how are we to know that we shall not be defrauded of our security by its being made away with under the pressure of circumstances which the Ruler of Egypt might find too strong for him?" Upon that representations were made to the French and English Governments, and it was said—"If you will undertake to recommend first the appointment of gentlemen who may administer these estates, and will be responsible for seeing that the revenue is paid to the mortgagees, we will advance the money." In these circumstances it was thought right, after full consideration and discussion with the French Government, to take the step of nominating gentlemen, who were not to be removed without the consent of the English and French Governments, and a diplomatic engagement had been made to that effect. It was asked—"What will happen supposing the Khedive breaks that engagement?" But they did not contemplate that he would break an engagement which he had entered into in the exercise of his constitutional power. The Government had been asked whether they intended to do anything of the same kind for Turkey, and he could only say that up to the present time most assuredly they had no idea of the kind. He saw very great difficulties and objections to any step of the kind. What was done for Egypt was on a small and limited scale; and with regard to suggestions of a vast and vague and unlimited kind in relation to Turkish finances, he had never been able to see that it was possible to enter into any engagement without undertaking an amount of responsibility and power in the direction and management of the whole affairs of Turkey which he should never think of undertaking. It might, therefore, afford the hon. Gentleman who had asked the question some consolation to know that such a scheme was not contemplated by the Government. With regard to the third mode of assisting the country, the hon. Member said, it might be done by appointing collectors who should collect certain allocated revenues. Upon that he (the Chancellor of the Exchequer) might say that there was nothing of the kind in contemplation, but he wished to distinguish between two different ideas. Take, for instance, the Customs of Alexandria or Smyrna. If they were placed in the hands of certain officials nominated by the English Government, that would bring the suggestion to very nearly the same as the second which the hon. Member had proposed, and would raise difficulties and objections of a very similar character, because if they allocated the revenues of a particular port they must give the officers powers, which would raise questions of a difficult and embarrassing kind. But if it was merely meant that they were to place at the disposal of the Turkish Government gentlemen whose characters they knew, and whom they could recommend as to honesty and ability, he did not think the proposal was open to the same objection as the other. They knew very well that one of the great difficulties of an Oriental nation was the corruption of its servants, and that constantly the amounts of revenue which were raised and paid by the taxpayers were intercepted on their way to the Treasury. And, moreover, they knew that there was an ignorance of the principles of administration which very often caused a great deal of waste and loss of power, and it had been the practice from time to time of nations who had felt themselves behind in these matters to employ English or French officials, or people of other nations, because they thought them better informed or more trustworthy than their own officials. In China there was an English collector of Customs, and the same was the case in other places.

SIR JULIAN GOLDSMID asked whether these officials were appointed by the Government employing them?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER replied affirmatively, and proceeded to say that in cases in which any Government with which they were on friendly terms had applied to them to recommend the persons who were trustworthy, they had felt that those Governments were making an application which was perfectly natural and which might be complied with, but they had always been particularly cautious and reserved. They had, as a rule, said—"We will not undertake any such responsibility, but what we will do is to give you a list of gentlemen whose names occur to us"—gentlemen very often who had served their time in England or the Indian Service—"we will place this list in your hands, and offer any facilities for you to make enquiries, and if you like to make any bargain with those gentlemen, do so by all means," but they had abstained from entering upon any direct responsibility. In that way Mr. Romaine and several other officers were selected. The single instance of an exception being made was that of Mr. Rivers Wilson. With respect to him they had done that which they had not done in any other case. They had given him leave for two years to undertake his office. It was not correct, however, to say that they recommended him. His services were sought for by the Egyptian Government, and they were granted by us, but not tendered by us. He made that distinction because he thought it was important. The case of Captain Tyler some years ago was not exactly similar. That was a case in which that officer wished to undertake certain duties outside his own country, and it was on account of Her Majesty's Government feeling that it was important that the assistance sought for should be given that they gave him leave. As far as Mr. Rivers Wilson was concerned, the Government assented willingly to his application for leave, because they believed good would result from his appointment. It was not possible now to define the exact position of Mr. Wilson, because, unfortunately, the position of the Egyptian Ministry itself was in a very unsettled state owing to the crisis through which it had recently passed. When Mr. Wilson went out, he went as the Minister of the Khedive, who had the right to dismiss him from his post whenever he thought fit; but the precise circumstances were these:—The Khedive insisted upon the resignation or dismissal of Nubar Pasha, and it then became a question as to the course which should be taken by Mr. Wilson and M. de Blignières. They consulted their respective Governments, and Her Majesty's Ministers expressed to Mr. Wilson their opinion that it would be undesirable for him to resign, but that he was to be guided very much by the arrangements which might be come to with the Khedive. They had no control over Mr. Wilson, who was then and still remained perfectly free to take his own course; but they gave the advice and instructed the British Consul in Egypt to give Mr. Wilson his moral support. He might say that the French Government gave similar advice to M. de Blignières. This exceptional interference in Egyptian affairs was due to the fact that this country had not only a large financial interest in the country, but was also interested in it in a political sense. As far as the first-named consideration was concerned, hon. Members knew that the Turkish Loan of 1855, which was guaranteed by this country, rested to a considerable extent upon the payment of the Egyptian Tribute; and that Egypt was indebted to us in respect of the annuity for the payment of which its Government rendered themselves liable at the time of the purchase of the Suez Canal Shares. But far beyond this was the political aspect of the question. Her Majesty's Government felt it to be of the greatest importance to the welfare and interests of this country and of European peace that Egypt should not fall into a state of anarchy and of that state of confusion which resulted from financial embarrassment and bankruptcy, and they thought that if financial affairs in Egypt got into a bad state, interference might take place from other Powers, and complications of a difficult character might arise. It was with that in view that they took the course they did in connection with the Administration. They were at any time perfectly prepared to discuss the propriety of that course, but he thought the House would feel that it was one which should be discussed fully and not incidentally in a conversation of that kind. He thought he had substantially answered the questions which had been put, and if he had omitted any of them, he might, perhaps, be reminded of them. The course they had taken was consistent with their policy of several years past, and, at the present moment, while they were looking with hope to the success of the Egyptian experiment, they had not in contemplation any arrangements in regard either to Turkey or anywhere else of the kind which had been suggested, and which seemed so much to have alarmed several hon. Members of the House.

Mr. SHAW LEFEVRE wished to know, whether Mr. Rivers Wilson corresponded directly with Her Majesty's Government or through the Consul General of his dominion?

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER, in reply, said, that Mr. Rivers Wilson did not communicate with Her Majesty's Government directly, but did so through our Consul General at Cairo.

INSTRUCTION IN MIXED COLLEGES.

OBSERVATIONS.

Mr. O'DONNELL said, he had a Motion on the Paper, but he was precluded by the Forms of the House from pressing it to a Division on the present occasion. He did not, however, regret that very much, as the Government had taught them the value of Divisions in a manner which did not tend to assure them that a Division was always a test of the opinion of the House. The Government had its majority in the neighbourhood, and when it was wanted it would march in and vote. Still he would call the attention of the House to the subject of his Resolution, which was—

> "That the professional instruction on the most important subjects in mixed colleges and universities is necessarily superficial and imperfect when the conditions of mixed education are observed, and injurious and offensive to one or other denomination of students when the professors endeavour to be teachers in more than name."

Although continually impaled on one or the other horn of the dilemma set forth in his Resolution, the advocates of mixed colleges continued to assert that those institutions taught pure, uncoloured, and undistorted truth and science in a manner which ought to be perfectly acceptable to every fair-minded person of every religious or irreligious denomination; but he affirmed that in a mixed educational college the teaching of the Professoriate on all the most important subjects was necessarily offensive where the conditions of such education were duly observed. They could do one or other of two things—they could either leave the Professoriate unpledged and free, or they could tie it down by restrictions. If they left it perfectly unpledged and free, if they left the Chairs open to every sort of denomination, and if they left the occupants of those Chairs at perfect liberty to express their views as they chose, of course it would be quite impossible to keep up the pretence of impartiality—the appearance of fairness under the mixed education system at all. In a University conducted under such a system 20 important affairs might arise, and there might be 20 self-important Professors occupying those Chairs, satisfied with their own views, but probably differing from one another. The result would be that in passing from class-room to class-room they might find an aggressive Protestantism, then an aggressive Pantheism, then an aggressive Atheism, then an aggressive Mussulmanism, and then some equally aggressive members of the Oriental branch of the Christian Church. In the colleges which were most skilfully constructed to bear out the appearance of a mixed system the Professoriate was strictly restricted. He referred to the Queen's Colleges and the Queen's University in Ireland, which, no matter what imitations might have sprung up since their establishment—no matter how much their principle might have been borrowed, avowedly or unavowedly, by other institutions—remained the most scientifically constructed system of mixed education which had yet been invented. The University of London had attempted to solve the difficulty by having no Professoriate whatever, and by becoming a purely examining body; but the Queen's Colleges and University in Ireland were not only examining but teaching bodies; and what was the gagging provision which at present existed in regard to them? The Professor of a Chair was asked to sign a declaration to the effect that in lecturing, examining, and discharging the various duties of his office, he should carefully abstain from teaching or advancing any doctrine or making any statement derogatory to the truths of revealed religion or injurious or disrespectful to the religious convictions of any portion of his class or audience; and he also promised that he would not introduce or discuss, in his place and capacity as a Professor, any subject of controversy, political or religious, tending to produce contention or excitement. Let hon. Members imagine the effect of applying a provision of that kind over the whole sphere and area of educational subjects, and let them also imagine the position in which a Professor under the mixed education system might find himself. Suppose that there were within the walls of the Queen's Colleges in Ireland those who represented the various opinions of the Protestant world, the Catholics, the Buddhists, the Hindoos, the Mahommedans, the Oriental Christians, the Pantheists, the Atheists, and all the different sects which, since the coming and after the coming of Christ, had survived to the present day—suppose a Professor rising in his place under such circumstances and proposing to discuss any subject of philosophy or history, and to explain the influences which had been operating in any department of science, literature, or religion—he might at once be met with a remark—"Oh! you are depreciating the Catholic religion;" or, "You are depreciating the Mussulman religion;" and so on. There was not a question on which the veriest mentor might not have a right to shut up the most erudite Professor. The truth of the matter was that the whole theory of mixed education was absurd and impracticable, and that in practice it was simply a farce. He was by no means going to inflict upon the House an encyclopædic survey of human knowledge and research; but there could be no harm in making it manifest that this was a thoroughly practical question. Take, for example, the science of geology. There were schools which asserted that this earth bore evident traces of—indeed, was eloquent with abundant proofs of—the falsehood of the Scriptural narratives. There was also a school of geologists who equally maintained that there was nothing which science had discovered which in reality opposed the conclusions of the Revealed Word as believed by Christians. What must be the position of a Professor in such a case? He must be at the best cautious in expressing or in hinting at his own opinions, and careful not to give what might be thought undue weight to the one side or the other. Again, take the subject of comparative physiology. There were those who believed that the lessons of that science were fatal to the theory of the Divine origin of man; but there were also those who believed that its lessons, rightly understood and accurately appreciated, contained nothing whatever which could hurt the feelings of any Christian. Once more, take the science of chemistry. At first sight that science might appear to be comparatively innocuous, and yet they knew that in the present day distinguished men came forward and informed them that they were convinced that the potentiality of matter was so great as entirely to dispense with the Divine Creator. In these, as in other things, the Professoriate must sacrifice the interests of truth and science to the interests of refraining from injuring the convictions of any portion of a class or audience. It was manifest, however, that even in the fundamental study of the physical sciences they came upon points of differences of the first magnitude—points on which varieties of view were very numerous. Then take the question of history. He defied any Professor whatever, of any talent and experience, to teach history so as to avoid making any statement derogatory to the truths of revealed religion or injurious to the convictions of any portion of a class or audience. In connection with what century, what period of a century, what country, could that be done? Take the era of the Protestant Reformation in England, in Ireland, in Spain, in Italy, and in Germany, and on broad principles he would defy any Professor to deliver a lecture on that subject without saying a great deal which would be certain to be disrespectful to a good section of those whom he addressed.

Notice taken, that 40 Members were not present; House counted, and 40 Members being found present,

MR. O'DONNELL said, though the attempted count-out occurred during his speech, he quite sympathized with the natural indignation of his hon. Friend the Member for Meath (Mr. Parnell). Whenever any question of Irish importance was brought before the House there was emptiness on the benches of the Legislators for Ireland. He was quite aware his hon. Friend was not opposed to his remarks, but properly desired to call attention to the manner in which Ireland was dealt with in Parliament. Neither national nor general history could be treated with any conformity to truth or science by a Professor who was under the pledge to utter no statement which might be disrespectful or injurious to the convictions of any portion of his class. It was equally impossible to deal with any other subject of importance without touching the susceptibilities of somebody. How was philosophy to be taught? How would a Professor who had drawn his philosophy from Oxford, or Cambridge, or Trinity College, Dublin, deal with the great masters of Catholic thought? What could be more calculated to unsettle the fundamental morals and mental principles of a young man than to hear his Professor vainly attempting to turn the corners of the mixed education difficulty, reciting with equal indifference the names of all the systems and sham systems and schools of philosophy and sophistry from the beginning of the Greek down to the last vagary imported from Germany? When a Professor tried to teach philosophy under the mixed system he was driven to this sceptical attitude. The objection to this system applied to every branch of human knowledge, for there was no point which could be taught in anything but a superficial way under the pledge not to hurt the individual susceptibilities of any portion of a class or audience.

Notice taken, that 40 Members were not present; House counted, and 40 Members being found present,

MR. O'DONNELL resumed his speech. He asked how a Professor under the mixed system could discuss the influence of Voltaire on his century, or "the character of the Renaissance?" There would not be a single branch even of literature which must not be the arena of sectarian controversy, and in this country the system must work as an engine of attack against the convictions of Catholics. He entirely repudiated any thought of personal motive. No more honourable men could be found than the Professors of the Queen's Colleges with whom he had to do, and any shortcomings in their lectures or teaching were attributable to the system under which they worked. That system was in this country an assault on Catholic doctrines; but on the Continent it was an assault on Christianity itself; and in no long time the Anglican Church would feel the destroying influence of mixed education, and would disappear before the indifferentism which was both its parent and its offspring. Ruin had been brought on the Continent to the Churches outside the pale of the Church of Rome, and the same ruin was in store for Anglican Christianity if it destroyed denominationalism out of intolerance for Irish Catholics, and sacrificed their common Christianity before the shrine of plain and naked infidelity.

MR. M'LAREN was sorry that no hon. Member connected with the Universities had risen to remark upon the speech which the House had just heard from the hon. Member for Dungarvan. The reason why he wished to make some remarks was that he considered that if this Resolution could be put to a vote, and were carried, it would be one of the strongest possible votes of censure which the House could pass upon the system of University education which prevailed in Scotland. The system there was that which the hon. Member had described as mixed education, and yet there were none of the evils which he had described attending it. The teaching was not superficial, there was no discontent on the part of the people, and there were no attacks upon the Roman Catholics or any other body of men. Everything went on quietly and there was no complaint whatever. If the effects which the hon. Member had described were inevitably connected with mixed education, it would be found that the people in Scotland would not send their sons to be educated at the Universities; but was that the case? There were, he believed, as nearly as possible 5,000 students attending the Universities of England, and there were as nearly as possible the same number of students attending the Universities of Scotland. The result of these figures was that while England had about one University student to a population of 5,000, Scotland had seven University students to a population of 5,000. Did not that show that the inhabitants of that country were highly satisfied with the system of mixed education? If they took the University of Edinburgh, for example, they would find that there was not even a chapel in it—there were no prayers—there was no kind of interference with the religious opinions of any persons who chose to enter. The hon. Member had dwelt strongly on what he called the gagging system, and he read to the House a declaration that the Professors of the Queen's Colleges were not to do this, that, and the other thing. Well, he could easily understand that, remembering as he did the discussions which took place at the time that the Queen's Colleges were constituted, and that the Government of the day were most anxious to please both parties in Ireland. He doubted whether they had succeeded, but at all events they tried, and those long and tiresome prohibitions that were made to prevent particular tenets from being taught were no doubt well meant, were intended to conciliate all, and make those Colleges beneficial to the whole population of Ireland. It did not appear that they had done so; but most certainly the system had succeeded admirably in the country with which he had the honour to be connected. It might be said—"Well, but Scotland is a Presbyterian country, all the Professors must be Presbyterians, and therefore they teach Presbyterian doctrines." ["Hear, hear!"] He recognized that cheer, but the fact was quite different. There were a number of Episcopalian Professors appointed, and they had just as good a chance of being elected as members of any of the Presbyterian bodies. He could speak on this point from personal knowledge. More than 40 years ago he was a member of the electing body which appointed the Professors in Edinburgh, and he remembered taking a deep interest in promoting the return of a clergyman of the Church of England who was a candidate for the Professorship of Mathematics, because he believed him to be the best qualified of all the candidates. He and those who acted with him were successful in procuring his election, and to this day he remained an honour to the University. He remembered another instance where, at a later period, about 20 years ago, a gentleman, who was a very distinguished Greek scholar, offered himself as a candidate for the Greek Chair. That gentleman was, he admitted, opposed by certain parties on the ground that he was not sufficiently orthodox for the prevailing Presbyterian sentiment. That objection was strongly urged, but it did not prevail; and he was glad to say that the gentleman was appointed, although by the very small majority of his (Mr. M'Laren's) casting vote. He was proud of having been the means of appointing a distinguished Greek scholar, although objected to by some on account of his supposed religious views. He would like to say a word on the departments of that University. There were four departments—namely, the Faculties of Arts, Medicine, Law, and Divinity. The Faculty of Arts consisted of seven branches — Humanity, Greek, Mathematics, Logic and Metaphysics, Moral Philosophy, Natural Philosophy, Rhetoric and English Literature—from which the students made a selection, and when they passed their examination they got their degree of M.A. He would put it to anyone why an honest man appointed to be a Professor should interfere with the religious opinion of young men in teaching any of those branches? The gentlemen who were appointed Professors made the single declaration that they should not teach anything contrary to the Westminster Confession. That negative test was the only test. [*Ironical cheers.*] He had never heard of any dispute arising, or of any Professor being brought up or complained of for transgressing that declaration. Many Members present might never have read the Westminster Confession. It was framed and enacted by Parliament in England, but the Scotch people adopted it; and he believed that there was a great deal in it which many hon. Members who ironically cheered him would concur in if they would only read it. Then, in the Faculty of Medicine there were between 1,100 and 1,200 students. He believed it was the largest medical school in the world. Why should the Professor of any of the branches of medicine or surgery interfere with the opinions of Roman Catholic students? Why, it would be a monstrous perversion of everything that was right and proper. He did not believe it ever was or would be done. What, again, had law to do with religion? As to divinity, with the exception of the Church of Scotland, all the other religious denominations in Scotland had Professors of their own to teach students divinity according to their own views; but they sent them to the University for the purpose of going through the Arts classes. Now, if their Roman Catholic friends who complained of this system would just follow that example—would teach to their heart's content their own views of religion, and let the young men get their general education in the classes of the University which did not trench upon religious subjects at all—he thought they would find that, however theoretically wrong it might be in their estimation, that practically no injustice would be done to them. He had felt it his duty, as one of the Members for Scotland, to say these few words merely as a protest against the sweeping denunciations of the hon. Member for Dungarvan in regard to a system of education in which Scotland delighted.

MAJOR NOLAN said he was rather surprised at the hon. Member for Edinburgh (Mr. M'Laren) having suddenly changed the scene from Ireland to Scotland, a country of which the Irish Members were entirely ignorant. He did not, however, at all complain of the hon. Member for Edinburgh, who had, perhaps, added a new interest to the debate by giving them his experience of the system of education in Scotland; but as that hon. Member had abandoned the Irish side of the question, he could not expect the Irish Members to follow him on the Scotch side with the same ability and the same amount of knowledge which he had himself shown. He was informed that the Scotch Colleges, with reference to the question of religious instruction, were not in nearly so bad a condition as the Queen's Colleges in Ireland. He heard that there were chapels in the Scotch Colleges; that there was a large number of clergymen in them; and that those clergymen were of the same religion as the students. He heard also that there were schools of theology in the Scotch Colleges. That was not his idea of irreligious Colleges. If the Government were to give them in Ireland some system of that kind, under which a considerable number of the clergymen belonged to the religion of the majority of the country, and under which

Divine worship was celebrated, they would be very much inclined to take the chance for teaching also. In the Colleges of Oxford and Cambridge religious instruction was given. The Belfast College, which was frequented by Presbyterians, was in a condition much like that of the Scotch Colleges, and therefore it could not be an irreligious College. While religious teaching was excluded from Cork and Galway Colleges, where the population was almost entirely Catholic, a different system prevailed in Scotland and England, where no difficulties were put in the way of Protestants. He considered this was most unfair, and he thought something should be done to place Ireland on a level with the rest of the Kingdom in this matter.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL for IRELAND (Mr. Gibson) said, that the terms of this Motion were of the very widest possible description. It contained the clear and unqualified statement—

> "That the Professorial instruction on the most important subjects in mixed colleges and Universities is necessarily superficial and imperfect when the conditions of mixed education are observed, and injurious and offensive to one or other denomination of students when the Professors endeavour to be teachers in more than name."

This was wide enough to condemn without reserve the system which prevailed in the Scotch Universities, and to a substantial extent in the English Universities, in the Queen's University in Ireland, and which was recognised in the Dublin University. The Resolution of the hon. Member, in fact, amounted to this, that the system of mixed education must be a sham. How was that charge made out? The hon. Gentleman made a long speech, extending over two hours, but he had only endeavoured to show that if the subjects to which he had specifically alluded were taught in a particular way some injurious results might follow; or, in other words, if there was a system of cross purposes between the teachers and the taught, if the Professors had no common sense and the students were bent on mischief, no possible good could come of the instruction given. But these results were purely imaginary and most extravagant. No foundation in fact could be found for a Resolution so extreme as this. The Resolution, which contained no distinct reference to Ireland, was really an attack upon a system of education which had existed for years in England, Ireland, and Scotland; and the question to be considered was, what were the results which had been accomplished by that system? The hon. Member should have examined into that before he condemned it without reserve. Were there no good social and moral results from the mixed system? Was there nothing gained from the companionship of young men of different religions at a period of life when friendships were most likely to be warmly cemented? Were not these results of the greatest consequence? One could not look back upon his educational career, whether in an old Scotch University, in one of the great English Universities, in the Queen's, or in the Dublin University, without being able to recall some of his warmest friendships, which had grown up without the least regard to differences of religion. But there were other more material advantages gained by the system, and it could hardly be so unreservedly condemned when the students it produced were able, in competition, to win great and substantial prizes. He should not confine his view to Ireland. The Resolution did not mention that country. It was an attack on mixed education, and he was entitled to look at the results of the competitive examinations in the Empire. Everyone knew how successful the students were in the case of England and Scotland, and Ireland also. These were reasonable answers to the hon. Member, who, though he had made an elaborate indictment, had totally failed to advance any evidence in support of his sweeping Resolution.

Sir JOSEPH M'KENNA complained that the right hon. and learned Gentleman the Attorney General for Ireland had dealt in a very off-hand manner with the most important question of mixed education, which, as practised, not only led to, but absolutely involved, scepticism as to religious matters. It was true that in several respects the system, or rather, the theory of mixed education, had not worked ill in some parts of Ireland, but those were parts of the country in which some particular form of religion prevailed almost universally, and where the views of the teachers were actually in accordance with the religious predilections of the students who had to be taught. The question they were dealing with was whether there should be a school education without history as a branch of study; and if there should not, could there be a system that did not deal with the problems of Christianity? He did not care what the religions were. Of course, he should prefer his own religion. But in all the forms of Christian faith there was sufficient protection for society at present, and to teach every man his duty to the State. Physical science in education was of great use to individuals, but of no use to the State, unless the individuals were made good members of society. That, he denied, could be accomplished without making religion a portion of the education, and therefore the wishes and the aspirations of the people ought to be consulted in the system of education. Were they to ignore the influence of the Roman Catholic faith, which had lived and taught the highest morality in Ireland in spite of every opposition? He thought they ought not to do so, and he therefore supported the Motion.

Mr. SULLIVAN regretted that the right hon. and learned Gentleman the Attorney General for Ireland had not attempted to grapple with the difficulties attending the system of mixed education in the Irish Universities. As was said in nautical circles, he gave a "wide berth" to that question. It was not, however, to be wondered at, in view of the fact that the right hon. and learned Gentleman was a distinguished *alumnus* of Trinity College, Dublin, in which the difficulty existed in its most complete form. Charges had been made that in a Catholic University the Professors would be slaves, and dare not teach anything objectionable to the priests. Well, he rather thought that the Universities in this country attained to some eminence under the system so impugned. In the declaration made by a Professor connected with a College or University where mixed education prevailed, he bound himself to avoid all subjects which were calculated to produce any manner of controversy, religious or political. If he gave his pupils his own ideas of the history of the Reformation, the punishment meted out to him would be that he would be summoned before the Council and formally warned and reprimanded, and, if guilty of a repetition of the offence, he would be forthwith suspended from his functions; and his removal from office recommended. Well, how, he asked, could any such Professor in Ireland avoid references which would stir up such controversies on the part of one or more of his class? He remembered seeing a plate representing a scene in which some years after the battle of the Boyne an old Irish piper might be observed in the presence of a stalwart Irish soldier who was armed with a formidable shillelagh, and saying to the piper, "Strike-up 'The Battle of the Boyne;' I want to know how I can stand it." Might there not be some students to be found who would be as reasonable as that Irish soldier? He hoped that all traditions of the greatness, glory, and independence of University education had not faded from the land. Supposing that all the students were Protestants, a Professor dare not make use of phrases to them which Catholics would not shrink from using. If he was dealing with the time of Henry VIII., he might say he was a Prince of many virtues and many vices, but which were his virtues and which his vices he would leave to them. They paid their money, and might take their choice. It was an insult to Ireland to pretend this was to be the style of University education. The declaration to which he referred was a fetter on Professorial teaching. He had known cases of conscientious Protestant Professors who dared not treat the episode in history of the Inquisition in Spain in the manner in which their convictions would have led them to do, because a Roman Catholic student might be present, although they full well knew that such was not the case. The Attorney General for Ireland had asked what mischief had accrued from the present system? The answer to that question was this, that when they came to divert or to poison a system of education, the evil results could not, necessarily and naturally, be pointed to for a long time. The system had been sought to be palliated and defended by the fact that Roman Catholic students had gone through Trinity College, Dublin, and had not been prejudicially affected by the system which prevailed in that institution, of which every Irishman was proud. But the fact was due, not to the system which the Resolution condemned, but had occurred in spite of that system. If he were a Protestant parent, he would prefer to send his child to a Protestant rather than to a Catholic University, although students might have emerged from that Catholic University without harm to their religious principles. A system must be judged by its logical and consistent consequences, and not by its accidental products. If the emasculated conditions of the mixed system were maintained, he cared not whether in Ireland, England, or Scotland, learning must deteriorate, and a future race would grow up unworthy of their forefathers, imbecile as scholars, and a peril to Christian society.

Mr. PARNELL said, he was surprised that the Attorney General for Ireland should have put Trinity College on a level with the Queen's Colleges, which had notoriously failed as teaching institutions. Trinity College was, at the time when the right hon. and learned Gentleman was studying there, a strictly denominational College, and it was as such it had been so successful. The hon. Member for Edinburgh (Mr. M'Laren) had argued in favour of the mixed system on the ground that they got on so well with it in Scotland. But he denied that the Scotch system was really a mixed system. Scotch Presbyterians had a habit of assimilating themselves and their religion to the mixed system of education, and of converting a nominally undenominational and secular institution into a Presbyterian College or University. This was the case with the Colleges in the North of Ireland. He would like to know whether any Catholic filled a Chair in the University of Edinburgh? They were bound to respect the conscientious convictions of the Roman Catholics, and to legislate in accordance with their requirements. They might call the Irish system a mixed system, but it was decidedly opposed to the conscientious feelings of a vast majority of the people of that country. It was admitted that the state of Roman Catholic education in Ireland was deplorable, and Parliament was driven to this position—that they must give the Roman Catholics of Ireland a system that they could conscientiously take advantage of, or else give up the pretence of supplying Ireland with any system of University education at all. The system in Oxford and Cambridge was most sectarian, and he did not see how it was possible, with a great variety of branches of knowledge, that teaching could be conducted from any other than a religious point of view. Were they going to have no history at all taught in their Universities? Were they going to have no theological or divinity schools, in order that they might carry out their peculiar ideas as to University education in Ireland? He said by all means let the Freethinkers' children be taught in accordance with the Freethinkers' wish, but that the children of Roman Catholic parents be taught in accordance with their wish, and the children of Protestant parents in accordance with their wish.

MR. RIDLEY said, he profoundly objected to the proposition now before the House. He believed that the effect of the adoption of that proposition in the terms in which it had been expressed would be to strike a blow at almost everything which had been done for education in the country for many years past. He thought that the objection raised by hon. Members to the mixed educational system of Ireland might be traced rather to the way in which the inhabitants of that country regarded that system than to that system itself. In England, for many years past, a mixed system of education had existed without banishing religion from the schools. Why should not the same thing be done in the sister country? Why should it be impossible to teach history without rousing religious contention and stirring up questions which ought long ago to have been effaced from the minds of the people of Ireland, as they had already been from the minds of the Catholic inhabitants of this country? He wished to respect any man's convictions, be he Catholic or Protestant; but those convictions ought not to be wounded if they were founded on truth and a real knowledge of the religion a man professed, simply because he attended the lectures of a Professor of history. Since the University Tests Repeal Act was passed, nine years ago, the Universities of England had not lost their hold on the people of this country merely because no religious test of any kind was required of any person who took a degree. Yet there was no subject that was not introduced into the University *curriculum*, and nobody could fairly say that the Universities were irreligious. This debate seemed to him to be founded upon a false assumption—namely, that if Professors really taught their subjects, they must give offence to some denominational student. He declared that to be entirely untrue, and that it was quite possible to have mixed education without injury to religious susceptibilities. Hon. Gentlemen who opposed that system were trying to turn back the hand of the dial. Catholics and Protestants ought to be able to face a University in which students of other creeds besides their own were taught; and if their faith was not strong enough to hold its ground against such association with students of other creeds, then the sooner they obtained more firmly rooted convictions the better. Of all Christian creeds, that of hon. Members opposite had the longest tradition, and, perhaps, the ablest writers; but, at the same time, they now lived in the nineteenth century, and Catholics, as well as Protestants, must be prepared to face the world of scientific professors and historians. If there was one thing for which the education of this country was famous, it was that every subject was being introduced into its *curriculum.* He did not venture to dispute with Irish Members on their particular views with regard to particular Colleges or Universities in Ireland; but he differed from them profoundly with respect to mixed education. They were confusing mixed education with the manner in which it might be applied in a particular country. It might be so misapplied that the system might be bad; but he was convinced the system was the only means of teaching the rising generation the truth of the great principles which ought to be instilled into them from their youth.

Mr. O'CONNOR POWER asked whether the hon. Member who had just spoken had ever found in his experience that educated Catholics were afraid of facing the intellectual issues of the present day? The hon. Member said Catholic youths should not be afraid to enter the arena with an army of Professors, and he asked, why should they not submit themselves to Protestant Professors? He trusted the hon. Member and the House would not forget the able arguments of his hon. Friend the Member for Dungarvan (Mr O'Donnell), and the declaration he made, speaking on behalf of the Catholic people of Ireland. It had been assumed that the mixed system of the Queen's Colleges was the same as the system which prevailed in England and Scotland. No proof whatever had been given that it was. But even if it had been proved, it did not follow that the system which was suitable to England and Scotland was also suitable to Ireland. He held the Irish University Question would never be settled except on a denominational basis, and the Irish people could not follow the advice of the hon. Member for Edinburgh (Mr. M'Laren) to rest and be thankful. The hon. Member for Edinburgh had risen to prove that religion had nothing whatever to do with University education in Scotland; but he admitted that Professors had to subscribe a declaration that they would teach nothing subversive of the Westminster Confession of Faith. There was some laughter at this, and the hon. Member for Edinburgh got a little testy at it. This reminded him (Mr. O'Connor Power) of the opinion of a brilliant writer, that it required a surgical operation to get a joke into a Scotchman's head. The hon. Member for Edinburgh, when he made this admission about the Westminster Confession of Faith, really surrendered the whole case. The Irish people might have purchased peace long ago from England if they had been willing to sacrifice two things—the religion and the nationality of Ireland. But they refused to accept the bribe of the English Parliament at the expense of their religious or national convictions. Though the people of Ireland had had a long struggle to sustain education on Catholic principles against the richly endowed University of Dublin and the Queen's University, they had thought it right to make the sacrifice, and there were signs every day that parties were becoming convinced that no English Government could ever hope to settle the question of education in Ireland except upon a denominational basis, and one which would give Catholics the same advantages which Espiscopalian Protestants and Presbyterians enjoyed. The hon. Member for Edinburgh had borne testimony to the good intentions with which the system of the Queen's Colleges had been introduced. They had heard of a place paved with good intentions, but that did not make people anxious to go there. If an unjust and oppressive system was to be accepted because of the claim of good intentions on the part of its authors, the most monstrous tyranny ever practised for the degradation of man might be justified. He was glad the hon. Member for Dungarvan had seized this opportunity of presenting the Irish view of the matter to the House; and he should lose no occasion of reminding the House and the Government of the day that the demand of the Catholic people of Ireland must be acceded to if they really meant to do equal justice. The Irish did not want any special favour, but they asked the House to look at the practical results of the present system, and they were convinced they would have to say what Lord Cairns and the right hon. Member for Greenwich (Mr. Gladstone) had said, that University education in Ireland was scandalously bad, and that it was a scandal to Parliament and to Government that it should continue so.

MAJOR O'BEIRNE said, it was impossible for a Professor to teach properly under the mixed system. Hardly any question in Irish history had excited such controversy as the Great Rebellion of 1641, and on that subject Mr. Froude had been the accepted authority, until Mr. Leakie proved that the atrocities attributed to the Irish people were entirely false. There were a thousand matters in which conflicting views were taken, and he asked, how could history be discussed, and how could controverted points be worked out, if the Professors who taught it were not to touch upon points which might excite the religious susceptibilities of those to whom they lectured?

MR. MITCHELL HENRY remarked that although the question had been brought before the House in an abstract form, it enabled hon. Members to understand one of the subjects which at the present moment gave so much uneasiness and anxiety to the Irish people. Lord Beaconsfield once described Ireland as an island surrounded by a melancholy ocean, in which the people were discontented because they were not amused. Education, however, was no matter of amusement, and it was because the Irish people were like other human beings that they reiterated their demand to be allowed the ordinary liberty of British subjects—to educate their children in the way which seemed best to them. They asked that those who desired secular education should have it, and that those who desired religious education should have it; but the Irish people objected to Parliament giving them a system of a kind which did not exist in the rest of the three Kingdoms, and to compelling the Catholic people of Ireland to accept an education which some might call secular, but which was in reality denominational. Secularism and rationality were really religions. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Greenwich (Mr. Gladstone) had felt the religious difficulty, and he proposed to eliminate from the teaching the whole of modern history, and everything connected with moral philosophy. And what was the reason why the proposal proved fatal to the right hon. Gentleman's Government? It was because he told a people fond of learning, such as the Irish were, that in order to concede what was requisite to their prejudices, he would eliminate two of the greatest subjects of education. He thus insulted, instead of conciliating them as he expected, and every man in Ireland felt that the English Government put upon him such an insult as had never been put upon an intellectual people before. The hon. Member for South Northumberland (Mr. Ridley) was a promising young man, and it was not improbable that he might be sent to govern Ireland, he having the great advantage, which was generally looked for in a candidate for the post of Chief Secretary, of knowing nothing about the country which he was going to govern. As a Protestant he felt ashamed whenever this question was discussed in the House of Commons, because he felt that if the issue could be tried out before a Judge and jury, the verdict on the abstract justice of the case would be against the House of Commons. If there were a good sprinkling of Mahomedans in this country, the Government would do what they had done in India by providing for Mahomedan education, and not compel them to undergo the moral tortures of being educated in the atmosphere of a religion which was not their religion. The hon. Member for Edinburgh (Mr. M'Laren) had made a most inconsistent speech. Why, only the other day the University of Glasgow got a grant of money from the Government. For what purpose? To build a chapel in connection with their University where the doctrines of the Westminster Confession of Faith could be taught to the students. They had been advised to rise above the level of mere conversation; but he thought that no unprejudiced person who had listened to the speeches which had been delivered from that side of the House would deny that the question at issue was one of great importance, and that it had been advocated from their point of view with much ability. It was a noteworthy fact that two Members only on the other side of the House had taken part in the debate; and that fact might be accounted for in this way—that hon. Gentlemen opposite did not wish to advance arguments which they knew would be replied to effectively, and to have the debate thus stimulated. What the Irish people demanded in this matter was justice, and justice only. They required to be allowed to educate their children under a system of which they approved, and they would be satisfied with nothing less; and nothing could be fairer than such a demand. The subject had been introduced in a spirit of great forbearance, and no threats had been uttered or any disagreeable things said; but he trusted the House of Commons would remember this fact—that if it continued to violate the religious convictions of so large a portion of Her Majesty's subjects, it could not in fairness expect that there would be that union of hearts and minds which alone could make up a loving people.

MR. BIGGAR said, he was not able to say anything new on this subject; but he would repeat some of the arguments used previously, as the greater part of the hon. Members then present had not heard the earlier part of the debate, and as, in addition, it was sometimes useful to repeat arguments which had been used before, for they then became more deeply engraven on the minds of hon. Gentlemen, and they were more likely to profit by the arguments which had been directed at them. He had not himself had the opportunity of hearing the speech of the Attorney General for Ireland, who was also the Representative of the University of Dublin; but he believed that right hon. and learned Gentleman had devoted part of his remarks to dealing with the practical results of the teaching in the Queen's Colleges. If he had really made himself practically acquainted with this subject, he could not think that the result had been very flattering. The result was far better in the Catholic University, for there the Professors did give really good teaching, but they had not power to grant degrees; and, as a consequence, the students lost the practical fruits of their labour. Now, in all walks of life they liked to have the prizes of their labour, and to have value for their work. But in the Queen's Colleges the result was very different. In Galway they had literally to bribe the students to attend the lectures, by offering a very large number of prizes, in proportion to the number of students; while the teaching given there was, he was informed, of the worst description. Yet students, who were practically uneducated, and were almost ignorant of the subjects taught, were competent to obtain valuable Scholarships, and were very likely to get them. If that was the result of mixed education, he did not think the right hon. and learned Gentleman had any right to be proud of the practical result of the teaching in that College. In Cork, he understood, the case was not much better; while of Belfast he could speak more vigorously, because he knew the place from his personal knowledge. There was a pretty decent medical school there, and there was good teaching for the Presbyterians; but for the mass of the population—Roman Catholics or Episcopalians—it was an open failure. The Presbyterians, however, had utilized the College in a very judicious way, for they had built divinity schools immediately adjoining the College, in which they taught their students, and then sent them into the College for the rest of their classes, so far as the curriculum was suitable for their purpose. But there was no Episcopalian literary school in Belfast; and, in reality, the College was used almost entirely by the Presbyterians. Surely, then, the Queen's College of Belfast could not be said to be in a satisfactory state for the whole of the people of Ireland. It was of great value for a small sect in the North part of the country; but, so far as the nation generally was concerned, it was of no practical value whatever, and was a thorough failure. As to the teaching in Scotland, to which the hon. Member for Edinburgh (Mr. M'Laren) referred, he believed all the Professors at Edinburgh were bound to teach nothing contrary to the Westminster Confession of Faith. But that was a creed which, he believed, no man living believed. Some 35 years ago he was in the habit of going to a Presbyterian church, and there found out the way in which these affairs were managed. A number of elders were being ordained, and they had to make a declaration that they accepted the Westminster Confession of Faith. The clergyman who ordained them told them he only expected them to declare their belief in the Confession as at present understood. That must be the principle on which University education in Ireland was carried on. Again, although not universally so, he believed almost all the Professors were Presbyterians. The hon. Gentleman the Member for Edinburgh had, it was true, mentioned certain cases in which the Professors were not Presbyterians; but one of those was the case of the Professor of Mathematics. Surely there would be considerable difficulty in introducing anything of a theological character into the explanations of Euclid. In the teaching of mathematics, the religious views of the Professor surely might be made an open question, and it seemed that in Edinburgh that was done. On another occasion, on the election of a Professor of Greek, a Protestant Episcopalian was elected. If that was what denominational education meant in Scotland, they could put up with it very well in Ireland. If it were laid down in Ireland that nothing should be taught contrary to the Roman Catholic religion, nobody would object. Nothing would be said against it in Ireland. In these Queen's Colleges, however, so far from the Professors being Roman Catholics, they were, with very few exceptions, members of the different forms of the Protestant religion. Nobody could pretend that that was a satisfactory state of things in a Roman Catholic country, where the people wished their children educated in their own faith. Yet they could only have their wishes carried out where the Professors of debateable subjects were of their own faith, looking at all important matters of education from the same point of view. He did not intend to hold out any threats; but hon. Gentlemen and right hon. Gentlemen opposite must not think it strange if this question was debated, not once or twice, but many times during the Session. In fact, they might make up their minds that they would hear a good deal on this subject until they settled it in a satisfactory manner. As to the Board of Examiners, he had no authority to speak for the Roman Catholics, or to say what as regarded University education would be considered thoroughly satisfactory as a settlement; but he certainly thought he might say that the people would not pull down the flag if something unreasonably small were offered. An hon. Gentleman had said that he did not consider this Resolution was shaped in a very satisfactory form. If the hon. Gentleman who said that had heard the speech of the hon. Gentleman the Member for Dungarvan (Mr. O'Donnell), he would probably have thought differently; for, as it seemed to him, the case in support of the Resolution was put in a very conclusive and exhaustive manner. An hon. Gentleman should certainly hear a speech before he ventured to offer any criticisms upon it. If hon. Gentlemen took the trouble to listen to their speeches, they would probably then be able to form an opinion on a subject which was worth the attention of the House.

MR. O'CLERY said, no doubt the Members of the Government would be very much annoyed at the continuance of the debate; but they must not be surprised at it. The people of England had been both deceived and disappointed by the action of Ministers in regard to University education, and they had no right to be surprised that Irish Members should endeavour to force the subject upon the House. This was well known, and over and over again it should be repeated, in order to impress upon the Government how deeply the people were pained. The Government had undoubtedly deceived them. They had, to a certain extent, committed themselves; but in obedience to the advice of Orange Members from Ireland, and of some of their evangelical allies, they had endeavoured to ignore what they had partly promised, and had tried to set aside the wishes of the people of Ireland. This subject was of the greatest moment; it was, indeed, almost vital to Ireland. This question of mixed education was now being fought out, not merely in this country, but in every nation of the world. In the United States of America the common school system had been a bone of contention for several years past, and the Catholic Bishops of that country had called upon their flocks to come forward and subscribe to schools that would give purely Catholic education, so deeply did they feel the necessity for it. In Switzerland and France the same thing was going on. The Conservatism of England—the spurious Conservatism of this country—would, no doubt, sympathize with revolution in France and with the Liberal majority in the Chambers there, so long as the revolution was not brought over to this country; but they must remember that that majority refused to give the education which the majority of the French people demanded. In Germany, also, the same struggle was going on. He thought, however, that the Government would hardly care to follow in Prince Bismarck's footsteps. It would not attempt to muzzle the minority, as Prince Bismarck had tried to muzzle the minority in the Reichstag. The Conservative Party in this country were pledged to denominational education, and had fought the Liberal Party year after year upon it. They were ready to cede to the Catholic minority in this country the right to denominational education in the primary schools and in the Universities, if necessary, and yet they would not give the same privilege to the Catholic people of Ireland. It was folly to suppose that the Catholic Irishmen would be satisfied so long as that right was denied them. The Catholic hierarchy recently proclaimed their wishes on the subject in the most formal manner, and University education would be made a vital question at the next General Election. The Liberals formerly held sway in Ireland, and the Irish votes year after year gave them a majority in that House. But a third Party had now grown up, which had broken their power; and was it wise, as a point of political tactics, for the Conservatives to force that third Party into the arms of the Liberals by refusing them the justice they demanded? They owed, besides, a debt of gratitude to the Irish Party, for during the present Parliament in every vote on education questions that Party had voted with the Conservatives. On this question of Irish education the people felt deeply; and during the Session their Representatives in Parliament would feel it their duty to force the question very strongly on the attention of the Government. The teaching in the Queen's Colleges was a mere farce; and if the Professors acted honestly, must, by the nature of the terms under which they worked, be a mere nullity. In Belfast the College practically belonged to the Presbyterians; while in Cork and Galway the Catholic hierarchy had withdrawn the students from the Colleges. He believed the mixed system of education to be a most harmful one. Under Guizot it produced the Revolution of 1849, and later on its results were seen in the Commune of 1870. But the Irish were not a revolutionary people, and they held aloof from the troubles on the Continent. But though in England attacks on religion were allowed to go unchecked, and Atheism spread rapidly among their work-people, they did not want anything of that kind in their country, and would still endeavour to rear their children in the spirit of true religion, and in the spirit of true loyalty.

Sir PATRICK O'BRIEN said, though the Resolution was in an abstract form, there was no question which at the moment more deeply affected the Irish people than this one of University education; and, therefore, he was surprised that but one Member of the Government, and he not a Cabinet Minister, had risen to address the House. Yet, unless public rumour was a liar, for the last six or eight months there had been interviews, and conversations, and interchanges of views going on between various Members of the Government and representative Catholics upon this great question. When the Irish people read the report of that debate, they would ask why no Cabinet Minister addressed the House. Had the noble Duke, who at present occupied the post of Vice Regent, been communicated with? Had he represented to the Government the desirability—as a matter of prudence, of policy; above all, of justice—of considering the demand of the Irish people? Might not that noble Duke, who had now obtained considerable popularity in Ireland, have been able to come to some agreement on this subject? The Conservative Government had given the Irish Members a polite hearing on this subject; but it had done nothing else. No one had ventured to say that the Catholic hierarchy had demanded what was outrageous and could not be granted, because they knew such a statement would be incorrect. They did not say that they were so overwhelmed with Irish Business that they could not attend to the matter. They could not say even that their attention was occupied by foreign affairs, for they all were assured the success of the Treaty of Berlin was great and manifest, and they now had the necessary time to turn their attention to domestic affairs. He did regret that the Government had not told them whether or no they had a policy, or whether they would be likely to have one before the end of the Session. There was yet time, however; and he did most respectfully beg to bring that question to the attention of the Chancellor of the Exchequer.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT said, he was afraid he could not enlighten his hon. Friend (Sir Patrick O'Brien) upon the policy of the Government with regard to Ireland. They were masters of their own secrets; and he supposed, for the present, they would have to wait to learn what was the proposition they were said to have made in Ireland—if it was not to remain for ever an undiscovered secret, like the history of the man in the Iron Mask, and the authorship of Junius. He had only risen to say that Irish Members must not think, if English Members did not take part in this debate, that it was due to any want of interest on their part in the subject. The reason was, that one of the first things English Members desired to know was exactly what Irish Members desired in this matter. That point, he was bound to say, was not so clear to them all as they would desire. They heard conflicting statements of what the Irish people did and did not desire; and, therefore, at present, they were somewhat in the dark as to what really was required. On the main question he thought it was practically admitted that this was not a fortunate proposition in its terms; because it did not refer alone to Irish University education, but was directed against mixed education everywhere. In England certainly they were not dissatisfied with mixed education. He admitted, of course, that because they were satisfied with it in England and Scotland that, therefore, it ought to be absolutely satisfactory and sufficient for the people of Ireland. But he was sorry that this question of University education in Ireland should be raised on this general Resolution; and he hoped the subject would be brought up again during the Session in a more positive form. It was admitted that the Presbyterians were satisfied with the Queen's Colleges. If that were so, he did not see why they should be done away with. It was quite another question, however, whether they supplied what the Irish people—the Roman Catholic people—wanted. It would, therefore, be a very wise thing to provide some other scheme of education for them which they did not at present possess. The hon. Gentleman the Member for Wexford had claimed the gratitude of the other side of the House for his Party for the way in which they had voted with them. He, and one or two others, it was true, had voted with the Government, and, therefore, had a very considerable claim upon its gratitude.

MR. O'CLERY rose to explain. What he said was that in every question affecting education debated in the House during the last five years, the Irish Members had supported the Government.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT: The hon. Member said that the Irish Members had merely voted in favour of denominational education, and he (Sir William Harcourt) had remarked that his support had gone far beyond that question; and that, therefore, he had a special claim upon the gratitude of the Government. There was, in fact, no Party question upon which they had not been sure of his support.

MR. O'CLERY said, he had not voted for the Government on the question of mixed education, but had walked out of the House.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT said, he would not discuss any longer the policy of the third Party, which was a policy he did not understand; but wished to say a few words on another matter. He thought the Irish Members ought not to suppose that the English Members upon either side of the House were at all indisposed to consider, and that with a view of arriving at a settlement, their desire for a system of education that would give more satisfaction to the Catholics of Ireland. His noble Friend the Leader of the Opposition, who had just left the House, had expressed the same sentiments in a statement made by him some months ago, when he said that there would be a desire to meet, in any fair way, the views of the Catholic

Members. An experiment had already been made by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Greenwich (Mr. Gladstone); but it had, unfortunately, failed, and other experiments had been talked of, but had not seen the light. It was an entire misconstruction of the intentions of English Members to suppose that there was any disinclination carefully to consider the question with a view to settlement. He had always been in favour of undenominational education; yet, as the majority in Parliament had established in England what was, practically speaking, a denominational system of education, he thought it would be unfair, on the part of a Protestant majority, to refuse to Irish Catholics denominational education. When the Irish Members brought forward clearly their views with reference to a system which could be established for meeting the requirements and demands of Irish Catholics upon University education, he could assure the House that it would receive from him the most careful and respectful consideration; because he did not think anyone could avoid seeing that the University education given at Dublin and in the Queen's Colleges, however well it might have been intended, had not met the requirements referred to, and that in one way or another some system must be discovered that would do so. At that hour he did not think that question could be advantageously entered upon. He had only risen for the purpose of saying, in answer to the hon. Member for Galway (Mr. Mitchell Henry), that he must not suppose there existed the slightest unwillingness to consider, with the hope of arriving at a beneficial and satisfactory result, any positive proposition which might be brought forward by Irish Members.

Colonel COLTHURST wished to say a few words in reply to the hon. and learned Member (Sir William Harcourt), who had asked the Irish Members to state, if they could, what they desired with regard to Irish University education. He had, during the last six weeks, been in constant communication with all classes of Catholics in Ireland—amongst others, with three or four Bishops of the Catholic Church, and he could assure the House—speaking, of course, only for himself—that they desired nothing but an equitable settlement. The form of that settlement he thought they were justified in leaving to the Government of the country, to whom the initiative belonged, as it was felt that no Bill introduced by a private Member would have any chance of success. He could assure the House that, as far as he was acquainted with the sentiments of the Irish Bishops, they desired nothing unreasonable, and were ready to accept any adjustment of the question by which equality should be secured.

Mr. CALLAN congratulated the hon. and learned Member for Oxford (Sir William Harcourt) on the change which had come over the spirit of his dream, when he found him expressing sentiments which were really encouraging to the Irish Members. As far as the experiment referred to by him as having been introduced by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Greenwich was concerned, and which had, unfortunately, failed, he was of opinion that no speech made during the progress of that measure had tended more to bring that failure about than the speech of the hon. and learned Gentleman. But what was the recommendation of the measure given by him? Was it that it gave satisfaction to the Irish Members? On the contrary, he had spoken of it as one which was equally unsatisfactory and distasteful to Irish Catholics and statesmen.

Dr. O'LEARY said, that whether Trinity College, Dublin, was denominational or not, it was largely permeated with the religious atmosphere; and he would mention the name of Professor Hoffman, of Trinity College, who had spent many years of his life in proving the consistency which existed between the Book of Genesis—that was to say, between religious and high scientific teaching. In that way Professor Hoffman had brought about a most healthy state of religious teaching within the walls of Trinity College, Dublin. There was an atmosphere about the College lecture-room which told the Professor that religion had not been divorced from science; and he (Dr. O'Leary) trusted the day would never arrive when that retrograde state would be reached.

Motion, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair," by leave, *withdrawn.*

Committee *deferred* till *To-morrow.*

ARMY DISCIPLINE AND REGULATION BILL.—[BILL 88.]

(*Mr. Secretary Stanley, Mr. Secretary Cross, Mr. William Henry Smith, The Judge Advocate General.*)

SECOND READING DEFERRED.

MR. PARNELL reminded the Secretary of State for War that, with regard to a Motion of the hon. and learned Member for Limerick (Mr. O'Shaughnessy) in reference to that Bill, he had stated that he accepted the principle of the Motion, which declared that there existed a necessity for its careful consideration, on condition that no opposition was offered to the renewal of the present Mutiny Act. He also asked the right hon. and gallant Gentleman to recollect that hon. Members on his side of the House expected him to bring forward the Bill early, and afford opportunities, both on the second reading and in Committee, for working it into a practical measure. As the Bill contained many imperfections, and had not been satisfactorily considered, he hoped the Secretary of State for War would that evening give them some assurance that the Army Discipline and Regulation Bill would be brought forward for second reading as soon as possible, in order to enable hon. Members to consider it fully, and place Amendments upon the Paper.

COLONEL STANLEY said, he had accepted the Amendment of the hon. and learned Member for Limerick in the same sense as that in which it was offered—namely, with a wish to facilitate the Business of the House. He was very anxious that no time should be lost in the consideration of the Army Discipline and Regulation Bill. The time of year was advancing, and it was necessary that the Supplementary Estimates should be passed, in order to take the Vote for the money for the pay of the Army. He had arranged that the Bill should be brought in without delay.

MAJOR NOLAN inquired if it were correct to bring on the Bill before the men and money had been voted?

COLONEL STANLEY replied that the men had been already voted.

Second Reading *deferred* till *To-morrow.*

OYSTER AND MUSSEL FISHERIES ORDER (BLACKWATER, ESSEX) BILL.

(*Mr. J. G. Talbot, Viscount Sandon.*)

[BILL 76.] COMMITTEE.

Bill *considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Clauses 1 and 2 *agreed to.*

Schedule.

MR. J. G. TALBOT moved, in page 3, line 41, after "Colchester," to insert "Wyvenhoe," and after "respectively," to insert "at the Cinque Port and Board of Trade Warehouse at Brightlingsea."

Amendment *agreed to.*

Schedule, as amended, *agreed to.*

Bill *reported;* as amended, to be considered *To-morrow.*

MOTION.

TEACHERS ORGANISATION AND REGISTRATION BILL.

On Motion of Mr. LYON PLAYFAIR, Bill for the Organisation and Registration of Teachers engaged in Intermediate Education in England and Wales, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. LYON PLAYFAIR, Mr. ARTHUR MILLS, Sir JOHN LUBBOCK, and Lord FRANCIS HERVEY.

Bill *presented,* and read the first time. [Bill 101.]

House adjourned at One o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Friday, 14*th March,* 1879.

MINUTES.]—PUBLIC BILLS—*First Reading*—Mutiny Act (Temporary) Continuance*.

Royal Assent—Exchequer Bonds (No. 1) [42 *Vict.* c. 3]; Consolidated Fund (No. 1) [42 *Vict.* c. 2]; Assizes [42 *Vict.* c. 1].

THE VOLUNTEER FORCE.

ADDRESS FOR A RETURN.

LORD TRURO rose to move—

"That a humble Address be presented to Her Majesty for Return showing the number of courts of inquiry ordered by the War Office in each year in the Volunteer Force since its establishment; the number of volunteers of all ranks, the number of adjutants, and the number of instructors in each year on whom such were held, and the several offences charged."

The noble Lord said, he had hoped that the Return would be unopposed; but almost at the last moment the noble Viscount the Under Secretary of State for War (Viscount Bury) had given him to understand that he did not intend to comply with his request. Returns of this character were made annually in the Army, and he thought it desirable that they should have something similar in regard to the Volunteers. Such a Return would search out all the weak points, whatever they might be, of the whole system—with respect to the working of which he intended on a later day to move for a Royal Commission, and for that purpose the Return he now asked for would be available. When Returns were opposed, it was usually on the ground that they were injurious to the public interests or that they would involve considerable expenditure of money or time. In the present instance no such objection could be urged, as letters addressed to the commanding officers of the various corps would elicit all the information he desired. With reference to the Report of the Departmental Committee, he admired the dexterity with which the Government had postponed, if not denied, the grant of any additional public money to the Volunteer Force. It would have been better if they had frankly stated their inability to recommend an increase of the annual grant. Most of the witnesses examined before the Committee were men of what he might call War Office proclivities, who, though they might command respect and consideration, were unable to understand the extreme difficulties that surrounded the Volunteers.

Moved that an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty for Return showing the number of courts of inquiry ordered by the War Office in each year in the Volunteer Force since its establishment; the number of volunteers of all ranks, the number of adjutants, and the number of instructors in each year on whom such were held, and the several offences charged.—(*The Lord Truro.*)

VISCOUNT BURY said, that he would reserve his defence of the Departmental Committee till the noble Lord moved for the Royal Commission. He was sorry that the War Office could not furnish the Return asked for by the noble Lord; but there were no records in the Office from which the information could be compiled, as when courts of inquiry were ordered no special note was kept of the order. Nor could the suggestion of the noble Lord that circular letters should be sent to the commanding officers of the corps be efficacious. The courts of inquiry were held, some under the authority of the Crown, and some under that of the commanding officers of the regiments; the former were held on officers, and the latter on the private members of the Force. In many instances corps had ceased to exist, and it was not probable that in all cases their records were complete; but, in any case, the War Office must decline to be responsible for the returns that might be procured. Moreover, in his opinion, the Return would involve serious expense and trouble.

LORD TRURO asked whether it was the fact that no record had been kept at the War Office of courts of inquiry ordered to be held upon adjutants attached to the Volunteer regiments?

VISCOUNT BURY replied, that in the case both of the Volunteers and of the Regular Army the same course had been pursued.

THE DUKE OF CAMBRIDGE: I must repudiate the notion that the military authorities have been opposed to the interests of the Volunteers. Whenever the War Office has had to decide a question of the kind referred to by the noble Lord (Lord Truro), we have taken into our fullest consideration the views of the commanding officers. I do not wish that your Lordships should have the impression that the military authorities are insensible to the interest of Volunteer officers. They are ready at all times to meet the Volunteers more than half way.

On Question, *Resolved in the Negative.*

HIGHWAY ACT, 1878.

QUESTION. OBSERVATIONS.

THE EARL OF KIMBERLEY rose to call attention to the provisions of the Highway Act of last Session, as to the expenses of "main roads," and to ask whether Her Majesty's Government intend to introduce any Bill to amend those provisions? The noble Earl said it would be remembered that the Act enabled the county authorities to declare any road whatever to be a main road; and the point he wished to raise was, whether they were empowered by the Act to pay half the expenses connected with such roads? It was argued that all taxing clauses should be precise and clear in their effect, and he was aware that the 18th clause of the Act provided that in the case of

> "Main roads the accounts should be rendered separately by the highway authorities to the county authority, and that in the event of any default in the rendering of those accounts the county authority might refuse to contribute half the expense of maintaining the roads, as provided by the 13th clause."

It might, therefore, be said that the whole of the main roads were covered by the Act, and he wished to know whether Her Majesty's Government entertained any doubts on the subject, and whether, if so, they intended to introduce a Bill this Session to amend the provisions of the Act?

THE DUKE OF RICHMOND AND GORDON said, no doubt his noble Friend had not put this Question from mere curiosity, because the subject had occupied the attention of several Quarter Sessions during the past year, and especially the Quarter Sessions of the County of Norfolk. He could not share the doubt that had been raised. The 13th section of the Act provided that all the turnpike roads should become main roads, and as such should have half the cost of their maintenance borne by the county rates. Then followed the 15th section, which provided that the highway authority might proclaim a road to be a main road. What, he should like to know, would be the use of that provision, unless something turned upon the fact that they had acquired a right to that name? That being so, the Government were of opinion that the same provision which applied to main roads under Clause 13 equally applied to those under Clause 15. He understood that the same conclusion had been arrived at by an eminent Counsel to whom a case had been submitted by the Justices of Northumberland. He had therefore arrived at the conclusion that it would not be necessary to introduce a declaratory Act during the present Session to remove the doubts as to the interpretation of the Act which had arisen in the minds of some persons. It was possible, however, that in the course of time it might be necessary to consolidate the general Highway Acts, in which case, if any doubts on the subject still existed, the opportunity might be taken to obviate them.

LORD SELBORNE did not think the matter was so free from doubt as the noble Duke seemed to suppose, and suggested the expediency of making the law clearer.

SOUTH AFRICA—THE ZULU WAR—THE DEFEAT AT ISANDULA.

QUESTION. OBSERVATIONS.

LORD THURLOW: My Lords, in putting this Question, of which I have given Notice, I will not detain your Lordships many moments. On the one hand, I feel it would be very unwise and very unfair to prejudge the causes which led to the disaster at Isandula; but, on the other hand, I feel that it would be still more unwise and still more unfair to shrink from the earliest and the closest and the most minute investigation into a catastrophe that has deprived this country of the lives and services of over 1,500 men. I dread the feeling gaining currency at home and abroad that this House and this country are indifferent to the lives of its soldiers and to the results of this campaign; and I deprecate the growing tendency of the age to accept with philosophical resignation whatever calamity may befall this country, and to seek for consolation in the sorrowful reflection that all displayed the utmost gallantry, that every man did his duty, and that nobody was to blame. I myself will not venture to apportion the blame; but I hold, and I maintain this country holds, that it is impossible to lose 1,500 men in a conflict with savages, however bold or well-armed and disciplined, without serious blame attaching to somebody or to some system of tactics pursued; and it is in the hope of receiving some assurance from Her Majesty's Government that a really competent Court of Inquiry has been appointed to discover where this blame attaches that I ask the first portion of my Question; and it is with a view to derive the utmost advantage from their Report, and to reduce to a minimum the chance of any repetition of the disaster, that I throw it out as a suggestion whether it might not be wise to delay the prosecution of offensive warfare in Zululand until the Report of this Court of Inquiry may be received and fully considered. There is only one other point to which I desire to refer. I was yesterday informed by a noble and highly distinguished Earl and General Officer opposite (the Earl of Longford) that he took exception to the wording of my Question, as liable to give pain and to wound the susceptibilities of the Army; and I then replied to him, and I now repeat it, that I sincerely hoped that such would not be the case, as nothing was further from my wishes than to cast any doubt upon the integrity and honour of the Service; and I will now add, that before placing my Notice on the Paper, I submitted it to another and equally distinguished General Officer, to whom it conveyed no impression of the kind, and I therefore think that he has been somewhat over-sensitive in this matter. It is for all these reasons, my Lords, and in no carping spirit of criticism, and, above all, in no feeling of wanton hostility towards Her Majesty's Government, that I ask the Question that stands in my name—namely, Whether they can give the names of the officers appointed by General Lord Chelmsford to examine and report upon the recent disaster at Isandula; and whether, in the opinion of Her Majesty's Government, such Court of Inquiry is composed of elements sufficiently independent of their commanding officer to justify the hope that their Report will be as unprejudiced and authoritative as the magnitude of the disaster renders desirable; and whether, in the opinion of Her Majesty's Government, it would not be wise, now that the opportunity of acting before the Zulu harvest has been lost, to delay a further invasion of Zululand until the Report above referred to shall have been received and fully considered?

THE EARL OF LONGFORD: Before the noble Viscount the Under Secretary of State answers this Question, I request to be heard. This matter concerns others besides the Government. The Government is here to answer for itself. The others are not here; for them I claim to speak. This Notice in itself appears to have come from some pigeon-hole of the Circumlocution Office. It is a pity that it was not allowed to remain there. The noble Lord disclaims any intention of giving offence either to those who may be serving abroad, or to their friends here. But his whole Notice is an offence. It imputes to Lord Chelmsford an error in judgment or more, and its language has been read elsewhere as meaning a great deal more, in having, upon an important occasion, summoned a Court of Inquiry so composed that it could not be expected to make a trustworthy Report; and it imputes to the military officers appointed to conduct that inquiry, who, in such a case as this, would obviously be officers of a certain rank and experience, that they would be so prejudiced, or so dependent, or so weak, that no credit could be attached to any opinion they might express. On behalf of Lord Chelmsford, for whose honour and good faith I will answer with my right hand, and on behalf of the officers of the Army who are insulted by these imputations, I say that there is no sound reason for the suspicions put forward by the noble Lord. Lord Chelmsford's public conduct is, of course, open to challenge, at the proper time, on proper information; but I repeat that the noble Lord is not justified in asking this Question on mere conjecture, nor in suggesting to Parliament and to the public to discredit beforehand a Report which has not yet been written. A French military writer, in describing the difficulties of a General in command, reminds him that after the most careful consideration of his plans, and the issue of his orders with all details, he must be prepared for every possible contrariety of circumstances; for floods in summer, droughts in winter, miscarriage of his combinations, mistakes of his subordinates—here he might have added, and ungenerous criticism at home. I assume that the noble Lord has spoken under a sense of public duty. My view of public duty is altogether different from his. I think that public servants engaged upon an arduous enterprize abroad are entitled to expect the cordial expression of our goodwill and support — certainly, not the discouragement of gratuitous suspicion. I, for one, will raise my voice here or elsewhere to protect those who are not here to speak for themselves from the uncalled-for imputations that this Notice conveys.

LORD TRURO: My Lords, I think it scarcely conceivable that the noble Earl who has just addressed the House can be serious in what he has said. I appeal to your Lordships whether any Notice has ever been presented to the House with more fairness and more modesty? It disclaimed, in the strongest manner, any desire to impute anything either discreditable or dishonourable to any body of men—officers or men—engaged in the service of their country. As I understood the noble Lord (Lord Thurlow), his sole object was to point out the great difficulty that must necessarily arise from appointing officers of inferior rank to Lord Chelmsford to decide upon the conduct of the noble and gallant Lord in this matter. There never has been a man in the position of Lord Chelmsford who, in circumstances similar to those that have occurred, has been visited with less of censure and less of unkind remark than has that noble Lord and gallant Officer. There is no man who is more beloved and popular, or who will command more sympathy, if it should prove that he has made a mistake; and I can see no harm in a Member of your Lordships' House pointing out the possibility of officers appointed as a Court of Inquiry being unduly influenced by their feelings of sympathy and affection for their commanding officer. I have no doubt that if it is the intention of Her Majesty's Government to send out officers of high rank to conduct the inquiry, the fact will be plainly stated to your Lordships. Speaking as one who has had some experience in Courts of Inquiry, I hope I may never have to say of the one which is about to be held that it has been of an unsatisfactory character. I cannot remain silent without protesting against the language in which the noble Earl (the Earl of Longford) has characterized the Question of my noble Friend, and the manner in which it was put to Her Majesty's Government.

LORD STANLEY OF ALDERLEY: My Lords, I regret that the first part of this Question should have been asked; and all criticism in this House of the commanding officer is to be deprecated, because it is liable to be unjust to him and to discourage him in the midst of his difficulties. Besides, what most concerns the House and the country is to fix the responsibility of this war, which is more important than the disaster of Isandula, which is to be taken as the fortune of war. I desire to support the second part of the Question, which asks for a delay of the invasion of Zululand, not until the Report is received, but until the country has been able to express an opinion. There is already a cessation of hostilities, for Cetewayo has not crossed the frontier. There are three reasons for this. The first and most generally received is that he has suffered too much at Isandula, at Rorke's Drift, and in the action with Colonel Pearson's force; the second is that he wants to get in his harvest; and the third, which I have seen mentioned in private letters from Natal from well informed authority, is that he has given orders to the chiefs of his regiments not to cross the Tugela, and only to defend their own country; and that he still relies upon British justice. Her Majesty's Government have instructed Sir Bartle Frere to temporise and not to engage in this war; they have thus shown that they thought it unnecessary, and therefore it was unjust, and should not have been undertaken.

VISCOUNT BURY: I cannot too highly thank the noble Earl behind me (the Earl of Longford) for the manly and outspoken way in which he has given voice to feelings which my mere prosaic duty of answering a Question would render inopportune in me. I think the Question which has been put by the noble Lord (Lord Thurlow) is founded on a radical misapprehension of the real meaning of what a Court of Inquiry is. On reading the Notice, I must confess it struck me as containing an imputation which it would be my duty most energetically to repel—an imputation that the Commander of Her Majesty's Forces in South Africa had seized the occasion of the appointment of this Court of Inquiry to place upon it officers so immediately under his own control that they would be likely, in plain language, to "whitewash" him. There can be no other interpretation placed on the Notice, which the noble Lord did not read to the House, but which, if the House will allow me, I shall read. The noble Lord's Question is as follows:—

> "To ask whether, in the opinion of Her Majesty's Government, such Court of Inquiry is composed of elements sufficiently independent of their Commanding Officer to justify the hope that their Report will be as unprejudiced and authoritative as the magnitude of the disaster renders desirable?"

My Lords, in answer to that I have to say, that the only information which the

Government are possessed of with regard to the constitution of that Court is one paragraph in the despatch of Lord Chelmsford, in which he mentions that he has not received from Colonel Hassard, commanding the Royal Engineers, the Report of the Court upon which he sat. We only know this indirectly—that Colonel Hassard was the President of that Court; but we conclude, from Lord Chelmsford's despatch, that such was the case. Now, Colonel Hassard is the second officer in command. He is a man highly distinguished and highly respected in his profession, and, as a British officer, he ought, I should think, to be shielded from such imputations as are conveyed in this Question. But I have another and a more complete answer to the imputation conveyed—and that is, that by the very nature of a Court of Inquiry, any kind of collusion between Lord Chelmsford and those composing the Court is rendered absolutely out of the question. A Court of Inquiry such as this is held under the Prerogative and not by Statute. It is a Court which can call before it witnesses subject to military law, but only by virtue of their position as military persons. It cannot take any evidence on oath. I will read from the Queen's Regulations the conditions under which the Court sits—

> "A Court of Inquiry may be assembled by any officer in command to assist him in arriving at a correct conclusion on any subject on which it may be expedient for him to be thoroughly informed. With this object in view, such Court may be directed to investigate and report upon any matter that may be brought before it; but it has no power (except when convened to record the illegal absence of soldiers as provided for in the Articles of War) to administer an oath, nor to compel the attendance of witnesses not military.
>
> "A Court of Inquiry is not to be considered in any light as a judicial body. It may be employed at the discretion of the convening officer to collect and record information only."

Now, My Lords, Lord Chelmsford was absent from Isandula at the moment of the disaster. He could not from his own personal observation send home an entirely satisfactory account to the authorities in this country. There was but one course open to him—to order the assembly of such a Court of Inquiry to inquire merely into matters of fact and not into matters of opinion. If that Court of Inquiry had been directed, or if it were directed, to express an opinion, then it would be open to anyone to question the motives on which that opinion rested. But, as it is, it was appointed simply to collect facts for the information of the Commander-in-Chief, which he might employ as he thought best and send home to the authorities on his own responsibility. The terms in which the noble Lord has been pleased to couch his Question, therefore, makes it fall to the ground, and it loses that unfortunate significance with which it is now invested. I wish it were now my proud duty to follow the noble Lord in the first few word of his remarks, and to offer a panegyric upon those brave men who fell at Isandula, and those who distinguished themselves at Rorke's Drift. It is not my duty to do that—I must confine myself to the Question—but no Englishman, in speaking upon this subject, can resist a passing tribute of admiration to their courage. In answer to the second part of the noble Lord's Question—Whether it would not be better to delay a further invasion of Zululand until the Report above referred to shall have been received and fully considered?—I have to say that Her Majesty's Government are giving their best consideration to the state of affairs, and will take that course which circumstances induce them to believe is best for the public interest.

House adjourned at a quarter past Six o'clock, to Monday next, a quarter before Five o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Friday, 14*th March*, 1879.

MINUTES.]—PRIVATE BILLS (*by Order*)—*Second Reading—Referred to Select Committee*—London and North Western Railway (Additional Powers); Midland Railway.

PUBLIC BILLS—*Resolution in Committee—Ordered—First Reading*—Companies Acts Amendment* [102].

Committee—Prosecution of Offences [68]—R.P.

Committee—Report—District Auditors [79]; Marine Mutiny Act (Temporary) Continuance* [98].

Considered as amended—Oyster and Mussel Fisheries Order (Blackwater, Essex)* [76],

PRIVATE BUSINESS.

LONDON AND NORTH WESTERN RAILWAY (ADDITIONAL POWERS) BILL.

(*by Order.*) SECOND READING.

Order for Second Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."—(*Sir Charles Forster.*)

MR. ALDERMAN COTTON said, that, in the interests of the carmen, contractors, and carriers of the United Kingdom, he rose to move that the Bill be read a second time on that day six months. The Legislature had always been particular in maintaining vested rights, and in opposing any attempt to interfere with them. The present Bill was an attempt at interference, on the part of the London and North Western Railway Company, with a very large vested right indeed. He was told that if they succeeded in carrying this Bill, Clause 33 would have the effect of causing total ruin to a very large and important body of men. The amount of capital invested by the carmen, carriers, and others, was no less than £20,000,000. Looking into the Census Returns of 1871, he found that there were at that time no less than 320,000 persons employed in this traffic in England and Wales; and it was estimated that the number at the present time had increased to over 1,000,000 persons in the United Kingdom. The Railway Companies had within themselves an enormous power, not only of interference, but of money, and any attempt on the part of any individual to oppose such great and important interests was almost sure to bring ruin on the persons so opposing. The House was well aware that all monopolies were, more or less, objectionable, and the monopoly of the Railway Companies was a most serious one indeed. Railways in the early days of inland navigation objected to become carriers, and they were the cause of bringing the carriers, and other traders of that description, into existence; but by degrees they had taken upon themselves to become their own carriers, and, in one way and the other, by the introduction into Acts of Parliament of special clauses, they had succeeded in making themselves traders in a very great many and important particulars. Since the year 1859 the Railway Companies had obtained power to become hotel proprietors, book-sellers at their stations, tarpaulin manufacturers, harness makers, farriers, and, in fact, almost everything which appertained to the traffic and the carriages which run upon their lines. They were now attempting, in the present case, not only to become carriers for themselves, but to establish agencies throughout the Metropolis, and possibly throughout the Kingdom; because, if this attempt should be successful, other Companies would fall into it, and the Railway Companies would become carriers not only for their own lines, but for other lines. He supposed they had all individually felt the powers already possessed by the Railway Companies. He imagined there was scarcely a Member of the House who had not some complaint or other to bring against the Railway Companies. A monopoly once established became too powerful for public opinion or individual exertions to upset, and the power of the railways, great as it was by the influx of money always flowing into their coffers, and by the very large amount of capital at their command, became almost irresistible. It was so great that it ought not to be used against the public, whose traffic over their lines contributed so much to their prosperity. He was afraid that their desire now to extend their profits arose from the extravagance they had indulged in in the past. It was only necessary to look around, in order to see what enormous sums of the shareholders' money had been invested in the erection of huge railway stations, such as those which existed in the neighbourhood of King's Cross; and now, on every side, they saw the Railway Companies attempting to redeem their extravagance by an increase of tolls, or of fares, over their lines, or by reducing the wages of the railway porters, or of the inferior officials in their employment. He was told that one of the railways, the other day, gave notice that it was going to raise the price of first-class season-tickets. They were remonstrated with, but persisted in their intention. Then railway travellers, in order to protect themselves, intimated that they would use the second-class carriages and season-tickets instead of the first; but, in order to meet any difficulty that might arise in that way, the Railway Companies took off their second-class carriages altogether, and when the passengers presented themselves to take a second-class ticket, they found that the Company had withdrawn all second-class carriages. The consequence was that the passengers would either have been too late for their business in the City, if they had waited for other trains, or they would be compelled to take single tickets by first-class carriages for that day's journey. He was told that, in this particular instance, the second-class carriages were withdrawn for a month. He thought such an act was entirely unworthy of a great Company. Unfortunately, the Railway Companies forgot, as soon as they obtained powers, that they were the servants of the public, and that they were put there to protect the interests of the public travelling on their line. Parliament had protected the Companies to a considerable extent by restricting the competition; and for many years the great main lines had been established throughout England, carrying on the traffic of all the large towns—the consequence being that, by one means or the other, the railway monopoly had passed into the hands of large Companies; and when all chance of competition was destroyed, it was found that these Companies invariably increased their fares against the public. He could assure the House that the persons who were taking an interest in getting this clause removed from the Bill felt very seriously, indeed, the position in which they were likely to be placed. They felt, however, that all-powerful as a Railway Company was, there was an important power over all of them—namely, the power of Parliament, a power which, he was sure, would not allow any great injustice to be done to the general community, and, by so doing, to every individual Member of the House. It was somewhat curious to observe how the Railway Companies were attempting, at all times, to evade the law of the land. One peculiar feature in railway legislation was the manner in which Railway Companies succeeded in introducing into different Private Bills clauses which gave them all they wanted. They did this in order to avoid the effect of the law, and to promote their own interests. It was a most ingenious device, and in many instances had been successful. It was not, however, always successful. In 1859, the Great Western Company applied for powers to Parliament to build a bridge over the West London Railway, instead of a level crossing, and they inserted in that Bill power to alter the rates of fares over the whole of their line. It was only after the Bill had been read a second time that this fact was discovered; and it was mainly through the instrumentality of the Bristol Chamber of Commerce that it was detected—indeed, it was by the merest accident that it was discovered. He had given Notice of opposition to the introduction of the Bill in the interests of the carmen, carriers, and other outside interests; but he hoped the House would agree to the Committee which, he believed, the noble Lord the President of the Board of Trade (Viscount Sandon) was about to propose—namely, a Hybrid Committee, to be nominated partly by the House and partly by the Committee of Selection, which would inquire fully into this question. He had such confidence in the noble Viscount that he was certain anything he proposed would be in the interests of both parties; and he should be quite content, therefore, if the House acceded to that proposal, not to persevere with his Motion for the rejection of the second reading of the Bill. He would move that Motion now formally, and, at the proper time, he would ask to be allowed to withdraw it.

Colonel BERESFORD seconded the Amendment.

Amendment proposed, to leave out the word "now," and at the end of the Question to add the words "upon this day six months."—(*Mr. Alderman Cotton.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question."

Lord RICHARD GROSVENOR congratulated the hon. Member for the City of London (Mr. Alderman Cotton) on having changed his views in respect to monopoly since last evening. The hon. Gentleman was of opinion that Railway Companies ought to be checked. He would not follow the hon. Member in the long string of indictments which he had brought against the Railway Companies, nor would he detain the House further than by drawing their attention to this particular clause, which related to wharfingers, warehouses, and town carriers. This clause did not in any way alter the position of carmen and carriers from what it was at present. The Railway Companies had been accused of attempting to evade the law. Now, their position was simply this. In a particular case an injunction was applied for against the London and North Western Company, and in order to put themselves right in future they proposed to introduce a clause into the present Bill. The terms of the clause had been modified. As it originally stood, it bore a construction which was not intended to be placed upon it; but as it was now modified he believed that, in most instances, it met the approval of those who had been previously opposed to it. As it appeared at present, it applied only to town carriers. The Railway Companies stood in a peculiar position. They were forced to get rid of the goods they carried as soon as they received them, because if they allowed any large accumulation of goods the accommodation at their disposal would be insufficient. They had, therefore, been obliged to make certain arrangements with certain agents for the delivery of the goods. If these arrangements were not made, and if they depended upon chance carriers, they would be unable to clear the goods; and so they were obliged to employ agents where they could not do the work themselves. They claimed, however, that they were legally entitled to do the work for themselves wherever they were able to do so; and, by the present clause, the London and North Western Company were only put on a level with the town carriers. Town carriers were employed to collect goods for various Railway Companies; and it was only for the interests of the public that one Railway Company should under agreement be entitled to carry goods for another Railway Company. For instance, if any individual wished to send three bales of goods by three particular Railway Companies, there was no reason why one Company should not accept the goods and agree to convey them to the stations of the other Companies. If they were compelled to send to the different offices by different carriers, the whole machinery for the collection of goods would be very much complicated. He was afraid the House might have been induced to believe that the town carriers did not receive anything from the Railway Companies for conveying the goods. That was by no means the case. They were paid by the Companies as well as by the public; and the clause which had been introduced in this case was, as he had said before, only introduced for placing the Railway Companies on a level with the town carriers. For these reasons, he supported the second reading of the Bill; but he should accept the promise of the noble Viscount the President of the Board of Trade (Viscount Sandon), that the Bill, when read a second time, should be sent to a Hybrid Committee.

MR. RATHBONE said, the question before the House was one of considerable importance. At present, they had heard the case as far as two of the parties were concerned—namely, the Railway Companies and those who were opposed to the second reading of the Bill. It must not, however, be forgotten that there was a third party whom the House was bound to consider in the matter, and that was the public themselves. The Railway Companies must not complain if any application on their part for increased powers was viewed with great jealousy, because nothing could have been more short-sighted, less liberal, or more inimical to the convenience of the public than the course which the Railway Companies had hitherto pursued with respect to parcels. Their charges were most exorbitant, while their accommodation was very slight; and he believed they had very much injured their own interests by the short-sighted policy they had pursued. Unfortunately, where they had Railway Companies with a practical monopoly, there was a very great want of enterprize; and when a Railway Company came to the House and began to ask for fresh powers, if Parliament should consider it desirable to give them the powers they sought, such powers ought only to be conferred when increased securities were given to the public that their convenience would be studied, and additional accommodation provided for them. He had no wish to object to the second reading of the Bill, because he thought the proposal made by the noble Viscount the President of the Board of Trade was the best way of dealing with the question. He would, however, make one suggestion to the Board of Trade. If the Bill was to be referred to a Select Committee of a hybrid character, he thought it should be understood that the Chambers of Commerce, and others representing the public interest, should be heard before that Select Committee, and that the scope of the inquiry should be sufficiently large to enable the Committee to deal generally with the requirements of the public.

MR. RITCHIE said, he had given Notice of an Amendment; but he need hardly say that he would be quite content on his part to accept the proposition of the noble Viscount the President of the Board of Trade. If that proposal was likely to be agreed to, he should not trouble the House with his Amendment; nor should he have risen at all, if it had not been for some remarks which had fallen from the noble Lord who sat opposite (Lord Richard Grosvenor), who, he had no doubt unintentionally, had misrepresented the existing condition of the Railway Companies. The noble Lord told them that the clause which was objected to in the present Bill did not alter the position of the town carriers. Now, he (Mr. Ritchie) contended that it did very materially alter the position of the town carriers. The noble Lord said the Railway Companies were at present legally entitled to do what they were now asking power from the House to enable them to do. If they were legally entitled to do it, why did they require the confirmation of their power in a fresh Act of Parliament?

LORD RICHARD GROSVENOR said, the Railway Companies asked to place themselves in the same position as the town carriers.

MR. RITCHIE had understood the noble Lord to say that they were already in the same position as town carriers. The noble Lord now said that they only sought to be placed in the same position. He (Mr. Ritchie) still contended that the Bill would place them in a very different position. The town carriers would have opposed to them the great Railway Companies, who had enormous capital, and who would, practically, be able to extinguish the competition of private individuals—such as town carriers—altogether. For instance, the capital of a town carrier was necessarily very small as compared with that of a Railway Company. It would be practically indifferent to a Railway Company whether they embarked a small portion of their capital in a particular business or not, and whether they sustained any loss upon it; while the business they carried on constituted the sole existence of the town carriers. They were thus in a very different position from the Railway Companies. He would only add, in reference to the remarks of the hon. Member for Liverpool (Mr. Rathbone), who spoke last, that he hoped all the Chambers of Commerce, and those members of the general public who were interested in the question, would be able to be heard before the Committee. He hoped his hon. Friend the Member for the City of London (Mr. Alderman Cotton) would withdraw his opposition to the second reading, so that the Bill might be read a second time and referred to the Select Committee proposed by the noble Viscount the President of the Board of Trade.

SIR JOSEPH M'KENNA thought it ought to be borne in mind, in connection with this question, and, indeed, with the whole class of these questions, that it was one of the Rules of the House that no Member was to take any part or interfere in a question in which he had a personal or any other interest. In this case there were two Bills before the House, each containing a clause proposing that the Company to which the Bill referred should have, in respect to an important branch of trade, a statutable monopoly. The noble Lord who spoke on the subject just now (Lord Richard Grosvenor) said that all the Railway Companies wanted to do was to place themselves in the position which common carriers now occupied. They would, however, be placed in a very different position if this Bill passed through Parliament and received the Royal Assent; because they would have not only an equal advantage in keeping their shop open in town for the receipt of goods; they would also practically have the key of the gate when the goods were brought to them to forward by rail, and they might impose their own conditions on the present forwarding agents. By this means they would be enabled to secure the annihilation of the private carriers. It would, practically, amount to that; and he thought it was the duty of Parliament to provide some safeguards in the interests of the public.

He had no desire to press the matter to a Division by any opposition on his part at this stage; but he hoped it would be borne in mind that while the railway interest was largely represented in the House on the one hand, the Rules of Parliament on the other precluded hon. Gentlemen in the railway interest from taking part in questions or voting where their personal interests were involved.

VISCOUNT SANDON said, he would only trouble the House with a very few remarks, because he gathered from the tone of the debate that hon. Members on both sides were willing to accept the proposal he was about to make. He would, therefore, simply explain why Her Majesty's Government did not lend their support to the Motion for throwing out these two Bills on the second reading; and why, on the other hand, they would not be satisfied with the reference of those Bills in the ordinary way to a Select Committee upstairs. With regard to throwing out these two Bills, they thought it would be a great injustice to the two Companies concerned; because, after all, they were only asking for legal powers, under amended clauses, to confirm what had been the usage for many years past. He had no reason to suppose they were acting in anything like bad faith. On the other hand, he felt that the subject raised was a very important one, so far as the great commercial communities were concerned. The Board of Trade had received deputations and communications on the subject of this Bill from almost every large town in the country. There had been deputations from Bradford, Portsmouth, Bristol, and many other towns, as well as important communications from London, all showing the great importance attached to the subject by the trading community. They had also borne in mind that Parliament had of late shown very great jealousy in allowing the Railway Companies to go at all beyond the actual business they had been intrusted with by Parliament as Railway Companies. He gathered that it was the wish of the House to restrict, to some extent, a permanent extension of those Companies in other lines of business than those which legitimately belonged to them. Considering the great interest taken, it was most desirable that the very best judgment of Parliament should be passed on the very large questions raised in these Bills. He therefore intended to propose, on behalf of the Government, that the Bills should be referred to a Hybrid Committee. He hoped to secure the services on that Committee, as Chairman, of some Gentleman of large experience; and he had ascertained that a Hybrid Committee would have the power of hearing the Chairmen of the Chambers of Commerce and private individuals on the subject, so that all the interests concerned would be fully heard. He might also add that he had already laid upon the Table of the House all the Memorials on the subject presented to the Board of Trade, and he proposed to refer them to the Committee, so as to call the attention of the Committee especially to the complaints which had been made. He thanked the House for the manner in which they had received the proposal of the Government; and he should be prepared to make this reference to a Hybrid Committee, when his hon. Friend the Member for the City of London withdrew his opposition.

COLONEL BERESFORD, who was very indistinctly heard, was understood to say that the principal Railway Companies of the Kingdom had already a great monopoly of the traffic in its various branches, and he trusted that the additional powers now sought for to enable them to become carmen, carriers, booking-office keepers, and wharfingers, to the destruction of those engaged in such undertakings, would be refused by the House.

MR. THOMSON HANKEY said, he could not see what was the object of sending the Bill to a Hybrid Committee. The noble Viscount the President of the Board of Trade intimated that he should propose to refer the Bill to a Committee, nominated partly by the House itself and partly by the Committee of Selection. He thought that they had had sufficient experience of the Committee of Selection to know that in all matters of importance the greatest care was taken by the Committee to secure the thorough investigation of a Bill upon its merits. He, therefore, failed to see what object was to be attained by appointing a Hybrid Committee instead of referring the Bill in the usual way. It was said that unless the House nominated part of the Members of the Committee, they would not have the power to instruct the Committee to hear witnesses on extraneous matters. That was not necessarily the case. If he was rightly informed, the House had ample powers to give all these instructions to an ordinary Committee; and as all of them could be given to an ordinary Committee, he thought the House was going out of its way to appoint a Hybrid Committee. He was afraid that of late they had been getting into a habit of appointing these Hybrid Committees unnecessarily. If it could be shown that any object was to be gained by the nomination of such Committees, he would not object; but without some object could be shown, and unless it could be made manifest that a Hybrid Committee would have powers which could not be given to an ordinary Committee, he thought the better way would be to appoint an ordinary Committee, calling the attention of the Committee of Selection to the nature of the provisions of the Bill, and giving them all the necessary instructions as to how the Bill was to be dealt with.

Mr. WOODD said, he did not know whether he ought to say a few words, because it was not improbable that the Bill would come before him personally; but he wished to give a reason why the Bill ought to be referred to a Hybrid Committee, rather than to an ordinary Committee. If it were referred to an ordinary Select Committee, the Committee would not be empowered to hear evidence where the parties had no *locus standi.* Another point was that, in a Select Committee, the decision virtually rested with the Chairman. A Select Committeè only consisted of four Members; and if the Chairman carried one Member with him, he was able to decide every point. As this Bill would probably have to come before him, in the event of its being referred in the usual way, almost all the material points would virtually be left to his decision, and he should be extremely sorry to undertake such a responsibility. He thought there could be no question that the Bill ought to be referred to a Hybrid Committee.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Main Question put, and *agreed to.*

Bill read a second time.

Mr. Thomson Hankey

VISCOUNT SANDON moved—

"That the Bill be *committed* to a Select Committee of Five Members, Three to be nominated by the House, and Two by the Committee of Selection."

Motion *agreed to.*

VISCOUNT SANDON then moved the following Instruction to the Committee:—

"That they have power to inquire and report as to the expediency of authorizing the said Company from time to time to purchase by agreement or take on lease or otherwise provide, and to establish and hold booking and receiving offices and other premises for the collection, reception, and booking and delivery of goods, parcels, and other matters and things intended to be carried upon or over their Railway, and to collect, receive, book, and invoice any such goods, parcels, and other matters and things; and to make and carry into effect any such contracts or agreements with any other Railway Company or Companies with regard to the collection, reception, booking, or invoicing of any goods, parcels, and other matters and things intended to be carried upon or over the Railways of the respective Companies so contracting, or any or either of them."

"Power to send for persons, papers, and records; Three to be the quorum."

Motion *agreed to.*

And, on March 21, Committee *nominated* as follows:—Mr. MASSEY, Sir JOHN KENNAWAY, and Mr. MAURICE BROOKS.

MIDLAND RAILWAY BILL (*by Order*).

SECOND READING.

Order for Second Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."—(*Sir Charles Forster.*)

Motion *agreed to.*

Bill read a second time.

VISCOUNT SANDON moved that the Bill be *committed* to the Select Committee on the London and North Western Railway (Additional Powers) Bill, with the following Instruction to the Committee:—

"That they have power to inquire and report as to the expediency of authorizing the said Company from time to time to purchase by agreement or take on lease or otherwise provide, and to establish and hold booking and receiving offices and other premises for the collection, reception, and booking and delivery of goods, parcels, and other matters and things intended to be carried upon or over their Railway, and to collect, receive, book, and invoice any such goods, parcels, and other matters and things; and to make and carry into effect any such contracts or agreements with any other Railway Company or Companies with regard to the collection, reception, booking, or invoicing of any goods, parcels, and other matters and things intended to be carried upon or over the Railways of the respective Companies so contracting, or any or either of them."

Motion *agreed to.*

QUESTIONS.

RAILWAYS — CONTINUOUS FOOT-BOARDS.—QUESTION.

Mr. GREGORY asked the President of the Board of Trade, Whether answers have been received to the Circular of the Board, relating to continuous foot-boards, from those Railway Companies which had not replied at the date of the last Return?

Viscount SANDON: We have received answers to the Circular of the Board of Trade relating to continuous footboards, since the presentation of the last Return, from the London, Brighton, and South Coast, the Taff Vale, the Manchester, Sheffield, and Lincolnshire, and the London and South-Western Railway Companies, and as soon as the replies of the 60 Companies who have not yet answered our Circular have been received, I shall be happy to lay them upon the Table of the House.

WEST INDIES—GRENADA—PROTECTOR OF IMMIGRANTS.—QUESTION.

Sir HENRY HOLLAND asked the Secretary of State for the Colonies, Whether any suitable officer has been found to be Protector of Immigrants in Grenada in the room of Mr. Denham?

Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH, in reply, said, no appointment had yet been actually made. He had every reason to believe, however, that he had secured a qualified officer for the post, who would very shortly assume the duties of it.

BRITISH BURMAH—THE REINFORCEMENTS.—QUESTION.

Mr. RICHARD asked Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Whether he can give the House any further information as to the occasion and object of the military reinforcements sent to Burmah; and, whether that measure was taken with the knowledge and consent of the Government at Home?

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER: I think the best answer I can give to the hon. Gentleman will be by reading a telegram received from the Viceroy of India on this subject—

> "British garrison reinforced with (it should be 'upon') urgent recommendation made by Chief Commissioner, and strong advice of Eden, Lieutenant Governor. Resident at Mandalay has reported warlike preparations of Burmese, strengthening of river forts, rumours of disturbances, insecurity to foreigners, and warning from well-informed quarters early mischief intended. Altogether, precarious position of affairs. Garrison in Burmah on peace footing; too weak for protection of Province in event of disturbance on frontier, and consequent internal excitement. News of reinforcement will support our Resident. Yesterday's mail takes despatch stating the situation and proposals."

The step was taken by the Viceroy of India on receiving a communication from the Resident at Burmah, and it was immediately communicated in the proper and ordinary course to the Secretary of State at home.

Mr. W. E. FORSTER: Will the right hon. Gentleman give the date of the telegram?

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER: The 8th of March.

THE CAPE COLONY—MILITARY EXPENDITURE.—QUESTION.

General Sir GEORGE BALFOUR asked Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, If he will cause to be prepared an approximate Statement of the Imperial Military Expenditure yearly incurred at the Cape and adjoining Territories from the date Lord Glenelg began to exercise an active control over the native affairs, adding, if available, the Colonial or Local Military Expenditure directly borne by the people of the several Territories, also the amounts contributed in aid of the money burdens which the people of the United Kingdom have borne for the acquisition and maintenance of these African lands?

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER: I am not sure that it would be possible to give all the information asked for by the hon. and gallant Member; but if it were possible, certainly it would be very expensive, and it would take a very long time; and I do not think that any result could be expected from it that would be equivalent to the expense.

MERCANTILE MARINE—THE CASE OF DAVID JULIAN.—QUESTION.

Mr. MACDONALD asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, If his attention has been directed to the case of David Julian, a Cardiff pilot, who engaged to take the Italian barque "Volta" to the limit of the Cardiff pilotage in December last, but through stress of weather was carried to Genoa, the passage lasting forty-nine days; whether it is true that while on the passage he asked for a bed and was refused, and told wet sails were good enough for pilots; whether, also, it is true that, though he had no under-clothing, towel, or razor, and when he asked such from the captain, he absolutely refused to give him anything; whether the sum paid to Julian through the British Consul at Genoa was a sufficient remuneration for the time he lost and such gross indignities; and, if these allegations are true, whether he will make a searching inquiry into the whole matter, with a view to redress for the treatment he was compelled to submit to?

Mr. BOURKE: In reply to the hon. Member, I have to state that a communication has been received at the Foreign Office, containing most of the allegations that are mentioned in the Question. Her Majesty's Ambassador at Rome will be instructed to make a communication to the Italian Government on the subject.

SOUTH AFRICA—THE ZULU WAR.

QUESTIONS.

Mr. SULLIVAN asked the Secretary of State for the Colonies, Whether, seeing there has been no invasion of the Colony of Natal, he will suspend military action until an opportunity has been afforded for a peaceful adjustment of the difference with the Zulu King?

Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH: I believe the fact that there has been, fortunately, no invasion of the Colony of Natal is mainly due,—first, to the memorable defence at Rorke's Drift; secondly, to the position occupied and held by Colonel Pearson; and thirdly, to the other preparations which were at once made for the defence of the Colony. I am not aware that the Zulu King has expressed any wish whatever for a peaceful adjustment of the difference with us; and for every reason, but mainly for the safety of the White race in South Africa, I think it necessary that the military disaster which has occurred should be retrieved.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN: I should like to inquire, Whether any further delay is desirable, in the interest of the Public Service, before the House discusses the Zulu War?

Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH: Further despatches on this subject will, I hope, be in the hands of hon. Members in the course of a few days. I am not prepared to say it is necessary that there should be any further delay before the House enters upon this discussion. I wish, however, to guard myself in one respect. I cannot possibly say what despatches may be on the way; but whatever information arrives, of any material importance, will at once be presented to the House.

Mr. E. JENKINS asked the Chancellor of the Exchequer, Whether the Government propose to place the supreme command of the forces in South Africa in other hands?

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER: No, Sir; as at present advised, they do not.

Mr. E. JENKINS (whose rising to address the House was met by loud and continued cries of "Order!") said: Sir, in consequence of the answer I have received, I shall have to ask the indulgence of the House—["Order, order!"]—and to put myself in Order, I propose to conclude with a Motion. It appears to me that the point which has been raised by my Question and the answer given by the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer are of such a character, involving such grave and important interests—["Order, order!" "Divide, divide!"]—as to demand that they shall be immediately discussed. ["Oh, oh!"] I hope, Sir, that the hon. and gallant Gentleman opposite will give me opportunity of at least stating to the House the object I have in bringing forward this matter. ["Oh, oh!"] Now, Sir, it is perfectly clear that if anything is to be done, if any expression of opinion is to be made in this House on this subject, it must be made at once. ["Oh, oh!"] I will wait until hon. Gentlemen have done. (The hon. Member, who had spoken amid continued cries of interruption, after a brief pause resumed.) I said—(*renewed interruption.*) Sir, I beg to tell the House at once that if I have to stand here all night I will say what I mean to say. ["Order!"]

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member is not entitled to use language menacing to the House; and though the hon. Gentleman may be strictly within his right in taking the course he now proposes to take, it is my duty to point out to him that the course of raising discussion at the present moment is highly inconvenient. I have also to observe that the hon. Member, if he desires to debate the answer given by the Chancellor of the Exchequer, will have a proper opportunity of doing so on the Motion for going into Committtee of Supply, which is appointed on the Orders to-night.

MR. E. JENKINS (whose rising was met with marks of impatience) said: I rise to say, Sir, that if this question—["Oh, oh!"]—perhaps you will hear me? If it were possible to raise this question upon going into Committee of Supply, I would be perfectly willing to do so; but as far as I see the opportunity would not be very great, because there are so many Notices on the Paper already. As far as I understand, it would not be possible to raise this question on going into Committee of Supply under a month. But it is one that if it is to be raised at all it must be raised at once. In a few moments I shall be able, if the House will let me, to show very good reasons why at least I ask that the answer of the Chancellor of the Exchequer should be discussed at once. [*Cries of* "Order, order!" *and* "Withdraw!"] I am strictly within my right. I am sure that hon. Gentlemen are only doing an injustice to the cause they wish to serve in endeavouring to prevent me from extracting from the Ministerial Bench some explanation of the grounds upon which Her Majesty's Government have declined to take any action in regard to this matter. [*Cries of* "Order!" *and* "Withdraw!"] I shall very briefly review the circumstances under which the disaster of Isandula occurred. ["Oh, oh!" "Order!"] If I am obliged to raise the question in a somewhat unusual form, I believe it will be understood by the House and the country that it is owing to no fault of mine. I will endeavour to put my observations in as few words as possible so as to save the time of the House.

COLONEL MURE rose to Order. He wished to ask whether, after the intimation of Mr. Speaker, it was respectful to the House that the hon. Gentleman should persevere?

MR. E. JENKINS (whose remarks were throughout broken by continued cries and interruption) was understood to say: I am not aware that the hon. and gallant Member has any position in relation to the House or in relation to me, which entitles him to give me a lesson in gentlemanliness or self-respect. ["Oh!"] I consider myself most unfairly treated by hon. Members opposite, who will not give me an opportunity of stating the ground upon which I wish to introduce this subject. Now, Sir, I wish to say in the first place, in regard to this question, that when any General suffers such a defeat as was suffered by General Lord Chelmsford at Isandula, there is a *primâ facie* case of incompetency against him; and it lies with him to demonstrate to the country and the military authorities that the defeat in question was not owing to any want either of ability or care on his part. ["Oh!" *and* "Hear, hear!"] The House is fortunately enabled to judge of the propriety of his conduct by his own despatches describing the operations which preceded the disaster. ["Order!" *and* "Withdraw!"] Hon. Members opposite have an opportunity of withdrawing, if they think fit; but I intend to remain until I have stated my case. ["Oh!"] I do not propose to enter into any criticisms of the general strategy of Lord Chelmsford. That is not in my programme. ["Oh!"] Let it be clearly understood that all I am asking for to-night is an explanation from the Government. We have waited for Lord Chelmsford's defence, and all the information that has been given is a childish despatch, in which he describes the course of operations which preceded and followed the disaster at Isandula. Let it be clearly understood that I am not making any attack upon Lord Chelmsford—I am only expressing a very common opinion on the part of military men, and others non-military, in saying that some explanation is required from the Government to justify their continuing in command a man who seems to have exhibited a great want of discretion, if not of military misconduct and incapacity. ["Oh!"] There are only two heads under which the conduct of Lord Chelmsford can be considered—first of all, there is his conduct in regard to the invasion of Zululand—and in connection with this part of the subject, I wish to say that I have no desire to forestall the discussion which is to take place on the Motion of the hon. Baronet the Member for Chelsea. ["Order!"]

Sir JOHN HAY: I rise to Order. I wish to ask whether, after the intimation given to the hon. Member for Birmingham by the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for the Colonies, that it will be convenient to discuss the Zulu question whenever the Motion may be brought forward, it is not out of Order to discuss that question now? I must also appeal to the hon. Gentleman himself whether it is right so to attack an absent man without Notice?

Mr. E. JENKINS: I also rise to Order—["Order!"]

Mr. SPEAKER: In answer to the Question of the right hon. and gallant Baronet, I have to repeat that no doubt it would be more convenient to discuss the question which the hon. Member for Dundee desires to bring under the notice of the House when the Motion referring to the affairs in Zululand is brought forward. At the same time, if the hon. Member thinks it right to proceed after the observations I have addressed to him, I am bound to say he is within his right, though I must again say it is most inconvenient.

Mr. E. JENKINS, (whose rising was again met with marks of impatience): I shall endeavour, Sir, if the House will listen to me, to show my reasons for wishing to bring this discussion on immediately. I think Lord Chelmsford's conduct requires explanation on two points at least. In the first place, we have a right to ask—Why should Lord Chelmsford, when he was in supreme command of the Forces, have acceded to the demand of Sir Bartle Frere to commence an invasion of Zululand, when in a previous despatch he had expressly stated that he had troops sufficient only to defend the Colony. [*Cries of* "Order!" *and* "Withdraw!"] The subject has been discussed, and not without some bitterness, in the country, and it is almost the universal opinion that the conduct of Lord Chelmsford shows great military incapacity. ["Oh!"] I think, therefore, we are entitled, at the very least, to know why the Government are determined to support him by continuing him in his command, and sending him competent subordinate officers to enable him to retrieve one of the most deplorable and disgraceful disasters that ever happened to the British Army. [*Continued interruption.*]

Mr. BIGGAR: I rise to Order. I wish to ask whether, after Mr. Speaker has ruled that the hon. Member for Dundee is within his right, it was in Order for hon. Gentlemen opposite to keep up continuous cries of "Divide, divide!" while the hon. Member is speaking?

Mr. SPEAKER: If the Rules of the House allow an hon. Member to explain his reasons for putting a Question to the Government, any interruption which interferes with that explanation is out of Order.

Mr. E. JENKINS: There seems to be a misunderstanding on the part of many hon. Members. I think I will be able to show, if they will listen to me, that my proposal is not so unreasonable as they think. A very strong feeling exists throughout the country in regard to the disaster at Isandula, and the continuance of Lord Chelmsford in command of the Forces in South Africa; and, in my opinion, there are very good grounds for that feeling. Now, possibly the Government have good grounds for the trust they put in his Lordship, and all I ask is—Whether they are prepared to give some explanation of the grounds on which he is to be continued in his command, in order that the public feeling and excitement may be allayed? [*Interruption.*] Mr. Speaker, the hon. Member for Hastings (Sir Ughtred Kay-Shuttleworth) is interrupting.

Mr. SPEAKER: Does the hon. Member conclude with a Motion?

Mr. E. JENKINS: I simply say I am being interrupted by the hon. Member for Hastings. [*Cries of* "Spoke!" *and* "Go on!"] (The hon. Member, taking up the Parliamentary Paper containing the despatches relating to Zululand, proceeded to criticize the proceedings of the civil and military authorities before the commencement of military operations. The hon. Member also proceeded to criticize the movements of the columns before and after the defeat at Isandula, as described in Lord Chelmsford's "childish" despatch.)

MR. J. COWEN: Sir, I rise to Order. I would like to ask you, Mr. Speaker, if it is competent, on a Motion simply for the adjournment of the House, to discuss a question the merits of which have already been anticipated by a Notice of Motion now standing on the Notice Paper of the House? The hon. Member for Chelsea (Sir Charles W. Dilke) raises the Zulu War question by his Motion; and is the hon. Member for Dundee, under cover of the Motion for adjournment, to be allowed to anticipate the discussion?

MR. SPEAKER: The remarks of the hon. Member for Dundee did not reach me; but if the hon. Member who rose to Order is correct in his statement that the hon. Member for Dundee is discussing the policy of the Zulu War, he is clearly out of Order, as Notice has been given of a Motion on the subject.

MR. E. JENKINS denied that he was discussing the question of the policy of that war. (The hon. Member then proceeded with his criticism of the military operations, referring especially to the conduct of Lord Chelmsford in dividing his force, leaving one part in an unintrenched camp, while he proceeded in two columns into the interior of the enemy's country, without establishing a communication with the force left in the camp, the result being the capture of the camp with all its stores, and the destruction of the force left in charge; arguing, as was understood, that a General who had so mismanaged a single expedition was not fit to be left in the supreme management of a company; but the hon. Member's reading and comments were received with such continued cries of impatience and disapprobation that no consistent report is possible.) At length—

MR. BIGGAR: I rise to Order. There is one hon. Member who more persistently than any other interrupts the hon. Member for Dundee; and I therefore beg to name the hon. Baronet the Member for Scarborough (Sir Charles Legard).

MR. SPEAKER: All interruptions are, no doubt, out of Order, not excepting those of the hon. Member for Cavan (Mr. Biggar).

MR. BIGGAR: My allegation, upon which I ask that the name of the hon. Member for Scarborough be taken down, is that the hon. Baronet is continuously and persistently interrupting the hon. Member for Dundee. I beg to move that the hon. Baronet's name be taken down.

MR. SPEAKER: All interruptions interfering with the hon. Member in possession of the House are out of Order. I call upon the hon. Member for Dundee to proceed.

MR. E. JENKINS: I wish to ask whether, in the face of what has occurred, the Government will continue Lord Chelmsford in command or not? It is not an unreasonable Question; it is one the country is asking, and will ask; and it ought to be asked in the House of Commons, and the House will require it to be answered. I desire to have an answer, in spite of the interested protests of hon. Members on the other side. ["Order, order!"]

COLONEL MURE rose to Order. The hon. Member for Dundee has accused hon. Members of having interested motives. I ask you, Sir, whether it is in Order to attribute to hon. Members that they are actuated by interested motives?

MR. E. JENKINS: It is only right, before the Question is answered, that those hon. Members who could not hear me distinctly on account of the interruptions, should know what were the exact words I used. I spoke of the "protests" of hon. Members on the other side; but I did not describe any particular kind of interest; I did not say whether it was political or military; and I did not intend to impute an interest of an objectionable character. But these endeavours to burk discussion, however slight, upon this question, will only convince the country of the rotten state of things at the Horse Guards. How is it that this noble Lord is maintained in the command after these specimens of incapacity? It is time someone should rise in his place in the House to point out that the Horse Guards is a centre of intrigue, where incompetence is shielded by Court influence or by favour with the Royal Person at the head of it. ["Order, order!"]

MR. BERESFORD HOPE asked whether the expressions just made use of—"Court influence" and "favour with a Royal Personage at the head of the Horse Guards"—were in Order?

MR. SPEAKER: The words said to have been used by the hon. Member for Dundee did not reach me.

Mr. E. JENKINS: I am perfectly ready to repeat them for the benefit of the hon. Member (Mr. Beresford Hope) if he desires it.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. Member must address himself to the Chair.

Mr. E. JENKINS: I thought I was addressing myself to the Chair, and I am sorry the noise made by hon. Members prevented the Chair from hearing what I said. I was saying that this is a case which undoubtedly will give rise to the notion that there are unfair influences at work for the purpose of maintaining the noble Lord who has distinguished himself in incapacity in his responsible position. I say that on the Papers before us a *primâ facie* case of incapacity is made out; and, at all events, the Government might say whether they had any grounds for entertaining a contrary opinion. This House cannot exercise any influence upon the dispensing of patronage at the Horse Guards, nor upon the arrangements of the Army; but at least this House, which votes the money for the maintenance of the Army, is entitled to ask upon what grounds Her Majesty's Ministers are able to defend an officer who is responsible for a deplorable disaster? I will conclude by moving the adjournment of the House.

Mr. SPEAKER: Does any hon. Member second the Motion?

Sir ROBERT PEEL: Sir, I shall second it. I am sorry for the interruptions the hon. Member for Dundee has received at the hands of the House, and more particularly so for the sake of the Government, supporters of whom have persistently interrupted the hon. Member—supporters of whom I have always hitherto accounted myself one, and a very strenuous supporter too. I am sorry they should not have allowed the hon. Member—who was perfectly in Order—to state the case he wished to submit to the House. I am bound to say I agree very strongly—not in the remarks he made, for I was hardly able to catch them—but I do concur with the hon. Member in this—that the answers which we receive from the Government upon this most grave and serious question cannot be satisfactory to the House or the country. I had a seat in this House so long ago as the commencement of the Crimean War, and I well recollect the interruptions which then pursued the right hon. and learned Member for Sheffield (Mr. Roebuck) and the right hon. Gentleman who is now Her Majesty's Ambassador at Constantinople (Sir Henry Layard) for the grave inconvenience they occasioned the Government by the remarks they persistently made—they and many others in common with them—against the policy of the Government. They charged the Government of that time with incompetence abroad and incompetence at home. I do not wish to make a similar charge against the Government now; but I remember how the two hon. Members I have named were treated then. They moved for a Committee of Inquiry, and they were told they did so out of vanity, out of malice, out of credulity. We have not moved for a Committee of Inquiry—yet; but I do not say that if the House of Commons is not to have, and soon, an opportunity of discussing this most serious question of the South African Colonies and the recent disaster, we may be obliged to force it on the Government. The replies to-night from the Government were, in my opinion, most unsatisfactory. The first Question put by the hon. and learned Member for Louth (Mr. Sullivan) was whether some communication could not be opened with the King of Zululand; and the reply of the Colonial Secretary was, No, that such a course was inconvenient; and there was every reason why, with a view to the safety of the whole population, the military disaster which had occurred should be avenged—["Oh!"]—should be avenged. [Hon. Members: Retrieved.] Retrieved; let it be so. Is it a reason why you should make war on a savage nation that by the incapacity, and nothing else, of the Commander-in-Chief—["No, no!"]—by the incapacity—["No, no!"]—by the want of strategy, then, of the Commander-in-Chief these brave savages—for they are brave—have been victorious? I wish to press upon the Government that we ought no longer to delay discussing this question. There has been a Motion on the Paper night after night by my Friend the hon. Baronet the Member for Chelsea (Sir Charles W. Dilke). We are now told that more Papers are on the way. More Papers on the way! Have we not Papers enough already? There never was a Government so profuse in the distribution of vast quantities of Papers on every subject for the information of the House. Have not we Papers enough now? Do not we know the policy of the Government? Do not we know the policy of Sir Bartle Frere? Do not we know—["Order, order!"]

Mr. SPEAKER: The right hon. Baronet is clearly out of Order; he is now discussing the policy of the Government in the Zulu War. That question is embraced in a Notice of Motion of the hon. Baronet the Member for Chelsea, and any discussion of that question is clearly premature and out of Order.

Sir ROBERT PEEL: I bow respectfully to your decision, Sir. I was not entering into the policy of the Government. I say we ought to discuss the policy of the Government, because really the state of affairs at the Cape is very grave. A vast expenditure of blood and money has been incurred. ["Order!"] I believe I am perfectly in Order in saying that.

Mr. DALRYMPLE: I rise to Order. I ask whether the very sentence the right hon. Baronet is now uttering has not reference to the question raised by the Motion of the hon. Baronet the Member for Chelsea?

Mr. SPEAKER: The right hon. Gentleman has scarcely concluded his sentence; but he certainly did appear to me to be again trenching upon Order.

Sir ROBERT PEEL: Then I will resume my seat. But I appeal to every man in this House whether we ought not to have an opportunity of discussing this question. I feel convinced that I do but interpret the feeling which very generally prevails out-of-doors when I say that the House of Commons cannot too early or too urgently impress upon the Government the necessity of stating to the House and the country what are the real issues at stake in this matter.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That this House do now adjourn."—(*Mr. Edward Jenkins.*)

Mr. CHAPLIN: Sir, the right hon. Baronet who has just spoken has expressed his deep regret that the observations of the hon. Member for Dundee should have been so interrupted. I venture also to express my regret that, for his own sake, and the sake of his Parliamentary reputation, the right hon. Baronet should have accepted him for his leader, and should have become the humble follower of the hon. Member for Dundee. The right hon. Baronet has said that the hon. Member for Dundee was strictly in Order. Yes, Sir, he was in Order; he was within his right—and you, Sir, ruled that he was—but I venture to think that, notwithstanding, he simply abused the Privileges of the House, and that, too, in a manner which, if frequently repeated, will render it absolutely impossible for the Business of the House to be conducted at all. The hon. Member for Dundee has excused himself on the ground of the great urgency of the question. I venture to say that, perhaps, on occasions of this kind, it is not even for the hon. Member for Dundee to decide alone upon the question of urgency. When I look to the front Opposition Bench, I see upon it the noble Lord the Leader of the Opposition —I see upon it the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Birmingham, who has grown old and grey in the service of his country. I see upon it the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Bradford (Mr. W. E. Forster) and other Gentlemen, whose opinions are valued, and whose reputations are great throughout the length and breadth of England. I must say that, considering their attitude, the hon. Member for Dundee has trespassed too much upon the attention of the House in interrupting Public Business in the manner he has done. I do not wish to pursue this subject for one moment further; but in sitting down I wish to express my regret at one thing above all others, and that is, Sir, that your repeated admonitions and repeated advice, and the manner in which you have pointed out the gross inconvenience that would result from the course that the hon. Member for Dundee has taken, were so deliberately disregarded as they have been.

Colonel MURE: Sir, I wish to express my deep regret, on public grounds, that the hon. Member for Dundee has brought this matter forward. When the sad news of the disaster at Isandula reached this country, I was much struck by the expression of opinion in the foreign papers—on the calm and dignified manner in which this country and this House had received the sad news, and the evident determination there was to deal fairly with those whose conduct would naturally be the subject of criticism. If we are to accept the course which has been indicated to us by the hon. Member for Dundee, we should, I fear, be in danger of losing that character for fairness and moderation which we have gained. I would only ask the House a single question—and I would urge the House not to allow itself to be dragged further into a discussion of the military conduct of Lord Chelmsford to-day—I would simply ask, whether, without any sufficient preparation, except a Question placed upon the Paper, with no information of any sort or kind, excepting the barest statement, a discussion involving such grave consequences ought to take place in this House—whether, while a Court of Inquiry is sitting at Isandula, which will bring before us the whole of the facts—this House is justified, as an Assemblage of fair men, in taking into consideration the military capacity and conduct of Lord Chelmsford? I would like to point this out to the House—that, in the records of Parliament, there is not one single instance in which the character of a General Officer has been brought before this House, or the House of Lords, in consideration of the allegation that a disaster on any particular day was caused by his faulty dispositions or tactics. The disaster of Isandula we may justly call a military disaster; but it is not a disaster of a character which is usually brought before this House. Before Parliament, on various occasions, military mismanagement has been made the subject of deliberation. At the time of the Walcheren Expedition, the matter was brought before the House of Lords by Lord Porchester, and the Government of that day were turned out upon that question. Similarly, at the time of the operations in Portugal and Spain, which ended in the battle of Corunna, Lord Grey brought before the House the conduct of the Ministers and the Executive. Similarly, at the period to which the right hon. Baronet (Sir Robert Peel) has alluded, the conduct of the operations in the Crimea was brought before the House. But, on these occasions, not in one single instance did the House attempt to arraign the conduct of any individual General, owing to a reverse on any particular day. That duty it has always referred to the Executive. But now, what would be the result, if we were to accept the course indicated to us by the hon. Member for Dundee? We have wars continually in various parts of the world. [*Loud ironical cheers from the Opposition.*] General Officers are unhappily engaged in many parts of the world; is their conduct from time to time to be made the subject of discussion in this House, their character the victim of faction?

Mr. E. JENKINS: I rise for a moment to Order. I would ask the hon. Member what course the hon. Member for Dundee has suggested?

Colonel MURE: The hon. Member has suggested, not only that this day we should discuss, but he has begun to discuss himself, the character of Lord Chelmsford. But I was on the point of asking what the result would be, if the House were to undertake the duty of censuring the Generals engaged in the field? I will tell you. We should be practically descending to the practice of the worst period of the Reign of Terror in France. At that time the French were embarked upon a career of ambition and conquest. It was natural that at the commencement of their revolutionary career they should be very unfortunate; therefore, alarmed and irritated at their reverses, the Convention used to employ Delegates to attend on the Staff of their Generals, and to report home whether these officers were successful or not. If they were successful, the Generals received the thanks of the Convention; if not, they were guillotined. Now, I do not for one moment suppose that in these days we should adopt such severe measures as that; but remember this—If we adopted the course advised by the hon. Member for Dundee, we should, in principle, be following in their footsteps; we should be usurping the functions of the Executive without either the technical knowledge or the requisite quality for such a duty, and, in this particular case, the result, I feel sure, would be grave injury to the character of a distinguished man, and the erection of a precedent which would have most injurious effects on the character of this House and on the Public Service. I have expressed no opinion myself upon Lord Chelmsford. I have my opinion upon the conduct of the whole war, but that is not a matter which I am going to lay before the House. I trust the House will not allow itself to be dragged into a premature discussion upon this grave question.

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER: There is much in what has taken place which, I think, ought to be a subject of regret. I do not desire to enter into any unnecessary criticism of the course which the hon. Member for Dundee has thought it his duty to take. I am sure that he, as a Member of this House, can only have adopted that course under a sense of duty. At the same time, I gravely question the propriety of the decision at which he arrived. And I wish, Sir, to point out that it is not consistent either with the dignity of the House or with the due conduct of Public Business that such a Motion as that which the hon. Member has proposed on the present occasion should be resorted to, under such circumstances, for the purpose of irregularly bringing forward the debate which he has attempted to force on. Whatever might be the subject of debate, it must be inconvenient that it should be brought on in so sudden a manner, and without preparation; and when it has reference to a matter of such great gravity as that which the hon. Member has introduced to our notice, I think the objections to such a course as that which he has followed are doubly and trebly magnified. Whatever may have been the judgment of the hon. Gentleman in beginning to call the attention of the House to the subject, he ought to have perceived—and I wonder he did not perceive—that the sense of the House was decidedly against him. I think that under those circumstances it ought to have been the part of an hon. Member to have taken into consideration what was obviously the general feeling of the House; and I cannot acquit the hon. Member for Dundee of great indiscretion in having persisted and persevered in his Motion as he has done. With regard to the question which he has raised, I think the few observations which have been just made by the hon. and gallant Member for Renfrewshire (Colonel Mure) ought to commend themselves to our attention. There is no desire on the part of Her Majesty's Government to evade any share of the responsibility which they feel properly belongs to them in this matter. It is a very serious responsibility; it is a matter which is of the greatest importance to the interests of the country. The Government have given their most careful consideration to all that has passed, and to all the information that they have received; and in coming to the decision which I announced in answer to the Question of the hon. Member for Dundee, they have done so under a perfect consciousness that they were acting in a matter in which their responsibility was of the most serious character. They have decided, however, with confidence, and they will be prepared, at any proper time, to discuss the matter in any way it may be thought proper to raise it. But I hope that at the present moment we shall not be called upon to proceed with this discussion. It would be very irregular, and exceedingly inconvenient, and I trust that the House will now allow the matter to drop, fully conscious that we are aware of the gravity of the question and of the responsibility which devolves upon us.

The Marquess of HARTINGTON: I cannot help feeling, with the right hon. Gentleman opposite, that what has taken place this evening must be viewed with regret. It is very much to be regretted that the hon. Member for Dundee has brought forward this subject without Notice. But I must also express my doubt whether the House has consulted its own dignity in the persistent manner in which it sought to prevent the hon. Member for Dundee from being heard. The excuse which might have palliated that proceeding appears to be altogether wanting; for after the scene which we all witnessed during the time the hon. Member was speaking, the right hon. Baronet opposite (Sir Robert Peel) rose to address the House; and although he made some remarks quite as strong respecting the military character of Lord Chelmsford and of those who are responsible for the conduct of military affairs in South Africa, there was no attempt on the part of the House to interrupt the right hon. Gentleman in the same manner in which it had interrupted the hon. Member for Dundee. If we are to do justice on an occasion of this kind, and to exercise any sort of control over the proceedings of hon. Members, we should, at all events, act impartially. Both the hon. Member for Dundee and the right hon. Gentleman opposite appeared to be equally under a misapprehension as to the reason which caused the hostility of the House to the course which they took. The hon. Gentleman said that he was perfectly in Order. Well, no doubt that was so; but if I am not much mistaken, that which aroused the hostility of the House was this—that the hon. Member proceeded to make an attack upon the military conduct and procedure of Lord Chelmsford without Notice, and without having given to those who are responsible any opportunity of knowing that such an attack would be made. I am not going to deny that this may be a question of very great urgency, or that it may not be right in some exceptional cases to bring forward a matter of this character without Notice, even at the cost of some inconvenience. But the hon. Member has never made any attempt to obtain a discussion of this question; he has never attempted to make a Motion in reference to it on going into Committee of Supply; neither has he ever indicated any intention of seriously calling in question the military conduct of Lord Chelmsford. I entirely agree with my hon. and gallant Friend behind me (Colonel Mure) as to the responsibility which attaches to the Government in this matter, and I cannot conceive anything more disastrous than that the House of Commons should attempt in any way to regulate the conduct of a campaign, for which it does not possess, and does not pretend to possess, the necessary military knowledge. It may be necessary for the House at some time or other to discuss the management of the campaign; but it must hold the Government, and the Government alone, responsible for what has taken place — and I cannot conceive any heavier responsibility than that which now rests upon the Government in reference to this subject. They have to consider, on the one hand, that if they judge by results, that if they censure and condemn an officer without sufficient inquiry and without sufficient knowledge, they may do an act of grave injustice to a gallant and an honourable man, and one which may weaken the sense of responsibility, and the spirit of willingness to undertake responsibilities which are so necessary in an officer. On the other hand, they have to consider that, by retaining in his position of command a man undoubtedly gallant and brave, but who, in the opinion of some, has not shown sufficient military capacity, they may possibly be endangering the success of the campaign, the safety of the troops, and even of the Colony itself. That is the responsibility which rests upon the Government; and I am utterly opposed, whether in a regular or in an irregular manner, to relieve them one atom from that responsibility. As we have not at hand the means of giving them advice, anything that we can do will merely tend to weaken their sense of responsibility. I entirely agree with the right hon. Gentleman opposite (Sir Robert Peel) that this matter of the policy of the Government with regard to South Africa is one that ought to be discussed as soon as possible. I conceive that it was with that object that the hon. Member for Birmingham (Mr. Chamberlain) put his Question to the Government to-night, and the answer which he has received from the Government places the matter in a very different position from that which it has hitherto occupied; and I have no doubt that the hon. Baronet the Member for Chelsea, who has a Motion on the Paper on the subject, will lose no time in informing the House of his intention in reference to it.

Mr. E. JENKINS, in asking leave to withdraw his Motion, explained that his object in making it was not so much to raise a debate as to ascertain from Her Majesty's Government the motives which had induced them to retain Lord Chelmsford in his command.

Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

UNIVERSITY EDUCATION (IRELAND).

QUESTION.

Mr. CALLAN asked Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Whether the negotiations between His Excellency the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland and members of the Irish Catholic Hierarchy, with reference to the question of University Education in Ireland, were initiated at the suggestion, or by the direction, or were carried on with the knowledge and sanction of Her Majesty's Government, or of any Member of the Cabinet, or of the Right Honourable the Chief Secretary for Ireland; whether any undertaking was given or promise held out, by His Excellency the Lord Lieutenant, to any member of the Irish Catholic Hierarchy or any other person, that a Bill dealing with the subject of University Education in Ireland would be introduced by Her Majesty's Government this Session; and, whether any Memorandum in reference thereto or consequent thereon was furnished to the Lord Lieutenant at the suggestion of His Excellency, or in compliance with his request, by certain of the Irish Catholic Hierarchy; and, if so, whether Her Majesty's Government will have any objection to lay the Memorandum referred to and copy of Correspondence, or Memorandum of any communications on the subject, upon the Table of the House?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: Sir, I think that ever since I have been in Parliament the question of Irish University Education has from time to time obtained the attention of successive Governments, and, no doubt, there have been frequent communications on the subject between the Irish Government and persons of all positions interested in the question. It is perfectly true that at the present time the Lord Lieutenant has given his attention to this question, and, no doubt, he has been in communication with many persons of all professions and creeds in Ireland in reference to it. I am not aware, however, that there has been anything in the nature of what the hon. Member calls "negotiations" between the Lord Lieutenant and any persons on the matter, and certainly no undertaking or promise has ever been given by Her Majesty's Government or by the Lord Lieutenant to any person that a Bill dealing with Irish University Education would be introduced by Her Majesty's Government this Session. I am not aware that any Memorandum on this subject has ever been furnished to the Lord Lieutenant at his suggestion, or in compliance with his request, and, therefore, it cannot be laid upon the Table of the House.

THE TREATY OF BERLIN—LORD SALISBURY'S DESPATCH OF JANUARY 26.

QUESTIONS.

LORD ROBERT MONTAGU asked Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Whether he will lay upon the Table without delay a Copy of the Despatch of Lord Salisbury to Lord A. Loftus, dated January 26, with any replies which may have been received; and, when that negotiation on the subject of fulfilling the provisions of the Berlin Treaty was concluded?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: I think I caught earlier in the evening that the noble Lord gave Notice that he proposes to call attention to this despatch, and to found a Motion upon it. If that be so, and he likes to move for this despatch, there is no objection to its production. At the same time, it is not particularly convenient to produce it without the further Correspondence; and it will not be possible to lay upon the Table any Correspondence that has passed between the Russian Government and Her Majesty's Government without the consent of the former. I confess I do not quite understand the noble Lord's second Question. I am informed that the provisions of the Berlin Treaty are in course of execution, and no doubt many communications have passed in reference to points connected with that Treaty; but no special negotiations, that I am aware of, have been entered into in reference to the fulfilment of the provisions.

LORD ROBERT MONTAGU: Lord Salisbury has enumerated a number of schemes which have been set on foot for creating an explosion in Eastern Roumelia directly after the Russians have retired. What I want to know is whether he has succeeded in inducing the Russian Government to abandon any of those schemes?

THE MARQUESS OF HARTINGTON: I wish to know whether the assent of Her Majesty's Government was given to the Russian Government for the publication of the despatch in question?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: I have no knowledge how the despatch was published. I was not aware it was published at all. I have no knowledge about it.

LICENSING LAWS AMENDMENT BILL.

QUESTION.

MR. MUNDELLA asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, If he is prepared to support the Licensing Laws Amendment Bill now before the House?

MR. ASSHETON CROSS: I am not satisfied that I should be in Order in answering this Question. It would, in any case, be most inconvenient to do so; and if the hon. Member will allow me I shall reserve my remarks until the subject is brought forward for discussion.

AFGHANISTAN—THE WAR—ADDRESS OF GENERAL ROBERTS.—QUESTION.

Mr. O'REILLY asked Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Whether the Government intend to carry out the declaration of Major General Roberts "That neither Shere Ali Khan, nor any other Amir of Kabul, will ever again be permitted to reign over Kuram," and that the Durani is exchanged for the British Government?

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER: The best answer I can give to the hon. Member is to call attention to the statement authoritatively made by my noble Friend the Secretary of State for India in "another place" in reply to a similar Question. Lord Cranbrook said—

> "I am not aware that any authority was given to General Roberts to make that particular speech; but no doubt authority was given to him, as it is to all Generals in such cases, that they should endeavour to withdraw the allegiance of tribes in the districts through which they have to advance; and in order to detach those tribes it is necessary to give them an assurance that they would not again fall under the old dominion. No doubt that was the object General Roberts had in view when making the speech. It was an assurance to those tribes that they would not be again brought under the old dominion of the Ruler from whom he had detached them. And, without saying what form of government may be adopted for that district, it was the intention of the Government that they should not return under the dominion of the Ameer."

EDUCATION (SCOTLAND) ACT, 1878—EXAMINATION OF HIGHER CLASS SCHOOLS.—QUESTION.

Mr. LYON PLAYFAIR asked the Vice President of the Committee of Council on Education, Whether the Education Department intend to carry out the 20th section of "The Education (Scotland) Act, 1878," by which the Scotch Education Department is empowered to make provision for the examination of higher class public schools?

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: The Scotch Education Department were prepared to undertake the examination of higher class public schools in those cases where the school boards having the management of such schools desired that they should do so. They found, to their regret, that the Treasury, in view of the recent rapid growth of the Education Votes for the United Kingdom, were unwilling to allow them to take a Vote for the purpose of meeting charges which, under the Act of 1872, were thrown upon the local rates. We have, therefore, asked the school boards whether they will defray the cost of the examination from the rates? One or two boards have expressed their willingness to do so, and we will endeavour to meet the wishes of those boards.

SOUTH AFRICA—TELEGRAPHIC DESPATCHES.—QUESTION.

Mr. OTWAY asked the Secretary of State for the Colonies, Whether his attention has been drawn to the publication by "The Daily Telegraph," on Tuesday the 11th instant, of a General Order by Lord Chelmsford, and of the Official Despatch by Lieutenant Chard, relating to the successful defence at Rorke's Drift under Lieutenants Chard and Bromhead; whether Her Majesty's Government have received that General Order and Despatch; and, if not, when they expect to receive it; and, whether pending the War in South Africa Her Majesty's Government will take those steps at Madeira and St. Vincent by which they can place themselves on a par with a portion of the daily press in obtaining reliable information from the seat of war? I would like to add that *The Daily Telegraph*, in the same publication, gave the list of killed and wounded.

Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH: Both the General Order and the Official Despatch, being from the General in command of the Forces, would naturally be forwarded to my right hon. and gallant Friend the Secretary of State for War and not to me. I understand from my right hon. and gallant Friend that he has not yet received them; but I apprehend they will arrive by the mail now due. It may be taken for granted that they were published officially in one of the Cape papers issued before the date on which the mail left Cape Town, and that the correspondent of *The Daily Telegraph* telegraphed them from Madeira on the arrival of the steamer there. The despatch, no doubt, is one of high interest; but it is not one of a character demanding any immediate action on the part of Her Majesty's Government, or urging upon them any pressing requirements from the General commanding in South Africa. Therefore, so far as my opinion goes, Lord Chelmsford is not open to blame for not having given instructions for it to be telegraphed from Madeira. I may say that steps have already been taken for securing that any telegram sent by the official authorities in South Africa shall be at once forwarded from St. Vincent or Madeira here. I do not think that the Government have always received such full telegraphic information as might have been desired; and a fortnight ago I requested Sir Bartle Frere to supply us in that way with any news of interest. I trust, therefore, that the telegrams received in future by the Government will be rather more full than they have hitherto been. With reference to the last matter alluded to by the hon. Member, I would say that there is great danger in publishing telegrams containing the names of persons killed and wounded in action. A telegram reached me the other day from the Lieutenant Governor of Natal, and I published it in the ordinary way. A few days afterwards I found that, owing to the error of the telegraph clerk, some of the names had been mis-spelt, and that others were entirely wrong; so that I think, on the whole, it is much better to wait for the Official Despatch.

SOUTH AFRICA — THE ZULU WAR — MANUFACTURE OF ARMS.

QUESTION.

MR. RITCHIE asked Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Whether the attention of the Government has been called to a paragraph in a newspaper to the effect that a firm in Whitechapel is manufacturing arms for shipment to the Zulus; and whether they are in possession of any information on the subject?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: The attention of the Government has been drawn to this statement, and inquiries are being made. I do not think it would be advantageous to make any further statement on the subject at present.

SOUTH AFRICA — THE ZULU WAR — THE REINFORCEMENTS — COALING OF TRANSPORTS.—QUESTION.

In reply to Mr. BOORD,

MR. A. F. EGERTON said, the report in *The Times* of his answer to the hon. Member for Sunderland (Mr. Gourley), in regard to the coaling of the transports, was not entirely accurate. It was given with greater accuracy in other papers. He did not say there were only 1,000 tons of coal at St. Vincent; but he did say that there were facilities for coaling vessels at the rate of 1,000 tons a-day. The case was briefly this—The Government had sent to St. Vincent some 7,500 tons to their own contractors, and besides that there was a supply in private hands and other firms of about 10,000 tons, so that there was no question of coal falling short at St. Vincent. Perhaps the House would like to hear the latest intelligence with regard to the sailing of the transports. He had just had placed in his hands a telegram which reached the Admiralty at 5 o'clock in the afternoon of that day, and which was despatched that morning. It was as follows:—

> "The *Manora* left at 7.20 on the 3rd, and took 610 tons; the *Paris* at 1 o'clock a.m. on the 5th, taking 856 tons; the *Florence*, 9 p.m. on the 6th, taking 91 tons; the *Margaret*, 1 a.m. 7th, taking 388 tons; *Olympus*, 2 a.m., 7th, taking 366 tons; *Venice*, 3.50 p.m., 7th, taking 295 tons; *China*, 1 a.m., 9th, with 441 tons; *Palmyra*, 2.30 p.m., 9th, 188 tons; *Russia*, 11.15 p.m., 11th, 820 tons; *England*, noon, 12th, with 648 tons; *Clyde*, 2 a.m., 13th, no coals; *France*, taking 800 tons, sails this evening; *Spain* and *Egypt*, with 800 tons each, will sail on Sunday morning. Strong north-east winds have prevailed from the 2nd to the 14th."

That he had no doubt was the cause, to a considerable extent, of the delay which had taken place.

SOUTH AFRICA — EXPORT OF MUNITIONS OF WAR FOR MOZAMBIQUE.

OBSERVATIONS.

MR. BOURKE: It will be in the recollection of the House that yesterday, in answer to a Question from the hon. Member for the Tower Hamlets (Mr. Ritchie), I stated that certain arms had been exported from Cardiff last week—a number of muskets, and, I think, 560 lbs. of gunpowder—and that these articles had been shipped by two firms—Messrs. James Hutton, of Dale Street, Manchester, and Messrs. Hutton, of the Temple, Liverpool. Mr. James Hutton called upon me this morning, and has informed me that the only goods from his firm which were shipped in the *Argus* consisted of 180 bales of Manchester cotton goods, and that he would communicate with the firm on whose account these goods were shipped and send their reply to Her Majesty's Government. Mr. James Hutton also informed me that Messrs. Hutton and Co., of Liverpool, in whose firm he had no interest, shipped some flint-lock muskets and African trade powder by the *Argus* on account of a French house trading at Mozambique. I have just at this moment had a telegram from Mr. A. Hutton, of Liverpool, and I ought, perhaps, in justice to them, to be allowed to read their explanation. The telegram is as follows:—

> "Will you kindly explain in the House to-night on my behalf that the 831 guns shipped by me were old flint guns, costing under 6*s.* each; that the gunpowder was ordinary African trade powder, costing under 30*s.* per barrel, whereas military powder is worth 100*s.* per barrel; and that for many years I have made four or five similar shipments annually to the same latitude, which is fully 1,000 miles from Zulu territory? I have had this order since the 23rd of November, and I emphatically deny that it is intended for that country. The voyage there will occupy four months."

In justice to these two firms I have thought it necessary to make this explanation.

MR. MAC IVER said, that Messrs. Hutton were well-known and respected Liverpool merchants, who traded regularly with Africa, and that there was nothing exceptional in the shipments to which allusion had been made. They were not intended for the enemies of our country, nor likely to reach the Zulus; but such shipments had long been a matter of regular trade and part of Messrs. Hutton's general business with the coast of Africa.

SOUTH AFRICA—THE ZULU WAR—SIR CHARLES W. DILKE'S MOTION.

QUESTION.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE asked Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Whether he is prepared to state what facilities he will give for bringing before the House the subject of the Zulu War?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: I shall be fully prepared to give a Government night for that purpose; but we are rather in a difficulty with regard to our Business, the Supplementary Estimates and other Business not being in a forward state; but I should be glad to agree with the hon. Baronet as to a day to be given. I could not undertake to give him next Monday, and I do not whether Thursday would be convenient, or if the hon. Baronet would think Thursday week too late; but I will communicate with him in the course of the evening.

PRIVATE BILLS—CANVASSING OF MEMBERS.—OBSERVATIONS.

MR. RAIKES: Mr. Speaker, I wish to address a Question to you upon a matter which I do not desire to place so high as a Question of Privilege, but which appears to me to affect the character and authority of this House. A Circular reached me in the course of yesterday evening—as I believe it did most of the other Members of the House—with reference to a question which was debated in this House at the time of Private Business yesterday. Members generally will be familiar with the practice, which has been frequently deprecated, of addressing Circulars to Members, endeavouring to bias their opinions with regard to Private Bills before the House of Commons; and I should not have ventured, Sir, to trouble you, or to ask you for an opinion on a subject of that kind—where, I believe, the practice of Parliament, as expressed by very high authority, is clearly understood; but the Circular to which I refer appears to me to go further; and I venture, therefore, to ask you to favour the House with your opinion upon it. The Circular is headed, "Thames River Prevention of Floods—Nomination of six Members by the House;" and it says—

> "Your attendance in support of Colonel Beresford's Motion at a quarter to 4 on Thursday, March 13th, is most respectfully and earnestly requested. Colonel Beresford's Motion is to omit the name of Sir J. M'Garel-Hogg as one of the six Members, and to substitute the name of Mr. Watney in lieu thereof."

That Circular is signed "Thomas E. Jones, clerk to the Fulham District Board of Works," and "J. E. Bradfield, Parliamentary Agent." Sir, I venture, in putting this Question to you, to invite your opinion as to whether the nomination of Members to serve on Select Committees is not one of the most delicate and most eminently judicial functions which this House is called upon to perform; and, whether, in your opinion, attempts to bespeak the support of Members in regard to Private

Bills which may be submitted to the House is not disrespectful to the House, and calculated, if such a practice comes to be assented to, seriously to impair the authority of this House as a tribunal with regard to Private Business?

Mr. SPEAKER: The practice of canvassing Members to support or oppose Private Bills has often been the subject of complaint in this House. In the present case the hon. Gentleman the Chairman of Ways and Means has brought under the notice of the House the fact that the parties have gone further, and commented, in connection with the proposed constitution of the Committee, on the names of particular Members selected to serve upon it. Such a practice is undoubtedly very objectionable, and should be discountenanced by the general reprehension of the House. But, except in cases in which false or misleading statements are made, or expressions are used which are injurious to Members, the House will scarcely think it necessary to take any measures against the parties referred to.

SOUTH AFRICA—THE ZULU WAR—THE DEFEAT AT ISANDULA — GENERAL LORD CHELMSFORD. — NOTICE OF QUESTION.

Mr. RYLANDS: I wish to give Notice that on Monday next I will ask the Chancellor of the Exchequer, Whether, on February the 24th, General Ponsonby, by direction of Her Majesty the Queen, sent a message to the Secretary of State for War, desiring him to telegraph to Lord Chelmsford that She sympathized with him most sincerely in regard to the painful loss sustained by the British arms, but that She placed entire confidence in him and the troops to maintain the honour and good name of the British Army; and, whether that message from Her Majesty was communicated to Lord Chelmsford by the Secretary of State for War?

Colonel STANLEY: I will answer that Question at once, with your permission, Sir. As to the terms, I have no reason to suppose that the hon. Member for Burnley has mis-stated them in any way. That message was forwarded to me by General Ponsonby from Her Majesty. That message I conceived it to be perfectly consistent with my duty to forward to Lord Chelmsford; and, I venture to add, so far as our humble expression of opinion goes, that it was a very natural expression of sympathy under the distressing circumstances under which that General Officer commanded the troops at the Cape.

ORDERS OF THE DAY.

SUPPLY.—COMMITTEE.

Order for Committee read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair."

ARMY—THE SCIENTIFIC CORPS.

RESOLUTION.

Colonel ARBUTHNOT assured the House that he rose with great diffidence for the second time at so early a period of the Session to call attention to matters connected with military administration. His diffidence would have been even greater were it not for the success which had resulted from his former Motion, and if his previous experience had not convinced him that the kind treatment which he then received at the hands of the House would be extended to any Member who did not speak too frequently, who understood his subject, and was known to be thoroughly in earnest. While most emphatically disclaiming the desire only to benefit those corps referred to by the terms of his Motion, in one of which he had passed many years of his life, he wished still less to draw any invidious distinction between the various branches of the Army. In mentioning that he had never in his life been within the walls of the Royal Academy at Woolwich; that for three generations no near relation of his had served in the Ordnance corps, although many had with the Guards, Cavalry and Infantry; and that he (Colonel Arbuthnot) had served in a Cavalry regiment, he only desired to show that in dealing with a subject relating to the Ordnance and Scientific branches of the Service, he was likely to be as disinterested as any Member of the House. He wished the House to believe that he approached the question altogether in the public interest and upon national grounds, and to understand that he blamed no Department, either Parliamentary or Executive, for a state of things attributable, in his opinion, entirely to natural causes, which had grown up by the force of circumstances, and for which no one was responsible. At the same time, he desired to say that if he did not succeed in making out a very strong or even unanswerable case, the failure would be his own, and not due to any insufficiency of argument at his disposal. With the permission of the House, he thought it well to read the terms of the Motion which he had the honour to submit to its consideration—namely—

> "That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, praying Her Majesty to be pleased to order the issue of a Royal Commission to inquire into and to report whether any and what alterations of the Military system now in force are desirable, as regards the pay, promotion, employment, and conditions of service and retirement of the officers of the Ordnance corps."

It would be recollected that until the Crimean War, and up to the year 1854, the organization of the Army differed totally from that of the present time. The Ordnance corps were then entirely apart from the rest of the Army, and formed something between a mechanical and semi-official Department. They were specially represented in Parliament, and were not under the Commander-in-Chief, but had a Master General and a Clerk to the Board, who was a Member of the Government. That last Clerk of the Ordnance was Colonel Boldero, who, though he commenced life as an Engineer, was, during his career, transferred to the Line, a fact that, in itself, was sufficient to show that the line of demarcation between the Scientific corps and the other branches of the Army was more strongly defined now that the whole of the Army was under the control of the Horse Guards, than at the period to which he referred. At that time the Ordnance corps enjoyed great advantages, financial and otherwise, both in England and the Colonies, which, however, were so numerous, intricate, and uninteresting, that he would not dwell upon them, but refer any hon. Members who desired further information upon that subject to the history of the Royal Artillery by Major Duncan. Many of those advantages disappeared with the abolition of the Board of Ordnance, although he was of opinion that a contrary impression existed, and that the country had never realized the change which had taken place. It might be supposed that when the Board of Ordnance was suppressed, and after the Scientific corps came under the Horse Guards, they would share all the advantages and disadvantages alike, common to the other branches of the Service. The case, however, was unavoidably otherwise, and he did not complain of that for one moment. The fact was, that long after the abolition of the Board they still retained special advantages, sufficient to compensate for the disadvantages under which they laboured, and which, at all events, offered sufficient inducements for parents and guardians to send young men into the corps. But in 1871, it would be remembered that an entire change took place. The Army Purchase system was abolished, and the whole Army was placed prospectively on the same footing as regarded entrance and subsequent commissions. That being the case, he contended that the same advantages and disadvantages should apply to all branches of the Service alike, and that was also the opinion of the Royal Commission that sat to inquire into the matter of promotion and retirement, the Report of which stated, at page 78, that—

> "There is no difficulty in saying that the different arms of the Service should be treated with impartiality, and that no boon or benefit should be accorded to the officers of one which, under similar circumstances, is withheld from the other, and that each arm or branch of the Service should, as far as practicable, have an equal share of the honours, distinctions, emoluments and other advantages is also a proposition not likely to be denied."

The special advantages and disadvantages he had referred to as existing before the abolition of Purchase in the other arms were as follows:—In the first place, the officers of Ordnance did not pay for their first or subsequent commissions; and though their promotion came tardily, they got their steps without paying for them, and, consequently, received *bonâ fide* pay, instead of indifferent interest for their money. Then there was the rank of full colonel, which carried with it high pay, and was a thing looked forward to by the officers of those corps;

but that rank had been abolished by the recommendation of the Royal Commission. He might remark, with regard to the construction of the Commission, that although it included an officer of the Indian Artillery, the interests of the English Army were not represented by any officer who was serving in England or the Colonies; and he added, upon good authority, that the Commissioners, when at the last moment they went into the question of the effects of their recommendations upon the non-purchase corps, did so in a most perfunctory manner, and without foreseeing what those effects would be. Another advantage enjoyed by those corps, about which he would afterwards have something more to say, was that they possessed a better retiring system. He was simply arguing this question with reference to the effect of the new Regulations upon the supply of candidates for the Ordnance corps, because he felt that one result only could ensue—namely, that when the new Rules in operation were understood, the corps would lose caste, and find themselves without a suitable supply of officers to command them — to guard against which in the future was his object in trespassing upon the time and attention of the House. He now came to the disadvantages under which the Corps laboured, and he ventured to say that these had been very much increased by the recent legislation for the abolition of Purchase, and by the action taken to carry out the recommendations of the Royal Commission on Promotion and Retirement. In the first place, the entrance examination was severer, and, therefore, the education was more costly. He did not say for one moment that more money was not spent upon the education of some Infantry officers than was spent on that of any officer who joined the Ordnance corps; but he still maintained that to obtain a commission in that Service it was necessary to spend more money, because a far higher standard of education had to be attained. The entrance examination was severer, and the course of instruction longer. He admitted that a little benefit was conferred by the reduction in the age of entrance at Woolwich; but, taking the average age of cadets, it would be seen that the Woolwich cadet obtained his commission at a later age than others, had spent more money in consequence upon his education, and was more heavily handicapped at the starting on the race. Passing on to the question of pay, he believed he should be able to show the House that in every rank except below that of captain the Engineers and Artillery received less pay and emolument than the Infantry of the Line. The only financial recommendation of the Commission was one that acted entirely to the disadvantage of those corps, and was to the effect that a saving in the effective pay of the Army should be made by the abolition of the rank of full colonel, which saving mulcted the Royal Artillery in the sum of £52,000, and the Royal Engineers in the sum of about £30,000, annually. By existing Regulations, lieutenant colonels of Royal Artillery and Royal Engineers were especially at a disadvantage. Only about two out of five drew command pay; while adjutants, though captains, only drew 1*s.* 8*d.*; while an Infantry adjutant, who was a subaltern, drew 2*s.* 6*d.* or 3*s.* He now came to the question of promotion. It was, of course, known that the Ordnance corps used to obtain their promotion free of expense, though it came tardily; but the Royal Commission appointed to inquire into the matter drew up statistics showing that if the Army had been left as Viscount Cardwell left it, without any scheme for promotion or retirement, the Ordnance corps would have been in advance of the rest of the Army as regards rapidity. Although the actuarial statements drawn up and published might be of authority or otherwise—for he did not place much reliance in such statements unless based upon very large figures — still they went to show that under the scheme recommended by the Commissioners, officers in the Ordnance corps would be from four to six years later in gaining each successive step on the ladder of promotion. He had now to ask the attention of the House to the most serious of all the causes which were at work to deter young men from joining the Ordnance corps, and that was the practical exclusion of the officers from the Staff. He found that with the exception of the two General Staff officers at Woolwich—Colonel Brackenbury at Cyprus, whose appointment he understood was about to cease, and who probably owed his selection to the personal influence of Sir Garnet Wolseley, and one other about to proceed to Natal as Deputy Assistant Adjutant General—there were no officers of Ordnance employed upon the General Staff. If any doubt existed as to the non-employment of those officers, who numbered about one-third of the whole body of officers in the Army, he would like to refer to a case within his own recollection of an Engineer officer who for some time temporarily discharged the duties of a high Staff appointment at an important military station. The post became vacant, and application was made for him to be confirmed in it; but the answer received was—"Ordnance officers are not eligible for appointment to these positions." That answer simply conceded the whole point which he (Colonel Arbuthnot) wished to bring before the House, He admitted that there were occasional cases of men employed in departments where special qualifications were required—such as the Intelligence and Education Departments — but they did not come into the category of the 60 officers employed on the General Staff. Why were the officers of the Ordnance corps excluded from Staff appointments in England and the Colonies? In his opinion, they were all more or less qualified for the Staff by their knowledge of topography, surveying, and military drawing. Field Artillery officers were pre-eminently fitted for Staff employments and commands, because from the nature of their regimental duties at field days and manœuvres, they had better opportunity of studying the movement and the handling of troops. On these occasions the artilleryman got a general view of what was going on; while the Cavalry soldier was either employed on reconnaisance duty, or, if with his regiment, was hidden away behind a hill till required to move, when he was enveloped in a cloud of dust; and the Infantry officer was devoting his time and attention to seeing that when he gave the order "fours right," the men did not form "fours left." If one wanted to get an account of what had happened on a field day, it was much more likely to be obtained from a sub-lieutenant of Artillery than from even a commanding officer of any other Arm. The officers of the Ordnance corps had been invariably excluded from occupying any of the three highest positions to which the officers of other corps could attain, and were, besides, shut out from the positions of heads of the Departments of Clothing, Recruiting, Intelligence, and Education. Out of the officers commanding at the 30 district divisions and brigades in England and the Colonies, only one was an officer of a scientific corps. With regard to the appointment at Woolwich, he saw that the post was to be filled by a distinguished Crimean officer, which was to be regretted; because that standing appointment of an Artillery officer to Woolwich was one of the means by which the line of demarcation between the Ordnance corps and the rest of the Army had been maintained. He would like to see a Cavalry officer sent to command the Woolwich district, and an Artillery General commanding some of the great defensive districts. He believed that it was an object of the greatest importance to break through that line of demarcation, and that he should eventually succeed in his endeavours to do so. It was quite true that Ordnance officers had been appointed to commands at Gibraltar and Bermuda; but he wished to remind the House that in those places the command of the troops was quite subordinate to the position of Civil Governor, and were not purely War Office appointments. Again, it might be asked—"How can you complain, when General Roberts and General Biddulph both hold commands in India?" To which he replied—"If it is just and expedient to employ the officers of Ordnance corps when they get to India, how will it be otherwise than unjust and impolitic to say they shall have no commands in England and the Colonies?" If there happened to be no officers of Artillery or Engineers fitted for any particular vacancy, of course he did not complain that no one was appointed. He did not say those officers must be employed simply on the grounds of numerical proportion; but simply asked why was England to be the only country in the world not to employ on the Staff and in commands its most highly educated officers? Referring again to the Afghan War, he might contrast the selection of generals with that in the Zulu War. In the former, the Ordnance corps had a fair share, while, in the latter, out of five generals now on the way to the scene of operations, not one belonged to those corps. It would be an easy thing to mention scores of officers in foreign Armies who had been employed in independent commands, and whose names were emblazoned on the pages of history. To begin with the French Army, there was the First Napoleon, Marmont, Foy, Drouot, Pichegru, L'Espinasse, and Bosquet; while the Italians had their Della Marmora, and the Russians General Todleben and Prince Gortschakoff. All these distinguished men were Artillery or Engineer officers. Again, we had only to look to our own Indian Army for the names of Pollock, Whish, Archdale, Wilson, and Napier of Magdala — names of which England was not ashamed. He had moved in December last for a Return of the General Officers of the Ordnance Corps holding independent commands; but although he should have thought it might have been made out in five minutes, that Return had not yet been presented. It had apparently baffled the ingenuity and the research of the War Office clerks, and no wonder, for he believed no such record existed; at any rate, he had never heard of it. Sir Robert Jardine had commanded at Gibraltar, and Sir Fenwick Williams in Canada, and he had heard it stated that Sir John Burgoyne would have commanded in the Crimea had he not been an Engineer officer; but he foresaw an objection that might be advanced, by those who were anxious to do so, to the effect that he was, by making those remarks, criticizing the conduct and the patronage of the illustrious Duke at the head of the Army. He need hardly assure hon. Members that such was not his intention; although he was bound to say that if it appeared to him at any time that the Head of any Department, however high their position might be, and however exalted the rank of the individual was, sacrificing the public interest by errors of judgment, he would not for one moment hesitate to discharge his duty by pointing them out to the House. At that moment, however, his object was a very different one, for he wished not to criticize, but to strengthen the hands of the illustrious Duke, who was Colonel of the two corps in question, who it was impossible could be influenced by any silly prejudices, and whose aim, as everyone knew, was to maintain the Army in the highest state of efficiency. But it was difficult for the illustrious Duke to take upon himself the responsibility of making the great changes indicated, and upsetting a system which he had found in force, and which during a great part of his tenure of Office had been defensible, unless his hands were strengthened by the Report of a Royal Commission. As he was entering the House that evening, an hon. Member had said that he was about to ask the House of Commons to govern the Army; but nothing could be more absurd than that statement; for the matter was not one of discipline, but of organization, and it, therefore, was a most important question for the decision of the House of Commons. He would pass on to another subject, which he did not wish to represent as a grievance in any way. It was a fact that a man could much more easily get into the Staff College from the Line than from the Artillery or Engineers, which alone was an inducement for him to join other corps in preference to the Ordnance. There were some persons who thought that as there was a competitive examination to be passed, selection should be made from those who gained the highest number of marks. If that were the rule, the officers of Artillery and Engineers would monopolize all the appointments. This, however, was a secondary matter. For himself, he readily acknowledged the necessity of limiting the number from each arm of the Service. He only inquired why, if it was thought necessary to limit the number of Artillery and Engineer officers, the Cavalry and Infantry, whose duties were perfectly distinct, should be lumped together? Then, again, it was a perfect waste of money to educate Artillery and Engineer officers at the Staff College, with the view to their filling appointments which were never given to them. It was true that they held regimental Staff appointments, but for these no Staff education was necessary. Ordnance officers laboured under the further disadvantage of being the only ones who could not escape compulsory retirement, and for this reason—because officers of other corps about to come under compulsory retirement could be saved from it and promoted to other corps; while the Engineer or Artillery officer could not, inasmuch as there was no other corps open to him. The circumstances to which he had referred led him to believe that as they had been created by the recommendations of various Royal Commissions, nothing short of a Royal Commission could effectively consider and modify them. Another point was the effect which the recommendation of the Royal Commission to abolish the rank of regimental full colonel had upon the scientific branches of the Army. He had heard, on the highest authority, that it would be the ruin of the Engineers; and he believed it would have the same effect upon the Artillery, by leading to the wholesale retirement of a large number of their most valuable officers. After a certain date—the 1st of October, 1882—no officer would be allowed to continue as lieutenant colonel longer than five years, but would then have the option of being placed upon half-pay, or of receiving a larger sum on retiring from the Service altogether. At the same date the rank of full colonel would also cease to exist, although there would be over 30 lieutenant colonels of Engineers and 50 of Artillery still eligible for promotion as full colonels, and who would have to be disposed of either by their being bought out or promoted before the other officers could hope for any employment. Those officers who had served their five years and been shelved would have to decide between receiving half-pay for an indefinite number of years and the higher terms offered to them on final retirement, and being usually poor men would be compelled to choose the latter, and the State would be very unfortunate in losing from that cause alone the services of so many valuable officers. It appeared to him that the only argument which could be advanced against the throwing open of appointments upon the Staff to the Ordnance officers was that they had already special appointments open to them. But he would ask the House, was it likely that such men, unless having a certain bent of mind, would prefer such an appointment as that of master saddler to the position of a Staff officer? He was of opinion that the line of demarcation between the scientific and other parts of the Army should be broken down, and the appointments in question thrown open to all. He could see no reason whatever why this should not be effected. The loss to the country of the abilities of scientific officers was no less than a national misfortune. Take the case of Sir William Palliser, Sir Henry Gordon, or Colonel Colley, whose services could have been invaluable to the State in certain Departments had they not been ineligible, because they were not Artillery officers. Again, it might be said that the supply of Ordnance officers was still equal to the demand; but with that argument he begged to join issue, and would only state that whereas, before the abolition of Purchase, the numbers of those who qualified in the preliminary examination and those who obtained appointments were in the proportion of four and a-half to one, they now stood in the proportion of three to two. The number of those who qualified had fallen off, and it was simply a waste of time to examine men who had not sufficient education to justify the authorities in continuing their examination after the first two days. He asked, was it or was it not desirable to attract the cream of the Army to the Ordnance corps? And had he not shown that those corps laboured under disadvantages which, as time went on, would increase rather than diminish? Was it likely that they could hold their own under the new Regulations; and would it not be a national misfortune if they were to sink into disrepute? There could be but one answer, and that was, that it would be a most unfortunate thing for the efficiency of the British Army and for the English nation at large. Again, he asked, was it not wise to anticipate those possible events with a view to their prevention? As inquiries of that kind were not matters of a day, he trusted the excuse would not be used that it was premature to deal with the subject at that time. How could the subject be investigated better than by a Royal Commission? He had shown that the matters to be inquired into were the results of the recommendation of two previous Royal Commissions; and he contended there were, at least, half-a-dozen points within the four corners of his Motion, the investigation of which was quite as important as anything that had justified the appointment of Royal Commissions in former times. He knew that the strongest feeling existed against sending young men to Woolwich. In a letter which he had received from a General Officer, the writer said that anyone who sent his son to Woolwich must be a lunatic or ignorant of the facts. Leaving the question of lunacy to be settled among the two distinguished Generals, he would read another letter which he had received from another General Officer who took exception to the above-mentioned expression, in which the writer, while foreseeing and admitting every word that he (Colonel Arbuthnot) had either uttered or written as to the disadvantages under which this corps laboured, said—

> "The fact is that there are attractions in the Artillery Service that in some measure tend to counterbalance the ill-usage to which we are subjected, and these are—The pleasant life, the friendly brotherhood of the officers commencing at the Academy and continuing throughout; the interesting duties, the moderate scale of expense, and generally the high tone of the regiment. These considerations are sufficiently weighty to induce Artillery officers to send their sons to compete in spite of all the drawbacks."

But all these were advantages which an Infantry officer might claim for himself, just as much as an Engineer or Artilleryman; and were they sufficient to compensate for what was really the case now — the absence of a career? He wished to impress strongly upon the House what it was that the Artillery or Engineer officer had to look forward to. It was this—Those who were lieutenant-colonels, and had been lieutenant-colonels for many years, could only look forward to being lieutenant-colonels still, and a large proportion of them would be shelved without so much as their drawing command pay. They attained that position at an early age, and would have to go on half-pay or on permanent retirement, unless the whole system was changed. Eventually they might become major-generals, and get £450 a-year; but they would not be employed. He did not know what would happen when the full colonels were abolished; but there were very few appointments which, even in the remote future, could be occupied by Artillery or Engineer officers. All the brigade depôts were open to officers of the Line; but there were very few military appointments open to Ordnance officers. He admitted that all his arguments did not apply equally to the two corps—some of them were more applicable to the Artillery than to the Engineers. These were all reasons why a Royal Commission should be appointed. It was impossible even for the able Secretary of State for War they now had—it was quite ridiculous to suppose that either his right hon. and gallant Friend, or the Executive Commanding Officer of the Army could possibly settle all these questions. They required an enormous amount of grappling with; and it would be childish to say, in answer to his appeal —"The matter is being considered now; it is occupying our time and attention, and you are only anticipating what we may very likely do." He therefore urged his right hon. and gallant Friend not to shrink from dealing with the question. He granted that it was a very large and momentous question. His right hon. and gallant Friend might take another line of argument. He did not know that his right hon. and gallant Friend would do so; but he might say that the question was too new—that this was the first time it had been brought before the House; or that the Parliament was too old—nearly in its last Session. He hoped his right hon. and gallant Friend would not rely upon that as an objection. He believed that the abolition of Purchase was carried out the first time it was brought before the House—or, at any rate, in its first Session. At any rate, he could assure the House of one thing—that if the matter was not well enough known now, it would soon be well enough known. The Press had already taken the matter up, and it would, he had very little doubt, be taken up in "another place;" and what was more, and what he was infinitely more concerned in, was that both the military and the civil public—those who understood the matter now, and those who would understand it eventually—would be on his side. This was why he said he had no doubt whatever that the matter would be eventually understood, and that the demand now made would be eventually conceded. He thought, therefore, that it would be very wise indeed for his right hon. and gallant Friend to take the initiative, and for the Government to deal with it by appointing a Royal Commission. He did not for a moment mean to say that his right hon. and gallant Friend was primarily responsible for the present state of things; but the responsibility—and a very great responsibility it was—had been thrown upon the shoulders of his right hon. and gallant Friend in consequence of his acceptance of the Office which he now held. It would be far better, he thought, that at this particular time his right hon. and gallant Friend should grant the inquiry, and declare at once that the Government would appoint a Royal Commission. He apologized to the House for having occupied so much of their time. He had, however, tried to be as short as he could, and he thanked them very much for the patience and attention with which they had listened to him. He would now leave the matter in the hands of the House and of his right hon. and gallant Friend, with the fullest faith in the truth, vitality, and ultimate success of the arguments he had used, and in the impartiality of the House of Commons, hoping confidently that it would be satisfactorily dealt with. The hon. and gallant Gentleman concluded by moving his Resolution.

Amendment proposed,

"To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, praying Her Majesty to be pleased to order the issue of a Royal Commission to inquire into and to report whether any and what alterations of the Military system now in force are desirable, as regards the pay, promotion, employment, and conditions of service and retirement of the officers of the Ordnance Corps,"—(*Colonel Arbuthnot*,)

—instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

Colonel STANLEY: I think it would be for the convenience of the House that I should rise as early as possible to reply to my hon. and gallant Friend, and state what is the present position of affairs, and what is the view I take in regard to the question which my hon. and gallant Friend has so ably brought forward. I do not think that any apology was necessary on the part of my hon. and gallant Friend to the House for having introduced the subject; but the importance of the subject, and the temperate manner in which my hon. and gallant Friend has brought it forward, entirely justify the appeal which he has made, and I trust that what I shall have to say will prove to him that if it is my duty to resist the Motion in the form in which he has made it, it is not from any feeling inimicable to his object or from any feeling of indifference to the subjects which he has thought it necessary to bring before the House. Now, it seemed to me that although my hon. and gallant Friend touched upon many grievances and many cases of hardship—and there are many points in which, perhaps, the working of the Royal Warrant, as far as the Royal Artillery are concerned, is not wholly satisfactory — at the same time, he very briefly touched upon that which, in my opinion, is the pith and root of the whole of this question, and that is, how far the position of the officers of the Scientific and Non-purchase Corps has been affected—not actually, but relatively—by the better terms now given in the other branches of Her Majesty's Service. The main point, as my hon. and gallant Friend has said, is this —Undoubtedly, it is desirable to attract what he calls the cream of the Service to the two branches of the Ordnance corps, commonly called the Scientific branches of the Service. That I answer without hesitation. He points out that they are under certain disadvantages, and he asks that these disadvantages should not be allowed to increase, adding reasons why the Ordnance corps cannot possibly hold their own under such circumstances. I am free to admit that not only now, but for some time past, even when I filled the position which my hon. and gallant Friend near me (Colonel Loyd Lindsay) now occupies—that of Financial Secretary—I could not avoid seeing that the time would come, sooner or later, when the position of the Royal Artillery and the Royal Engineers must claim the attention of the Executive Government. From the moment when the abolition of Purchase took place, and particularly after the Royal Warrant in reference to promotion and retirement was passed, there could be no question that the subject must arise in some form or other; and probably, in the opinion of many who were best acquainted with the subject, the day would be almost immediate. But I confess that even those who took most interest in the subject could hardly have been prepared to see an effect produced in so short a space of time, or to find the Warrant, drafted, as I hope it was, entirely in the interests of the various branches of the Service, should turn out to have somewhat the opposite effect to that for which it was designed. I confess that I have not been able to examine into this matter as fully as I myself desired; but as far as my recollection goes, in the original form of the Warrant, as recommended by the Royal Commission, I do not think that compulsory retirement, at all events, in the lower grades, was recommended to the extent to which it has been carried out in the Royal Warrant. That is, as far as my recollection goes; but I am free to admit that opinions about it were divided. There were many eminent authorities taken into consultation, who were connected with, and deeply interested in, the welfare of the two Scientific corps, who thought it would be better to apply the system of compulsory retirement in much the same manner as in the other branches of the Service. However, when they came to apply those rules to the Scientific branch of the Service, a question arose which, although it was, to a certain extent, latent as regarded the Infantry and the Cavalry arms of the Service, has become one of very great prominence in regard to the Royal Artillery and the Royal Engineers. It is a difficulty which will land you on one or other of the horns of a dilemma. My hon. and gallant Friend did not suggest or indicate a remedy—and it is mainly that where you want, on the one hand, to insure such a flow of promotion in the lower ranks as to enable officers to succeed to posts of importance at a comparatively early age of life, or while they retain all their business activity about them, you are, on the other hand, dealing with a class of officers whose value in many cases in the Service increases with every day of their service, and whom you cannot but regret to see forced, or even induced, to leave the Service. That is a difficulty which must beset you on the one hand or the other; and it is only by balancing the evils that the matter can be tested. Although I fully sympathize with my hon. and gallant Friend in the regret he has expressed at so many officers of great value to the Service being obliged, or feeling themselves obliged, to leave the Service, still I do not see, on the other hand, how that can be entirely avoided, unless you were to put up a flow of promotion, such as that which attracted so much attention in the Ordnance corps some years ago. Now, I confess that I followed with a great deal of interest what my hon. and gallant Friend said with regard to the line of demarcation between the Ordnance services and those of the rest of the Army; and I am bound to say that he appeared to me to take a view much more reasonable than that which has been urged upon me in other quarters, in so far that he is quite willing that the line of separation between the Ordnance and the other Services should be broken down on both sides. Hitherto it has rather been from custom than upon any known rule that one Service has been excluded from the other. My hon. and gallant Friend, on the other hand, would be glad to see appointments of a *quasi*-civil nature, although they might touch upon professional matters, opened up to the rest of the Army. I think there would be in that case some risk, if I may say so, of interfering with that feeling of comradeship which I am happy to think has always existed in the Royal Artillery, and which, indeed, has been much exemplified in this House. I refer to that feeling which knits the Royal Artillery together as one man. It is upon that feeling that pressure, no doubt, has been put, not only that appointments should be opened out to the Royal Artillery and the Royal Engineers—appointments which are now only open to the other branches of the Service—but that they should, on the other hand, retain all the *quasi*-Staff appointments more particularly associated with them at the present time. I was glad, therefore, to recognize, on the part of my hon. and gallant Friend, a disposition to say that if the line of separation is to be made less distinct, he is prepared to waive as much on the one side as the other. In using that argument he certainly does much to advance the position he takes up. So far as I am myself concerned, during the time I have held the Office I have now the honour to hold—and I speak with all due reserve on these points, because, as the House is aware, the small number of commands and the large number of officers who are eligible for them renders selection for command a matter of difficulty—so far as I am personally concerned, I have no reason to believe that the Artillery or Engineer officers are excluded, by the mere fact of their being such, from appointments which are open to other officers of the Army. I have never gone into the point of the numerical proportion; and I am not at all sure—although I dare say my hon. and gallant Friend has verified the statement he has made—I am not at all sure that, as far as the doctrine of numerical proportion goes, it would not tell against rather than for him. There is one point in regard to what has been stated by my hon. and gallant Friend upon which I wish to be allowed to speak with some reservation, because in referring to it I am dealing with it as an abstract case. It has been said, and cited as an illustration, that Lieutenant Chard, of the Royal Engineers, could not be promoted under the Warrant; whereas Lieutenant Bromhead, who was associated with him in the memorable defence of Rorke's Drift, could be.

COLONEL ARBUTHNOT: I did not say under the terms of the Warrant, but under the existing state of things.

COLONEL STANLEY: That is an impression I wish to correct. So far as I am informed—and I have taken steps to verify the accuracy of my own belief—there will be the means of promotion. I do not mean in reference to particular officers concerned; but taking this instance as an abstract case, it is perfectly possible for an officer of the Artillery or Engineers to be promoted to half-pay under the Royal Warrant as it now stands, on condition, however, that he is brought back to full pay within the year. No doubt, as my hon. and gallant Friend has stated, that involves a curious way of dealing with the question. But the more we are dealing with officers as a homogeneous body, the more we find ourselves in a difficulty in satisfactorily disposing of the question. In the other branches of the Service, officers obtaining extended promotion are allowed to join other regiments; but that, of course, cannot be the case in a body constituted like the Royal Engineers or the Royal Artillery. My hon. and gallant Friend has touched upon a point which I am free to admit is one that has always caused me some concern; and although I could not but agree, on the whole, with the premisses under which the Royal Warrant was framed, I cannot but regret that in some respects it appears to press extremely hard upon the lieutenant colonels. Lieutenant colonels, who held that rank prior to October, 1877, of course have their rights saved to them, and are not in any way interfered with by the Royal Warrant. Therefore, it is inevitable that those immediately below these officers should be placed between the pressure of promotion, on the one hand, while, by a well intended saving of the rights of officers, they are kept down on the other hand. I am free to admit that this is a substantial grievance, and a case of considerable hardship; and, speaking personally, I should be glad to see my way to redress it. I have no wish to take up too much of the time of the House. My only wish was to explain, as early as possible, how the matter at present stands. I have said that for some time past I have been of opinion that this question would come forward; but I did not expect to see it come forward as soon as it has done. I may say that even some months ago I placed myself in communication with the Inspector General of Fortifications, and with some other officers connected with the administration of the Royal Engineers, feeling that in that branch, at that moment, there was, undoubtedly, some pressure; and that the future of some of the officers who are now excluded from other appointments was not that which existed when the officers of the young Artillery regiments entered the Service. From the Engineers, all conversant with the subject know, it was no very remote step to the Royal Artillery; and I cannot say that I ever felt in my own time excluded from entering the Royal Artillery. But I think it is of extreme importance that we should ascertain accurately what it is that we propose to ourselves to do. I am bound to remind the House that the effect of a new Warrant is extremely difficult to forecast. And in many cases, when you thought you were giving that which was a concession to the wants of a particular branch of the Service, you found, on reference afterwards to other matters, that were not before you at the time, that the change has had an opposite effect to that which you expected, and has told against the interests of those whose interests at the moment you thought you were protecting. Take, for instance, the Warrant which followed the inquiry conducted by my right hon. Friend the Member for Pontefract (Mr. Childers) in reference to retirement. The immediate effect of the change made in consequence of that inquiry, I am imformed, so far from expediting the retirement of officers, was to make it more difficult than ever to attain a higher position. That is only one out of many other instances; and I therefore repeat that it is our duty to see clearly before us to what point our inquiries should be conducted, and to endeavour to make the ground clear for the investigation of a Royal Commission. What I should have desired, if time permitted, was to have investigated the whole of the subject, and cleared up every point, and then to have an inquiry; but whether by a Royal Commission or by a Departmental Committee I am not at present prepared to say. It has been my wish to have these grievances ventilated, and get some of these points cleared up. I have thought that by taking evidence, and procuring information from officers, I might have formulated a Report and brought these grievances into some tangible shape; and after that had been done, it would then be for the Executive to take such action as they thought fit to recommend to the House. I still think that that course of proceeding might be taken with advantage. But with all deference to my hon. and gallant Friend, who has made so good a case this evening, I think that to appoint a Royal Commission which could not, from its very terms of reference, deal with other matters relating to the Service, would be disadvantageous rather than an advantage at the present time. It must be borne in mind that all these matters, large and serious as they are to one branch of the Service, are matters which have to be weighed in reference to other branches of the Service, and we must in our own minds pay a due regard to the proportion of the different branches, and take care that while we are doing justice to one branch of the Service we are not, at the same time, falling into the error of doing injustice to other branches. For that reason, it would be necessary to limit and to indicate very clearly the points to which any Royal Commission or Committee should direct their attention; and after that were done, when the ground had been so far cleared to enable the inquiry to be undertaken, it would be found, probably, that no time had been lost. In all probability a Committee or Royal Commission, with such indications before them, would be able to conduct their work within a less period of time than would be consumed if they were to start, in the first instance, without such a preliminary inquiry. I am sorry that circumstances connected with the Army Business before the House—the Army Estimates—have so far interfered with my intentions, and placed me more backward than I hoped would have been the case when Parliament assembled. From the reasons which I have now given, I would ask my hon. and gallant Friend to understand why it is that I find myself compelled to oppose his Motion for the appointment of a Royal Commission. I hope I have said enough to show the House, and those who are interested in the matter, that I am fully aware of the gravity of the subject. I do not yield to my hon. and gallant Friend myself, or to any of the officers of the Ordnance corps—whether Royal Engineers or Royal Artillery—in his opinion that we should get, as my hon. and gallant Friend expresses it, the cream of the Army into the Scientific branches; and I hope, with this assurance, that my hon. and gallant Friend will understand why I am obliged to feel it my duty to oppose, this evening, the appointment of a Royal Commission.

Mr. O'REILLY said, he took an interest in the matter now before the House, in consequence of having served on the Committee which inquired into the question of promotion and retirement in the two Scientific corps some 12 years ago. Up to the abolition of Purchase these two corps had attracted, in point of intellectual power, the cream of the young men who entered the Army. He agreed with the right hon. and gallant Gentleman the Secretary of State for War in holding it to be the most desirable that this state of things should continue; but, under present circumstances, they might be certain it would not. The competition for entrance into these two corps was falling off. It was natural that young men with a taste for scientific pursuits should wish to enter them, but it was against their interest to do so. There was no advantage in joining them, and the difficulty of entrance was much greater. Again, in the Scientific corps the pay was rather less than in the Line, and promotion was certainly slower. Then came the question of the fair distribution of commands between the different portions of the Service, and the evidence given before the Committee of 1867 showed that the Scientific corps never had anything like their proper share of the superior commands — a circumstance that might be accounted for by their virtual separation from the rest of the Army. The Secretary of State for War had, however, admitted the existence of a difficulty, and was aware of the causes that were likely to diminish the supply of efficient officers. The right hon. and gallant Gentleman had been unable to consent to the appointment of a Royal Commission, but had proposed to collect evidence, and, after classifying and arranging it, to refer the whole question to a Committee. In his opinion, a Royal Commission, with sufficient scope and a good *personnel*, would be practically well fitted to deal with the subject, involving, as it did, the relations of the two Scientific corps with the whole Army and the principle on which those corps should be manned; but no small improvements in matters of detail would meet the exigencies of the case. He did not know whether his hon. and gallant Friend intended to press his Motion to a Division; but this he knew, that sooner or later the whole question at issue must be fully considered by Parliament.

Sir JOHN HAY said, that the recommendations of the Committee of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Pontefract (Mr. Childers) would have necessitated considerable expenditure, without which there could be no proper flow of promotion; but they had never been carried out. Soon after that Committee had reported, a Government with economical views came into Office, and the Chairman of the Committee had to admit that he saw no way of giving effect to their proposals. At the present time, perhaps, some different course would have to be adopted, as the circumstances had changed; and he agreed with the hon. and gallant Member for Longford (Mr. O'Reilly), and with his hon. and gallant Friend who had brought forward the Motion, that some authoritative inquiry was wanted. He thought his hon. and gallant Friend had gained a considerable step in advance for the object he had in view by eliciting the assurance which had been given by the Secretary of State for War. He would advise his hon. and gallant Friend to await the further steps which the right hon. and gallant Gentleman would no doubt take in this matter.

General Sir GEORGE BALFOUR said, he placed entire confidence in the promises which had been made by the Secretary of State for War to inquire into the unwise exclusion of the officers of the Artillery and Engineers from those employments on the Staff of the Army, to which they had a fair right, and would therefore suggest the desirability of not pressing the Amendment for the Royal Commission to a Division. He contended for the expediency of not bolstering up any particular rank or branch of the Service, but of selecting from all the officers of the Army those who were best qualified to fill particular appointments. Now, there was no justification for the present exclusion. Purchase had been abolished, so that the old officers, in regard to promotion, pay, and Staff appointments, ought to be on an equality. He desired that the Artillery and Engineers should be placed on the same footing, in all respects, with Infantry and Cavalry officers. He was perfectly certain that no hesitation need be felt in doing that. Their training and military knowledge fully fitted them for Staff duties. The Secretary of State for War, who was now the responsible Officer for the whole Army, had given promises which would be performed; but how they were to be carried out remained to him a mystery, so long as the Army was at present managed. He (General Sir George Balfour) strongly recommended the hon. and gallant Gentleman opposite not to go to a Division. The difficulties of the Secretary of State for War in undoing the old prejudices against, and exclusions of, Artillery officers were so great that much tact was needed to effect reform. If, however, he did go to a Division, he would be defeated, because the Secretary of State for War could bring to his support an overwhelming number of Members, and he (General Sir George Balfour) did not wish the hon. and gallant Gentleman's good cause to be injured by being defeated. The hon. and gallant Gentleman had done good work that night, and had made such an impression on the Secretary of State for War that it could not fail to be effective in removing the disabilities of a very large section of officers of the Army.

COLONEL NORTH said, he hoped his hon. and gallant Friend would not think it necessary to divide the House. He thought the Secretary of State for War had gone a great way with his hon. and gallant Friend. He was glad to find there would be no difficulty in promoting Lieutenant Chard. When he considered the wonderful conduct of that young officer, he wanted to know why he should not be promoted in his own corps? There were certainly no less than 38 officers at this moment before him; but he hardly thought that any one of them would hesitate to approve the promotion over him of one who had conferred such lustre, not only upon his own corps, but upon the whole Army and the whole nation. If there was no precedent for such a promotion as he (Colonel North) suggested, he hoped a precedent would be made in the case of Lieutenant Chard. A more soldierly despatch than that of Lieutenant Chard was never penned. What made Napoleon the Great the idol of his Army? It was this—he took advantage of such occasions as the one to which he (Colonel North) was referring, and promoted a man who had distinguished himself, no matter what rank he held.

COLONEL BEAUMONT said, that brute force now counted for less, and mind and intelligence for more, than formerly, and, therefore, they should not impose undue limits by confining to a limited sphere the Scientific corps. The hon. and gallant Member who brought forward this Motion advocated a Royal Commission, and the Secretary of State for War opposed it, and he (Colonel Beaumont) was inclined to agree with the right hon. and gallant Gentleman. He rather questioned, *per se*, whether a Royal Commission would be the best way of dealing with the subject; but unless something were done, he should, for one, not let the matter rest.

MAJOR O'BEIRNE said, there were two points to which he wished briefly to call the attention of the House. He saw no reason whatever why Artillery officers should not be appointed to brigade depôts as well as Cavalry officers; and he considered it very unjust that they should be excluded from the Horse Guards Staff. He would be very glad, in the interests of the Army, to see Artillery officers on the Horse Guards Staff, because, independently of the change which they would effect, it would give an impulse to education throughout the Army. The public were well aware that none of the great reforms effected in the Army, such as the abolition of Purchase and the five years' rule, had ever originated with the Horse Guards.

MR. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN said, that while he thought his hon. and gallant Friend had made out his case, he joined issue with him on the terms of the Resolution. He spoke of this grievance as the effect of the abolition of Purchase, but this was not so. The abolition of Purchase had conferred a great indirect benefit on the Ordnance corps, inasmuch as it had removed the principal ground for their exclusion from a full share in the emoluments and distinctions of the Army. There could be no doubt that in the past officers of the Artillery and Engineers had been shut out from many good positions in the Service for which, in point of education and skill, they were well fitted, the ground for such exclusion being not only that their own branches of the Service had many good things to bestow, but chiefly that they did not pay for their commissions, as was the case with the Cavalry and Infantry. The grievance now complained of was to an extent created by the Royal Warrant of 1877, and the fault of that Warrant lay mainly in the fact that the Royal Commission on whose recommendations it was founded were instructed not to inquire into the question of the organization of the Army, and, therefore, had to devise means of procuring a proper flow of promotion under the existing organization. They were thus driven to the adoption of compulsory retirement. The provisions in the Warrant relating to the compulsory retirement of officers in the lower ranks affected the officers of the Ordnance corps even more harshly than the rest of the Army; because, being able to calculate with almost mathematical accuracy the period at which their promotion would come, they knew also when they would be compulsorily retired, and could not, therefore, be expected to take the same interest in their duties while they remained in the Service that would otherwise be the case. In the Infantry and Cavalry branches, where promotion was in some regiments rapid and in others slow, there was an element of uncertainty which tended to mitigate this effect. The principal grievance, however, of which the officers in the two branches of the Service under discussion complained, and justly, was their practical exclusion from the Staff appointments. This exclusion was mainly traceable to the fact that the idea was not yet exploded that the Ordnance corps had some peculiar privileges of their own, and it was to be hoped that at no distant date the officers would be admitted to a fair share—and this was all they asked—of the higher appointments on the Staff of the Army. It had been said that the present system had an injurious effect upon the number and quality of the cadets entered at Woolwich. Feeling considerable interest in this branch of the subject, he had consulted the Governor of the Royal Academy at Woolwich, who said he had no complaint to make either of the quality or the number of the cadets applying for admission—that, in fact, they were of just as good a class as they had ever been. He found that, notwithstanding the high mathematical and scientific qualifications which were required, there were, in the case of Woolwich, four times as many candidates as there were openings, and in the case of Sandhurst, six times as many; so that the difference was not so great as might have been expected. While, in the main, he agreed with his hon. and gallant Friend who had introduced the Motion, he could not see how a Royal Commission could remedy the grievance of which he had complained. They had before them the Report of a Royal Commission which fully bore out the view he had urged upon the House; and he would suggest to his hon. and gallant Friend—more especially the main grievance—that of exclusion from the general Staff of the Army—was a matter of administration in which the responsibility rested with the Executive Government—to accept the assurances which the Secretary of State for War had given to the House.

Sir WALTER B. BARTTELOT concurred in the observations of his hon. Friend who had just sat down. His hon. and gallant Friend who had brought forward the subject had enlisted the sympathies of the House, and had received, he hoped, substantial and fairly satisfactory assurances from his right hon. and gallant Friend the Secretary of State for War. They had, therefore, reasons to hope that the two Scientific corps referred to, and of which they were all so proud, would not, so to say, be left out in the cold as regarded the higher appointments in the Army for the future; and he trusted, therefore, that his hon. and gallant Friend's Motion would not be pressed to a Division.

Sir ALEXANDER GORDON observed, that there was not an Army in Europe in respect of which so unjust and impolitic a provision existed as that which had been brought under the notice of the House, or one which bore so heavily on a most meritorious class of officers—a class which devoted their lives to the study of their Profession. He was glad to hear the assurance given by his right hon. and gallant Friend the Secretary of State for War that the grievance under which they laboured would receive due consideration.

Sir PATRICK O'BRIEN said, that hitherto the debate had been carried on either by military men or by ex-officials connected with military administration. He rose, as one belonging to neither of those classes, but as one of the general public, who, both in that House and in the country, were determined that, as far as they could exercise the power, long-delayed justice should be done to those Scientific Services which were the pride and the glory of the Empire. Whilst all, of course, recognized the courage and the heroism of other branches of our Military Services, there might, perhaps, upon the Continent be questions raised as regarded their comparative efficiency; but he believed he was accurate in stating that in no military society in Europe would it be denied that the British Artillery stood without a rival; and yet this regiment, and its sister corps, the Engineers, remained, and would remain for many a long year, in the cold shade, if the British public did not speak out upon the question, and terminate once and for all an unworthy favouritism. He was surprised with some allusions which had been made by the hon. Gentleman the Member for the Stirling Burghs (Mr. Campbell-Bannerman) to the circumstance of a Cavalryman, Guardsman, or a Linesman having purchased his commission, where the Artillery officer had not done so. Why, surely the hon. Gentleman had forgotten the expenses that had been incurred in giving the young man, prior to his becoming a cadet, an expensive scientific preliminary training, and to the time which he had to spend afterwards at Woolwich before the could obtain his commission. Why, anyone of the smallest possible knowledge of the subject must know that the sum of £450 or £800, formerly paid for a commission, was but trifling when compared with the sum necessarily expended prior to entering the Artillery or Engineers. He would urge the hon. and gallant Member who had brought the subject forward not to be content with evasive promises from the Treasury Bench, but to press his Motion to a Division. It was well known that the Horse Guards endeavoured to rule the Secretary of State for War, and even the House of Commons, on military matters, and at one time the present Commander-in-Chief acted as if his authority was superior to the House of Commons; but 15 years ago the House had settled that question. The present Secretary of State could scarcely hope, however well-intentioned, to cope with, what he had heard termed, the Horse Guards Ring in this matter. At the Horse Guards the Scientific corps had never been in good odour, and would obtain but scant justice if that House did not, as behoved it, take the affair into its own hands. He had ventured to speak in this fashion, because it was more than human nature to expect that military men could speak out on a professional subject with the freedom of a layman. And he well recollected that some 15 years ago, when he used to bring forward military grievances in that House, he often had the advantage of suggestions from military men, who selected him, for the very reason of his being a layman, to be the exponent of their opinions. It was evident that the two front Benches perfectly understood each other, and had agreed to "square" the matter; but he was there to tell them that the injustice done to the Artillery was not such as to be smoothed over by soft words. Behind officials, past and present, there stood the great British public, who, when they understood the matter, would assuredly insist that Artillery officers should have justice.

MAJOR NOLAN maintained that the late Returns showed that they were now maintaining a lower class of candidates, intellectually considered, for the Artillery than they formerly secured If they left the position of the Artillery officer as it was at present, he might not fall off in physical qualities or in social status; but there would probably be a declension in his attainments in book learning—a matter of great importance in connection both with the Artillery and the Engineers. He did not contend that a picked Artillery officer should have better book knowledge than a picked officer of the Line; but with the average Line officer and the average Artillery officer the case was very different. It was impossible for them to keep up the book learning in the Artillery unless they paid for it. The House would act very unwisely if it did not encourage high mental qualifications for those branches of the Service. It was the opinion of all the great military writers, from Jomini downwards, that the first quality for the Artillery was science. Formerly, our Artillery officers were accustomed to have continuous service, while the Infantry and Cavalry were put upon half-pay. But the advantage of continuous service had been taken away from the Artillery by the retirement Warrant of the year before last, which he had opposed at the time, because he foresaw the evil effect it would have upon the whole Army, and especially upon the Artillery and the Engineers.

COLONEL JERVIS observed, that while the Secretary of State for War had promised, as far as he could, to remedy the present state of things, he had said that, as to commands, he did not quite see his way how exactly to proportion them. The military authorities were responsible for those whom they placed in the different commands, and they selected for them the best men they could. But that was not the real point from which the Artillery suffered. The number of General Officers of Artillery was limited in unfair proportion to the remainder of the Service; and the more distinguished an Artillery officer was as a young man, the higher he rose as a young man, and the more his name was known, the sooner that officer was shelved. If he became distinguished—say, like Lieutenant Chard—he received his captaincy and a brevet majority perhaps; but when he became colonel, and got to the top of the tree of full colonels, he had to wait long years before he was promoted to the rank of major-general. He concurred with all that had been said as to the uselessness of referring a question like this to a Royal Commission, and would illustrate the point by referring to the unsatisfactory results of the labours of the Royal Commissions appointed to examine into the complaints of officers of the Indian Service. The appointment of a Royal Commission was, in fact, a very easy way of shelving the question. Therefore, he trusted the hon. and gallant Member for Hereford (Colonel Arbuthnot), accepting what had been stated to-night by the Secretary of State for War, would refrain from pressing his Motion to a Division.

Colonel ARBUTHNOT said, he knew he had no right to reply; but, with the indulgence of the House, he might, perhaps, be allowed to say that he should be anxious to withdraw the Motion if any of the assurances, which he was told had been given by the Government, had reached him. He did think it was a remarkable thing that only one Member of the Treasury Bench had risen to take part in the debate. He was afraid, under all the circumstances, that he must put the House to the trouble of dividing.

Question put.

The House *divided*:—Ayes 68; Noes 69: Majority 1.—(Div. List, No. 44.)

Words *added*.

Main Question, as amended, put, and *agreed to*.

Resolved, That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, praying Her Majesty to be pleased to order the issue of a Royal Commission to inquire into and to report whether any and what alterations of the Military system now in force are desirable, as regards the pay, promotion, employment, and conditions of service and retirement of the officers of the Ordnance Corps.

DISTRICT AUDITORS BILL.—[Bill 79.]

(*Mr. Sclater-Booth, Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson, Mr. Salt.*)

COMMITTEE

Order for Committee read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair."—(*Mr. Sclater-Booth.*)

Sir GEORGE CAMPBELL, who had on the Paper a Notice of a Resolution on the subject of the North-West Frontier of India, then rose to address the House on this question, but——

Mr. SPEAKER informed the hon. Baronet that he was under a misapprehension, as the Question now before the House was, that the House do go into Committee on the District Auditors Bill.

Mr. PARNELL said, he supposed the Rule was, when the Motion against Supply was carried the Motion stood, and, in accordance with that Rule, this Motion stood till Monday next, unless it was set up again; but he would suggest to the Government whether they would not consider, under the circumstances of this case, that it would be better to set Supply up again, in order to give the hon. Baronet an opportunity of addressing the House.

Question again put.

Mr. PARNELL said, he omitted to mention that he intended to conclude his observations with a Motion for the adjournment of the debate, and, therefore, he wished to give his reasons why he thought the Government ought to agree to the adjournment of the debate on this particular Bill. Those who were interested in the Paper were placed in a very awkward position by reason of the Government being defeated, and they were not prepared to go into several of the questions on two or three very important Bills on the Paper—the Army Discipline and Regulation Bill, which was a very important matter, and which could not properly be discussed just now; the Prosecution of Offences Bill, which introduced the question of English procedure; and the District Auditors Bill, which was not expected to come on, and the opposition to it was not ready. He, therefore, now begged to move the adjournment of the debate.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Debate be now adjourned."—(*Mr. Parnell.*)

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER said, he hoped the hon. Member for Meath would not press his Motion. He thought the hon. Member for Kirkcaldy (Sir George Campbell) hardly saw the effect of the last Motion—it had negatived the Motion to go into Committee of Supply. It was not the intention of the Government to proceed that evening with the Army Discipline and Regulation Bill.

SIR GEORGE CAMPBELL said, he now perceived that he had no right to call attention to the subject of the North-West Frontier of India to-night. He had spoken formerly under a misapprehension that it was because of his not rising more quickly that his opportunity had been lost. The subject was most important, and he hoped the Government would give an opportunity for its ventilation.

MR. PARNELL observed, that he had no desire to stand in the way of the Government Business on the Paper, and he would therefore withdraw his Motion for the adjournment.

MR. J. R. YORKE said, he objected to the policy, adopted by the Government of late years, of transferring the charges from the Local Government Board to the ratepayers.

MR. SCLATER-BOOTH said, the same amount of contribution from the Votes of Parliament would be continued as in former years. The whole of the money which was now applicable to the salaries of the auditors was either derived from Votes of Parliament or local rates. No difference was made by the Bill in this respect. The only difference now proposed was, that the Guardians, with other local authorities, should pay the *ad valorem* stamp. It was not to be regarded as a Guardians' question, but as a ratepayers' question; and he was astonished that his hon. Friend should try to sow dissension amongst different classes of ratepayers. The Bill would really benefit all classes of ratepayers alike. One-half of the expenses of the auditors would be ultimately defrayed by the local rates. The whole of the salaries of the auditors would be paid by the Votes of Parliament; but the Public Exchequer would be recouped to the extent of 50 per cent.

Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Original Question, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair," put, and *agreed to.*

Bill *considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Clauses 1 to 10, inclusive, *agreed to.*

Clause 11 (Repeal of Acts).

MR. SCLATER-BOOTH moved the following Amendments:—

In page 4, line 33, leave out after "repealed," to end of Clause; page 4, line 39, after "day," insert—

"Or from recovering any expenses already incurred, or which may hereafter be incurred, by him under section sixty, sub-section eight, of 'The Elementary Education Act, 1870.'"

Amendments *agreed to.*

Clause, as amended, *agreed to.*

On the Motion of Mr. SCLATER-BOOTH, the following Clause was *agreed to,* and *added* to the Bill, after Clause 11:—

(Saving of certain fees and expenses.)

"Nothing in this Act shall prevent a district auditor from recovering any sum in respect of an audit held by him prior to the twenty-fifth day of March one thousand eight hundred and seventy-nine, or in respect of an audit of accounts made up to some day prior to that day, and the audit of which might have been held before the said day, or for recovering any expenses incurred, or which he may hereafter incur, in any proceedings which he is authorised or required to take or defend under the statutes in that behalf."

Preamble.

On the Motion of Mr. SCLATER-BOOTH, the following Amendment was made:—in page 1, line 9, after "and," leave out "it is expedient to make further provision," and insert—

"Whereas it is expedient that in future the whole of such remuneration and expenses should be paid out of moneys voted by Parliament, and that in lieu of the amount now so paid out of local rates an equivalent sum should be raised by means of stamps in manner hereinafter mentioned, and also that further provision should be made."

Bill *reported;* as amended, to be *considered* upon *Monday* next.

PROSECUTION OF OFFENCES BILL.

(*Mr. Secretary Cross, Mr. Attorney General, Mr. Solicitor General, Sir Matthew Ridley.*)

[BILL 68.] COMMITTEE.

Order for Committee read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair."—(*Mr. Secretary Cross.*)

MR. B. WILLIAMS, in rising to move that the House should go into Committee on the Bill that day six months, said, he objected to the Bill because it was a piece of masked legislation, and because there was no means of knowing whether it would pledge Parliament to an annual expenditure of £5,000 or £100,000 per annum, inasmuch as it left the patronage in the hands of the Attorney General, who was to make as many appointments as he pleased, and fix the salaries of the several officers, subject to the approval of the Home Secretary sanctioned by the Treasury. There was a great diversity of opinion with respect to the appointment of a Public Prosecutor; and although he had heard many of the Judges express an opinion in favour of it, he had to confess that, for his own part, he was not strongly in favour of it. Now, this Bill proposed that the Solicitor for Public Prosecutions should appoint officers all over the country to obey the behests of the Attorney General. All Treasury prosecutions partook more or less of jobbery, and always cost too much. The case of the Welsh fasting girl cost the country many thousands of pounds, but it was only an ordinary case, and could have been disposed of for £50. The Bill must be taken as it stood, and not as it was described on its introduction; and, in his opinion, it was far too dangerous to be allowed to pass. It gave unknown and unlimited powers, and invited Parliament to legislate in the dark. It was masked legislation, which might involve the country in a great expenditure. He moved, therefore, that the House should go into Committee on this Bill that day six months.

Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "this House will, upon this day six months, resolve itself into the said Committee,"—(*Mr. Benjamin Williams,*)

—instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

Mr. ANDERSON complained that there was nothing in the Bill either to define its scope or to prevent its being used to an almost illimitable extent. He highly approved of the establishment of Public Prosecutors; but if such a reform were to be adopted it should be in a straightforward way. He desired to know whether the Bill was intended to inaugurate a great system of Public Prosecutors, or was merely limited to assisting Treasury prosecutions. He should much have preferred that the Government had adopted a system similar to that under which the Procurators Fiscal in Scotland were appointed and performed their duties.

Mr. W. S. STANHOPE asked for some further explanations as to the object and scope of the measure.

Mr. MORGAN LLOYD supported the Motion on the ground that the Bill would enable the Attorney General, with the assistance of the Home Office, to appoint prosecuting officials in any number all over the country, without any limitation as to expense. The words of the Bill were of the vaguest description; whereas the powers proposed to be given by the measure ought to be strictly defined.

Mr. RODWELL supported the Bill on the ground that it was intended to remove defects which were constantly complained of by those who had to administer the law. It would meet cases that every now and then arose in which great difficulty was experienced in putting the law in motion, and it would not at all interfere with private prosecutions. In his opinion, many of the dangers anticipated by hon. Members would never be realized.

Mr. RATHBONE also supported the Bill. It was of great importance that there should be some one beyond the mere private individual to prosecute. Under the present system, some of the very worst forms of crime habitually went unpunished. This was especially true in cases of commercial fraud, in which those who had suffered most were often the least inclined to undertake the prosecution.

Mr. BULWER said, that the legislation proposed by the Bill was perfectly plain and clear, and in no way merited the condemnation which had been passed on it by the hon. Member for Glasgow (Mr. Anderson). He (Mr. Bulwer) saw no want of definition in the scope of the Bill. It was intended to apply to the whole of England. It could not be denied that some such measure was necessary. Any proposal for reform in this direction must, of necessity, involve expense. There were many cases in which the need was felt of a Public Prosecutor, and particularly in commercial cases; and the machinery of the existing law, as far as he knew, could not compel a man to prosecute and give evidence fully and unreservedly before the magistrates. There was also a class of offences in which a large number of persons conspired to commit extensive frauds, and, by means of "long firms," succeeded in doing so in many parts of the country at one and the same time. The duty of prosecuting such criminals was so onerous that no private person could be expected to undertake it; and the present machinery for a public prosecution was both cumbersome and expensive.

LORD FREDERICK CAVENDISH said, he hoped that if the House determined to establish a great system of Public Prosecutors it would, at least, do so with its eyes open. If the Bill became law, a large number of local legal officers would be required; and he did not know whether the Home Secretary would view with complacency the cost of the proposed change. He thought, before the Government asked the House to pass the Bill, a careful estimate should be laid before them of the anticipated cost, together with materials to enable them to judge whether the estimate was likely to be exceeded.

MR. SAMPSON LLOYD said, he hoped the House would not refuse to go into Committee on the Bill. For the last 15 or 20 years there had been a general demand for a Public Prosecutor. He would supplement the cases mentioned by the hon. and learned Member for Ipswich (Mr. Bulwer) by adding to them offences under the Bankruptcy Laws, in which the person most interested was often the least inclined to prosecute. The expense of introducing the new system would be rather formidable; but it would be justified by the results, which, if the precedent of Scotland could be relied on, promised to be highly satisfactory.

MR. HERSCHELL said, he did not think that there could be two opinions as to the importance of this measure; it was a question that had come before the House again and again, and hardly a year passed without the attention of the public being called to the matter. No doubt, the question was one in which the public took a strong interest; but it was also undoubted that the question was surrounded with difficulties. Many attempts had been made to deal with the matter; but those efforts had been frustrated, by reason of its always having been attempted not to make use of the present system of prosecution so far as it extended, but to introduce an entirely new system, by which the whole of the prosecutions throughout the country would be carried on by the Government and by a Public Prosecutor. Against such a scheme, whether right or wrong, a host of opponents were raised. All those who conducted prosecutions at the present time, and all those interested in the present mode of conducting prosecutions, became at once opponents of any attempt to wipe away the existing system. The great difficulty hitherto found in dealing with this subject had arisen, in some measure, from confounding two matters which might perfectly well be kept distinct. He believed that there was the greatest possible want in this country of a Public Prosecutor—it was felt every day; but, on the other hand, he must, for his part, frankly confess that the mode in which by far the greater number of prosecutions that went on throughout the country were conducted, was eminently satisfactory. It had been because those who had hitherto attempted to deal with this subject had not recognised this fact, and because they thought that if it were necessary to appoint a Public Prosecutor, or Prosecutors, it was also necessary to revolutionize the existing system, that the difficulty had arisen in dealing with the question at all. The distinction should be kept in view, between the existence of a Public Prosecutor, whose duty it should be, either by himself or by his subordinates, to see that prosecutions were carried on to their legitimate results, or, when necessary, to institute and carry on the machinery of a prosecution, and the placing of all prosecutions in the country in the hands of Government Prosecutors. In his opinion, those who now conducted the majority of prosecutions throughout the country did it admirably well, and there was no necessity for superseding them; but the necessity that did exist was to appoint some one whose business it should be generally to supervise those matters. He trusted that in the scheme which was now laid before the House this course would be adopted; and though he quite agreed with what had been said as to the terms of the Bill being extremely vague, yet still he believed that the Bill neither gave authority—nor was it intended by its promoters to do so—to substitute a Public Prosecutor for the persons who now conducted the prosecutions throughout the country, and to impose in all cases a Government organization and Government prosecutors. If the latter were the case, it would, as had been observed, cause a vastly increased expenditure, without corresponding profit to the public. But it would be a distinct advantage to the public to have a Public Officer who would be responsible for public prosecutions, and to whom all those who now conducted them would be amenable. Such an Officer should have a general supervision and control, with the view of seeing that the duties the various persons now prosecuting had to perform were properly carried out. There ought also to be a Public Official whose duty it should be to see that prosecutions were instituted where necessary, and where, at the present time, it was no one's duty to undertake them, and by means of which failure to prosecute many criminals at present escaped. It was monstrous that a private individual who had suffered great loss should be bound to waste further time and money in prosecuting the individual who injured him. He would not leave it to private persons to commence prosecutions, as now, for the purpose of collecting their debts, and then let the offenders go free. It was well known that in some towns the Police Court was used for debt-collecting purposes, and prosecutions were instituted, not with the object of being carried to a successful result, but merely for the purpose of putting the screw on to get payment of money which the parties prosecuted were civilly bound to pay. He thought the greatest possible mischief resulted from such a state of things as this, and from the civil liability to pay being confounded with the criminal responsibility for offence. Moreover, the failure to keep these two things distinct, he believed, contributed to the growing commercial immorality of the country. If once the Criminal Courts were permitted to be used for the purpose of collecting debts, the sharp distinction between the liability to pay money and to suffer for a wrong done was not brought home to people's minds. In any scheme of public prosecutions, the Public Prosecutor should have a voice whenever a private prosecutor set the law in motion. His belief was that this could be done without any great expense, because in most cases prosecutions would still be conducted as now. What was wanted was some Public Official in London, and two or three in certain districts, whose duty it should be to supervise prosecutions, and in cases of special difficulty give assistance to those who now prosecuted, and in some special cases to carry on the prosecution. But it should be the exception, rather than the rule, that prosecutions should be carried on by the Public Prosecutor. If the system he had suggested were adopted, he believed that there would be a better regulated system than the present indefinite one, by which the Treasury took up prosecutions at will; and that great good would be effected by allowing a Public Prosecutor either to give assistance to those whose duty it was to conduct them as they ought to be conducted, or to institute them himself if necessary. This should be the general scheme; but it was desirable that they should now ask for same explanation of a more definite character as to the design of Her Majesty's Government in the present measure. From the vagueness of the Bill, it was impossible to ascertain whether the views he had suggested were to be the guide; and it was difficult to see to what extent such very indefinite powers as the Bill granted might be carried. The matter was one which, however, required very careful consideration. He rejoiced that the Government had taken up the subject, and he hoped that the matter would be brought to a satisfactory conclusion. It was a crying shame that the matter had not been taken up long ago. It was, above all things, necessary that they should have proper investigation and proceed carefully; and he did not think that they should be asked at the present time to carry the Bill through Committee.

Mr. ASSHETON CROSS: It is right I should state the views of the Government with respect to this Bill. In the first place, I must express my most unqualified assent to all the observations that have fallen from the hon. and learned Member for Durham (Mr. Herschell). But I want to say, with regard to what fell from the noble Lord (Lord Frederick Cavendish), that we have not proceeded with this matter in a hurry. If there ever was one single subject brought before the House, with which the House has not proceeded in a hurry, it is the question of a Public Prosecutor, because we have had measures without end brought before us during the last 10 or 15 years on the matter. We have had a Royal Commission and a Committee appointed, and we have had every possible investigation that could be suggested in order to enable us to come to a conclusion. We have the example of a Public Prosecutor in Scotland and in Ireland, and the practical method in which they deal with the matter is perfectly well known. The investigations of the Committee, and the inquiries of the Judicature Commission and their Report, and the number of Bills that have been presented, have furnished the House with full opportunities of coming to a conclusion in the matter. Let me state to the House what my views upon this subject are. I do not think it is understood that, in this instance, my hon. and learned Friend the Attorney General is himself the Public Prosecutor under the existing state of things. But various inconvenient anomalies now exist. If there now is a case which is supposed to be an important one, an application is made to the Secretary of State to take it up as a Government prosecution, and, if it is decided to do so, an order is at once made to consult the Solicitor to the Treasury; and at the present moment there are a number of prosecutions that, either by law or practice, the Secretary of State may require the Treasury Solicitor to take up. The Attorney General is, therefore, practically a Public Prosecutor. When this question came before the Judicature Commission, the present Lord Chief Justice made a most elaborate Report upon the subject, and he took up a line extremely in favour of the appointment of a Public Prosecutor, about which, as an abstract question, there cannot be two opinions in this House. But the Lord Chief Justice also took up the notion that every act which the law constitutes a crime is, as such, an offence, not against the individual injured, but against the community or State. I do not deny that. When, therefore, an offence has been committed, a prosecution should, in the opinion of the Lord Chief Justice, be instituted, not by the individual, but on behalf of the State by its own Officer, or, in other words, by a Public Prosecutor. If I am allowed, I will read to the House a few sentences from the Report of the Judicature Commission—

> "It should be the duty of the police, as soon as a crime is known to have been committed, or a person suspected of a crime has been apprehended, to report the same to the local Public Prosecutor, and it should be made incumbent on the magistrate's clerk to transmit the depositions so soon as taken to that Officer, with any remarks which the case may appear to them to call for. A slight addition to the salaries of these clerks would compensate them for this new duty. It should not only be competent to the Public Prosecutor, but made incumbent upon him to intervene in the conduct of the case at any moment that the circumstances may seem to him to require it. In every case which proceeds to trial, it should be his duty to look through the depositions and to see that the proofs are complete before the case comes into Court. If further evidence should appear to be required, it should be his duty to take the necessary steps for procuring it if possible. It should be his business to prepare the brief and instruct counsel—in short, to do all that the attorney employed by a private prosecutor now does. It should be his duty to attend at all Assizes and Sessions held within his district, and to conduct the prosecutions on such occasions."

That is a complete scheme of public prosecutions by a Public Prosecutor, and it is a scheme to effectuate which several Bills have already been prepared; but I am bound to say that I cannot recommend the House to face the expense of carrying such a scheme into practice. I look upon that as an extreme view—as a perfect scheme; but I am not prepared to take the responsibility of asking the House to adopt the expense which would be incurred by it, and I do not think that the results would be equal to the expenditure. I take a different view of the matter. Admitting that all these crimes are offences against the State—and I most frankly and entirely agree with every word that fell from the hon. and learned Member for Durham (Mr. Herschell) as to the absolute necessity of keeping a broad distinction between crime and debt—I am bound to say, looking at the administration of the criminal law of this country—and in that I also entirely agree with the hon. and learned Member—that, in the vast majority of cases, the present system works quite well enough for all practical occasions. I do not propose, therefore, in the scheme which I have laid before the House, to interfere in the ordinary and usual run of criminal prosecutions, either at Quarter Sessions or with the Petty

Cases at the Assizes; but if this scheme is carried into effect, I believe that, without interfering with the machinery at present existing, the general tone and conduct of these cases will be raised, and that the standard of the conduct of cases throughout the country will be equalized. In some parts of the country prosecutions are better conducted than in others; and I believe that I shall establish a system which will raise those which are not so well carried on to the standard of those places where they are satisfactorily conducted. The probable result will be that in 99 cases out of 100, or in 999 cases out of 1,000, it will not be found necessary to interfere with the prosecutions as now conducted. The scheme which we now propose on behalf of the Government is this—that there should be a central Public Prosecutor in London. Some hon. Members have rather run away with the word "Solicitor," as if he were a person undertaking the ordinary duties of a solicitor. This is a mistake—the "Crown" Officer would be a better word. He should be a lawyer, with a fair salary equivalent—I do not like to bind myself to any sum at the present moment—but, perhaps, equivalent to that of an Under Secretary of State. He would be a permanent Officer, and therefore absolutely free from political bias. He would be under the Attorney General, who is, according to law, at the head of all public prosecutions in this country; and he would have under him a staff of officers to assist him in London, and also assistance in the country at different places. The hon. and learned Member for Durham is quite right in saying that we do not want a great number of persons; but if there were one or two attached to each Circuit in the country, that would be amply sufficient to perform the duties. By that means, I believe you would, in the course of a very short time, make a vast improvement in the administration of the criminal law in England. The duties that would have to be performed by this Crown Officer are contained in the second section of the Bill—

> "It shall be the duty of the Solicitor for Public Prosecutions, under the superintendence of the Attorney General, to institute, undertake, or carry on such criminal proceedings (whether in the Court for Crown Cases Reserved, before sessions of Oyer and Terminer, before magistrates, or otherwise), and to give such advice and assistance to chief officers of police, clerks to justices, and other persons, whether officers or not, concerned in any criminal proceeding respecting the conduct of that proceeding, as may be for the time being prescribed by regulations under this Act, or may be directed in a special case by the Attorney General."

So that all those persons who are appointed to the different positions will always be at the service either of the magistrates, or the police, or of a private prosecutor; and they would be in a position to assist, by their advice and direction, everybody who is concerned in the administration of the criminal law of this country. Of course, in all such cases, if there occurred an occasion when the prosecution ought to be taken up by the Government, then they would act on behalf of the Government in conducting the prosecutions. I do not mean to interfere with a very excellent Officer, the Solicitor for the Treasury, who is a gentleman of very considerable ability, and a most useful functionary. I believe that the person who would act as the Public Prosecutor would not act as a solicitor at all in the ordinary conduct of cases, or in getting them up. He would employ the Solicitor for the Treasury in any case where there was necessity for a public prosecution by the Government. I do not know that I need say more than this at the present moment. I think I have shown that, on the one hand, it is the wish of the Government not to go into any extravagant expenses, nor to take prosecutions into the hands of the Government in the way which was suggested by the Lord Chief Justice. I think I have expressed my opinion that the wisest course to adopt at the present moment is only to take up prosecutions when it is absolutely necessary, in cases of remarkable fraud, or where otherwise a failure of justice would occur, and also in every case where prosecutions would be put an end to collusively. We must begin in this matter in some way tentatively; and I do not see that it would be wise to begin, as suggested some years ago, by confining the operation of the measure to the Central Criminal Court. I do not think it right that the country should be precluded from sharing in the benefit of the expenditure, as they would be if the operation of the measure were confined to the Central Criminal Court. If the Public Official in London, under the Attorney General, and the assistants in the country, guided by the rules laid down by the Attorney General and by the Secretary of State, gained the supervision over all prosecutions, a vast improvement in the administration of criminal justice throughout the country will be effected. They would be able to interfere in cases of fraud where there is no one to prosecute, and the system of prosecution throughout the country would be brought to the same standard. Upon the second reading of this Bill I am aware that there was no discussion of its principle, for the principle was practically admitted, and it only becomes a question of how it is to be carried out. I do not gather at the present moment that there is any objection to the principle of the Bill. Some hon. Members seem to be of opinion that it goes too far, and some seem to think that it does not go far enough; but even the hon. Member (Mr. B. Williams) who moved the rejection of the Bill only thought that what it effected should be more clearly defined. I think, after what I have said, that it will be seen that the details of the measure will be under the control of the House to make the matter more definite; and I hope that the House will be willing to consent to Mr. Speaker leaving the Chair, in order that we may go into Committee upon the Bill. I have no wish to press the measure into Committee to-night, as I am desirous that the measure shall receive the most careful consideration; and all the suggestions made to me I will meet in the fairest possible spirit. If Mr. Speaker is allowed to leave the Chair, I am willing at once to report Progress in Committee, in order to give hon. Members an opportunity of considering Amendments they may desire to propose, which shall receive the best attention of the Government.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT: I think it somewhat extraordinary that the discussion on this Bill should take place upon the Motion to go into Committee rather than upon the second reading. I am one of the projectors of the idea of a Public Prosecutor, and, indeed, I was Chairman of the Committee upon the Public Prosecutors Bill. Somehow or other that Bill broke down, and I believe really by reason that it was opposed by the most formidable body, except the Licensed Victuallers, in the country—for everybody knows that they exercise an influence over hon. Members of this House, which is not equalled by anyone excepting Licensed Victuallers—I mean Solicitors. I think the Home Secretary has made a very good speech; but I do not see his speech in the Bill. He said he was going to do this, and he was not going to do that; but the Bill does not correspond with his speech at all. There is nothing whatever in the Bill but an enormous scheme of patronage under the Attorney General, and a centralization of the patronage throughout the country in his hands. So long as the present Home Secretary holds his Office, no doubt the line which he lays down in his speech will be adhered to; but in the three clauses of the Bill there is no limit, either in hundreds or thousands, to the number of officers who may be appointed. When you pass a Statute the thing goes out of your power, and you give the Executive Government of the day the powers contained in the Act. In the measure which I had the honour to recommend we avoided, what I think is one of the most growing evils in this country, the centralization of patronage in the hands of the Executive Government. We provided that the appointments under the Bill should be kept in the various counties. It is the great vice of the present Bill, that it gives the Home Secretary and the Attorney General an amount of patronage to which there is no limit. You may have an Attorney General appointing numbers of officers all over the country; and although the right hon. Gentleman may tell us that he does not mean to appoint beyond a certain limit, yet we have no safeguard as to what will be done hereafter. We know what pressure is brought to bear upon the Government to appoint an officer at a certain salary; and it is a very bad thing, indeed, in the administration of justice, that patronage should be so vested. So far as I know, this is the first Bill I have seen in which the amount of patronage to be placed in the hands of the Government was practically unlimited. But there is another objection to the Bill. Either this Bill is a good thing to pass, or it is not. I myself have been in favour of a more extended scheme of public prosecution; and I think that the evidence given before the Committee over which I had the honour to preside is overwhelming that there is in this country a very extensive system of compromising prosecutions. If that be so—and it is not in London alone, it is the same throughout the country, and, perhaps, more in the Provinces than here—I do not see how the Bill is going to prevent it. I cannot see what authority either the Solicitor for public prosecutions, or his assistants, will have to compel prosecutions. It is the duty of the Public Prosecutor to institute, undertake, and carry on all such criminal proceedings as may be prescribed by the regulations under the Act, or may be directed by the Attorney General; but, in the case of prosecutions undertaken by a private prosecutor, there is no power in the Bill to compel the prosecution to be continued. The Public Prosecutor, perhaps, might interfere and undertake a case; but I do not see anything to bring him into operation. Supposing a man, after instituting a prosecution—and the thing is actually done—compromises it, how is the Attorney General to know anything about it, or how is the Solicitor for prosecutions, or anyone else, to be made aware of it? That is a fault; and so long as you leave the matter in the hands of private prosecutors, so long will things continue in this state. Nor is it clear how, unless the Public Prosecutor is to have charge of all proceedings from the commencement until the end, he is to know what goes on. I should like to know, that there may be no misapprehension, if I am wrong, if it is within the scheme of this Bill to interfere in such cases; and, if so, how they are to be dealt with by the Public Prosecutor? Having been for many years interested in this subject, I do not believe that you will have a satisfactory administration of justice unless you have something like a Procurator Fiscal, as exists in Scotland, who is responsible for all prosecutions. I agree with what has been said as to there being no limit to the number of persons who may be appointed by the Government—it may be 20, or 100, or 500—and the Treasury may or may not control those appointments according to the opinion and exigencies of the Government for the time being. I hope, before the Bill is passed into law, there may be something introduced into it by which it may not become an enormous system of centralization of patronage in the hands of the Attorney General—a system which, as we all know, has a tendency to degenerate into jobbery.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Sir JOHN HOLKER): The view which has been apparently taken by my hon. and learned Friend the Member for Oxford (Sir William Harcourt) is, that you should have a system of public prosecutions throughout the country, and that all those prosecutions should be undertaken by a Public Prosecutor. No doubt the theory of the scheme which my hon. and learned Friend would establish is a very admirable one, and it is a scheme which recommends itself as being theoretically perfect. But, in the first place, it would be an enormous and, to a great extent, a useless expenditure, and then, again, it would be an entire revolution of the present system, and an interference with the arrangements which have been made, and a system which, in the main, works well. There has been, undoubtedly, at different times in this country a great cry raised for the establishment of a Public Prosecutor, not because prosecutions are not properly conducted, but because there are many cases of crime which are committed which are not brought to light, and where people are under the impression that a thorough investigation has not taken place; or, where a thorough and complete investigation having become possible, there has been no one to undertake the prosecution, and to make use of the materials to bring the criminal to justice. There are many offences which at the present time, are not dealt with as they ought to be—many offences which ought, in the interest of the community, to be prosecuted, and especially offences under the Bankruptcy Act. More particularly, in the case of offences against the Bankruptcy Act, it is desirable that the offenders should be brought to justice, for nothing more disastrous to the interests of society can be conceived than that such offenders should escape; but, unfortunately, the persons suffering do not usually move in the matter. There are also commercial frauds, in such offences as have been described by the hon. and learned Member for Ipswich (Mr. Bulwer), and it is most desirable that all these offences should be investigated, and that the perpetrators of them should be brought to justice. That cannot be well done under the present system, and therefore another reason arises why there is such a desire on the part of the public that there should be a Public Prosecutor to take the matter up. As the hon. and learned Member for Durham (Mr. Herschell) has pointed out in his very able speech, there is a necessity for a Public Prosecutor in such cases to take up prosecutions on behalf of the community without interference with the system under which prosecutions at present are conducted, because, as a rule, the present system works remarkably well. Prosecutions go on before the magistrates, and are undertaken by the police, and then go to Quarter Sessions or Assizes, and are directed by the magistrates' clerks or solicitors in the various localities. No one complains of the conduct of public prosecutions as a rule; but there is a great need for some Public Authority to be constituted to have supervision over all prosecutions, and to have a right to institute prosecutions when it should be deemed proper. There should be a Staff in London, and two or three Deputies upon each Circuit; and they should have the right to intervene at any moment in the conduct of a prosecution, and take it out of the hands of a private prosecutor, and make it a public prosecution. My hon. and learned Friend the Member for Oxford says he has read the Bill, and does not see in it any provision enabling a Public Prosecutor, when appointed, to act in a prosecution undertaken by a private individual and to take it out of his hands.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT said, that his objection was, that cases of collusion would not come to the knowledge of the Public Prosecutor.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Sir JOHN HOLKER): The objection which I have stated is one of those put forward by my hon. and learned Friend. I understood him to say there was nothing in this Bill which gave information how a Public Prosecutor could intervene. But if there is any foundation in the complaint which he now puts forward, I think it can be easily remedied, when the Bill goes into Committee, by the insertion of a few words to make it quite clear that the Public Prosecutor shall be at liberty to intervene whenever he thinks proper, and take the prosecution out of the hands of a private prosecutor. Then, he says that a great evil exists at present by reason of prosecutions being instituted and then collusively compromised. I quite agree that this is a very great evil; but I do not know it is the greatest evil that we have to deplore. Still, it is a very serious matter, and I think my hon. and learned Friend is perfectly right in complaining of it. Then he says, perhaps fairly enough, how are you to know—how is the Public Prosecutor in London to know—how are the Deputies in the Provinces to know—that this collusion has taken place? Well, they may not know it; they can only know it by keeping a sharp look out, and by getting information from the various magistrates, and various magistrates' clerks, as to all prosecutions that are instituted. People ascertain these things in ordinary cases by resorting to the usual sources of information; and in this particular case of a Public Prosecutor, he or his Deputy would have a right to require either the magistrates or their clerks to furnish every information and give him every assistance. And if there is the slightest idea that a prosecution that has been instituted is likely to be improperly compromised, the Public Prosecutor will be informed of it by the magistrates or their clerks, and will be enabled to intervene. I do not see, therefore, that there is any great difficulty in the matter. There is another evil, to which my hon. and learned Friend did not so distinctly point. It is this—that in some of our greatest commercial centres prosecutions are often instituted by individuals for the purpose of obtaining remedies for what are really civil grievances. In London, especially, I believe prosecutions are instituted for the purpose of extorting concessions from people which they would not otherwise make—in fact, for the purpose of extorting money. Now, as the case at present stands, it is very difficult to check these prosecutions; but when the Public Prosecutor is appointed, if complaint is made to him that a prosecution is wrongfully brought, he will look into the facts, and, if he deems it right, intervene to stop the wrong that is being done. There is one further point which my hon. and learned Friend has taken to which I will allude. He thinks that the centralization of patronage in the Secretary of State and in myself is very objectionable. If a Public Prosecutor is to be appointed, he must be appointed by some one; and I do not know that there is any very great objection to vest the appointment in the Secretary of State. I do not know that the Secretary of State is likely to exercise that power improperly, nor do I think that there is any great objection to joining with him the Attorney General. But if the Secretary of State and the Attorney General are not to make these appointments, who is? It has been suggested that the appointment should be made by a Town Council, or by the Local Boards throughout the country; but will not greater evils arise from the local authorities and the municipalities having this patronage, than from its being given to the officers of the Government? But my hon. and learned Friend (Sir William Harcourt) need not be so alarmed, for, of course, this measure is only to be tentative. Nor is it possible, in a Bill of this character, to make everything very definite or exact, or to describe with great minuteness every provision that will be made; but I think that every explanation as to what is intended to be done has been given by my right hon. Friend the Home Secretary. If it is necessary to limit the number of appointments to be made under the Bill, it will be very easy to do so when the Bill goes into Committee. Nothing can be more easy than for hon. Members to propose a clause limiting the number of these appointments—such as that there shall only be two or three officers appointed in each district or circuit.

MR. WHITWELL said, that without entering into the details of the Bill, he desired to express his gratification that the measure had been introduced. It had been long wished for; and although it might not go entirely on the lines that were wished by some, still it was an attempt to obviate some great imperfections of the system that now existed, and to introduce a system that would supply the deficiencies. He accepted the measure as a step in the right direction, and trusted it would be beneficial to the country. In his opinion, much crime that was now committed, especially in commercial circles, would not be committed if the administration of justice and punishment were pretty certain. It was owing to the great chance of escaping prosecution that gave a disposition to many commercial delinquents to commit the offences which they now did. They relied at present upon those whom they robbed not caring to spend more money and time in instituting prosecutions against them. He believed criminals of that class would feel, if this measure were carried, that their chance of punishment was much greater, and, their fear of punishment being much more complete, the offences would diminish in number.

MR. FLOYER said, that the speeches in the early part of the debate seemed to favour the appointment of a Public Prosecutor to undertake all the criminal business of the country. He was considerably relieved when the hon. and learned Member for Durham (Mr. Herschell) made the excellent observations he did; and after the explanation of the Home Secretary, he did not feel that there was much danger of what he dreaded coming to pass. Still, there were some passages in the speech of the right hon. Gentleman which caused him some misgiving, because he spoke of this being a tentative measure, and of the appointments being limited to those of provisional Prosecutors in various parts of the country, and referred to them as limited only in the first instance. That would give the impression that although the country was now proceeding in a very sober, quiet way, yet that, perhaps, the pace might be accelerated, and at a future day the nation might be launched into a complete system of public prosecution throughout the country under the control of the Government. It had been urged that this would be a very great expense, and undoubtedly it would be. Not only would the expenditure be unnecessary, but he thought it was to be condemned from a more important point of view. He felt that there was nothing which could be more prejudicial to the English character than to imitate the example of various foreign countries, and teach people to look to Government for everything. If people would not look after their own property, it was not right that they should be able to ask the Government to do it for them. It was, no doubt, one of the evils of the present system that people would not take the trouble to prosecute in cases where they had been defrauded; but if people were taught to rely on the Government, they would do, as occasionally happened, in consequence of our excellent police system—not lock their doors or bar their windows. By the establishment of a Public Prosecutor, people would not take the trouble to conduct their own prosecutions, but would ask Government to step in and conduct them for them; and, in his opinion, that would be a great disadvantage and blow to the English character. In the reliance of people upon themselves, and not upon the Government, the English differed from Continental nations—a great system of bureaucracy was foreign to them. He hoped that when the House went into Committee upon the Bill such limitations might be put into it as would prevent any chance of our drifting into a huge scheme of public prosecutions. He would say one word with regard to what had fallen from the hon. and learned Member for Oxford (Sir William Harcourt). The hon. and learned Gentleman spoke of the evils resulting from prosecutions being compromised. His (Mr. Floyer's) experience had been in the country; but it had been of long standing. Certainly, he did not remember any case where a compromise had been made which might be considered improper. If such instances did occur, he did not think that any system of public prosecutions would prevent them. With respect to commercial frauds he had no experience, and, perhaps, with regard to them, a Public Prosecutor might prove useful. As limited by the Attorney General, he thought a Public Prosecutor would be a useful functionary; but he should deplore greatly any scheme of public prosecution which would take out of the hands of individuals the conduct of their own cases, and lead people to place that reliance on the Government which they now had in themselves.

MR. MITCHELL HENRY: It is a pity that the Government should have brought on so important a Bill as this on a Friday night at this hour. Many objections which might be urged to going into Committee on this Bill now have already been brought forward in the course of debate, and I will not further allude to them. I wish, however, to draw the attention of the House to the fact that Public Prosecutors exist at the present time in Scotland and Ireland. In Ireland the system works exceedingly well. But the Bill is not founded upon either of these systems, and it contains everything which a Bill introduced into this House ought not to have in it. It is the vaguest, crudest document that was ever introduced into Parliament, dealing with such an important subject as this. It enables the Government to appoint a Solicitor for public prosecutions, and afterwards to appoint any number of assistants and other officers. The disadvantages resulting from that have already been pointed out by the hon. and learned Member for Oxford (Sir William Harcourt). The other provisions in the Bill are simply such as must naturally be adopted if the system is to be worked at all; but it is not until we come to the 6th clause that the great objection to legislation of this character becomes apparent. In order to make this Bill fit for becoming a workable Act, the 6th clause enables the Attorney General and the Home Secretary really to make an Act of Parliament. The Attorney General, with the Secretary of State, may, from time to time, make, rescind, vary, and add to regulations for carrying the Act into effect. The draft of such regulations as are approved by the Secretary of State are to be laid before both Houses of Parliament, and are not to be finally approved until they have remained 40 days upon the Table during the sitting of Parliament. Anyone, however, who has been in the habit of attending this House knows what that means; it means simply that no discussion will be possible, and no effectual objections to regulations laid upon the Table of the House in that manner can be made. This is just what will occur in the case of the present Act. I look upon the Bill as simply vesting in the Secretary of State, and centralizing in London, all the prosecutions of the country. I will elaborate the argument, if necessary. If we have Public Prosecutors at all, I think we ought to have the number of Public Prosecutors or officers defined in the Bill. The mode, also, in which the system is to be worked ought to be carefully defined. Further, in my opinion, the appointment of these Prosecutors, if not made entirely by the Corporations and by the Local Boards in the country, should, at any rate, be in some degree approved of by them. We have some experience in London of public prosecutions. The Corporation of the City of

London undertakes public prosecutions, and directs its own officers to prosecute any case within their control and jurisdiction. Now, however, we are to have a Minister of Justice, who will be termed a Solicitor, and who is to perform the duties devolving upon the Attorney General. In course of time, this officer will grow into a most powerful functionary. Every prosecution, great or small, will have to be referred to this personage, to be called the Solicitor for Prosecutions, and we shall have people living in London under the supervision of this officer. I object to such an officer being instituted in this country, unless we have some means of getting at him in Parliament. If you have a State Prosecutor at all, the head of the system ought to be the Attorney General himself, so that you may have an opportunity of making inquiries, and securing a responsible officer to deal with in this House. The hon. and learned Member for Durham (Mr. Herschell) seemed to me to make a very extraordinary speech. He said he did not wish to interfere with the present system of prosecutions, but to supplement them by giving Government assistance. In what cases, then, will prosecutions be conducted by the public? It is not in cases of small felonies, or in that of persons who have been run over, or suffered some bodily harm by felonious acts, that there will be a subsidy, and the prosecution taken up. In such cases people are put to enormous inconvenience and expense in carrying the law into effect, and I do not see that the Bill makes any provision to meet those cases. The hon. and learned Member apparently thinks that people will continue to prosecute cases when there is a Public Prosecutor, upon whom the duty of prosecuting devolves. In Ireland the police take up prosecutions before the magistrates, and there is in every county a Crown Solicitor, who is appointed by the Government, and whose appointment vests a great deal of patronage in the Government in power. With a Crown Prosecutor, from the nature of the case the responsibility is not placed upon the individual; but in Ireland the number of these Crown Prosecutors is limited by the Act under which they are appointed, and the provisions of it are very stringent. To bring forward such a measure as the present, which requires the most careful consideration, and commits us to the adoption of an elaborate system, and to push it forward on a Friday evening, at this hour—especially when, in the 6th clause, the Attorney General and the Home Secretary are, in fact, enabled to make an Act of Parliament—is not the proper course to take. This is a system of legislation against which I protest. I can only account for it on the ground that, there being a strong desire for a Public Prosecutor expressed by many hon. Gentlemen in this House, the Government, at the last moment, has determined to bring in a Bill of some kind, and have brought in this Bill. I do not at all agree with some of my hon. Friends, who seem to think that everybody should be protected in speculations into which they may enter by holding the terror of the law over the persons who commit some trifling breach of commercial law? The prosecutions for commercial offences ought, in my opinion, to be exceedingly infrequent when undertaken by the Government. We have a favourable specimen in Scotland, recently before us, in the case of the Directors of the City of Glasgow Bank. There is another case in this country, where the Government insisted upon prosecuting; but why, I could never understand. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for the University of London (Mr. Lowe) seemed to get it into his mind that, above all things, it was necessary that this great scandal in the Tichborne case should be prosecuted, and the country has been put to unheard-of expense in so doing. The exact sum of money spent in that prosecution we have never been able to get at; but I believe it amounted to £100,000. For these reasons, I trust we shall not go into Committee on this Bill, and that the question will be dealt with much more fully. Moreover, there are a great many hon. Gentlemen who wish to take part in this discussion who are not now present, thinking that it would not come on. I beg to move the adjournment of the debate.

MR. PARNELL said, he thought the conduct of the Government, in bringing on so important a Bill when many hon. Members were necessarily absent, was to be deprecated. The Bill practically gave the Home Secretary the power to make such a system as he pleased; and within the four corners of the Bill there was no limit to the number of Public

Prosecutors that might be appointed throughout the country. The Home Secretary had, indeed, explained that it was not his intention to appoint many of these Crown Prosecutors. But, although that might not be the intention of the Home Secretary at the present moment, yet he might change his mind, or some other right hon. Gentleman, at a future day, holding his Office, might do precisely as he pleased in the matter. The system of public prosecution in Ireland had been adverted to; and he presumed that the system of Crown Prosecutors in Ireland was adopted because of the indisposition in individuals, for reasons into which he need not enter, to come forward and prosecute offences. But private individuals in England did not have the same reason for being indisposed to prosecute, and therefore there was not the same reason for the Bill. At the present moment the Home Secretary and the Solicitor for the Treasury had the power that the Home Secretary now desired to obtain, and any prosecution could be entered into by the Crown against any offender whom it was desired to prosecute. It was said to be desirable to set an example to private individuals of the mode in which prosecutions should be conducted, by means of having Crown Prosecutors in certain districts; but it was perfectly within the power of the Solicitor for the Treasury to do all that at the present time. Therefore, he felt that it was unreasonable, at a quarter past 1 in the morning, to ask the House to go into Committee on a Bill which only gave the Home Secretary the power which the Solicitor for the Treasury already had. In conclusion, he begged to second the Motion of the hon. Member for Galway.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Debate be now adjourned."—(*Mr. Mitchell Henry.*)

SIR JOHN LUBBOCK observed, that the hon. Members who had moved the adjournment had informed them that in their parts of the country there was a system of public prosecution which worked well. Under these circumstances, he should have thought that they would have been the most disposed to facilitate the progress of this Bill. He must confess that he was not quite satisfied that the result of a system of public prosecutions would not be that persons who now felt bound to prosecute would not feel themselves relieved. As there were many hon. Members who took an interest in this subject not present then, he thought it would be fair if Her Majesty's Government would give them an assurance that at a subsequent stage of the Bill there would be a full opportunity of discussing it. Such an opportunity would arise on the Motion for the third reading. If Her Majesty's Government would not give such an assurance, he thought the debate should be adjourned; otherwise, he would ask the hon. Member for Galway to withdraw his Motion.

SIR PATRICK O'BRIEN did not see why, if the system of public prosecutions had been successful in Ireland, it should not be pursued in England. He thought a distinction was too often made between offences against property and attacks upon the person—much more consideration being given to the former than to the latter class of offences. As regarded the question of patronage, he quite agreed with the hon. Member for Galway (Mr. Mitchell Henry). It was a great advantage of the system in Ireland that, as no prosecution could be instituted by any individual without the cognizance of the first Law Officer of the Crown, the prosecution of people was not made a vehicle for obtaining other ends. He would not vote for this Bill, except he saw that there was some mode by which persons could be prevented from using the power of instituting prosecutions for purposes of their own. For his own part, he viewed with disfavour the proposition to make local attorneys the Public Prosecutors. What would happen in happy England if some lawyer—he did not care whether he was Whig or Tory—were entrusted with the discretion of instituting, or refusing to institute, a prosecution? Why, it would be often said that his action was induced by his political leaning—for men of this class were usually the political agents also in country districts. And that such an idea could get abroad he thought would be lamentable. The first consideration was that justice should be respected; and he entirely agreed in the view that the Committee should be postponed, and that the House should have an opportunity of considering the matter, and of framing Amendments, in order that an irresponsible solicitor might not be appointed to direct prosecutions in this country without power over them being vested in the first Law Officer of the Crown.

Mr. ASSHETON CROSS wished to say that the hon. Baronet had entirely mistaken the purport of the Bill, in supposing that it placed in the hands of solicitors in various parts of the country the power of instituting proceedings. The object of the Government was to leave prosecutions in the hands of the persons who now conducted them, but to see that there were persons who should take charge of them, and generally to exercise that check over prosecutions which he understood the hon. Baronet wished so much to see. Therefore, he hoped he would not oppose the Bill. With reference to the number of officers to be appointed, it was in the power of any hon. Member to put down an Amendment that the number of such officers on each Circuit should not exceed two.

Mr. MORGAN LLOYD hoped that the Motion for the adjournment of the debate would not be pressed, for it seemed to him that there was a substantial agreement in the views of the speakers on both sides of the House. It was only a question of detail; and, for his part, he freely accepted the promise of the Home Secretary, that he would give a reasonable time for them to consider the Bill and propose Amendments. That promise, he trusted, would be taken on this side of the House as sufficient, and they would allow the Bill to go into Committee on that occasion. In respect of what had been said as to the objects of the present Bill, he thought the right hon. Gentleman the Home Secretary should put in writing the scheme he sketched out in his speech, and put it into the Bill by way of amendment. Unless that were done, there was no guarantee, if the Bill were allowed to become law, that some future officers of the Crown might not extend the measure very much further than was intended by the present Members of the Government.

Mr. BARRAN also hoped that the Motion for the adjournment of the debate would not be pressed. The scheme sketched for them by the right hon. Gentleman the Home Secretary would, he thought, recommend itself to the mercantile community and to the public generally. They had seen of late a great deal of abuse of public confidence, and reference had been made to one very great abuse—that of the Glasgow Bank Directors. Whatever might be the opinion of his hon. Friend the Member for Galway (Mr. Mitchell Henry) with reference to that case, he was sure that the perpetrators would not have been brought to justice so speedily had there not been Public Prosecutors in Scotland. The argument both of the Scotch and Irish Members had proved most incontestably that the systems of public prosecutions in those countries had worked well. A fear had been expressed that they might drift too much into centralization. If Scotland had not drifted, nor Ireland, and the power that had been exercised had not been abused, what right was there to suppose that the result would be different in this country? Any Member of the House, becoming aware of any abuse, might, from time to time, put questions to the Government in respect to any such abuse. In connection with criminal prosecutions, he was sure, from his experience and observations, that it would be a great public benefit to have Public Prosecutors. There were various occasions upon which people did not wish to prosecute. Now in many cases they were too ignorant, and did not understand the steps necessary to be taken; but if it were well known that there were Public Prosecutors, crime would be much more generally punished than at present. Those who had suffered by a crime were not always ready to become the victims of lawyers, and undertake prosecutions. It was a common saying, that what was everyone's business was no one's business. The result was, that great public wrongs remained without due punishment. For this reason, he thought it would be a great advantage to have Public Prosecutors; and he felt sure that the best course to adopt would be to consent to the House going into Committee, and those who desired to put Amendments upon the Paper could do so, when the measure could be fully discussed.

Mr. BIGGAR said, there was a very strong objection to the Bill, which was, that it delegated authority to the Attorney General and the Home Secretary for the time being. The House of

Commons would never submit to such a course as the delegation of authority to any Minister, however clever he might be, for the result, it was well known, could be nothing but disaster. He thought that the Government should withdraw the Bill and formulate another scheme. The Bill should be made a first Order of the Day in Committee, so that hon. Members might have a fuller opportunity of discussing the necessary Amendments. If the Government would make the Bill a first Order in Committee, he would suggest the propriety of withdrawing the Motion for adjournment.

DR. O'LEARY said, he had always understood that the desire of the Irish Members was that the laws of Ireland should be equalized with the laws of England, and on that ground he thought that support should be given to the measure. There could be no question as to the advantage of having a Public Prosecutor in Ireland. He knew of a case recently where a gentleman had suffered wrong, and was very anxious to prosecute, as a matter of justice to the community. But he was too poor to bear the expense of a prosecution. He appealed to him (Dr. O'Leary), and after an application had been made to the Attorney General the case was taken up; the case went on, and the conviction was obtained. In that case there would, most undoubtedly, have been a miscarriage of justice, had it not been for the office of Public Prosecutor, which existed in Ireland. It was well to mention that it was the Attorney General who directed that prosecution. With regard to the remarks of the hon. Member for Cavan (Mr. Biggar), he considered that whatever difference of opinion might exist between the Attorney General of to-day and the Attorney General of five years hence, both would have but one duty to perform, and that was simply to discharge an official function. Being officers of justice, they would have nothing whatever to do with Party feeling. Indeed, in his opinion, Whig would be just as ready to prosecute Tory as Tory would be to prosecute Whig. He thought that he would occupy a very invidious position by not giving his assistance to the carrying out of that Act, which would equalize the laws of England with those of Ireland. By way of illustration, he would point out that there had been a great failure in the application of the Food and Drugs Bill for the want of a Public Prosecutor. He supported the Bill with all his heart, and hoped that his hon. Friend would withdraw his Motion for adjournment.

MR. MITCHELL HENRY said, the reasons urged by several hon. Members for the withdrawal of his Motion for adjournment only proved to him the necessity which existed for a real discussion upon the measure. He begged leave to withdraw his Motion.

Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

MR. PARNELL inquired if the Government really intended to afford them an opportunity of discussing the Bill in Committee or not? If the Bill were taken at so late an hour as the present, the opportunity for discussion was simply a mockery and a snare. He thought that the Bill should be made a first Order of the Day. It was evident that the Bill would have to be entirely remodelled, and that new Rules would have to be introduced; and as it was a measure of such a very important character, he thought that the least the Government should do would be to make it a first Order of the Day, in order to give hon. Members a fair opportunity for discussion.

MR. RAMSAY said, he would very much regret that the subject should be proceeded with at that late hour. A great defect of the Bill was that it established no real system of public prosecution, and he appealed to the right hon. Gentleman who had charge of the Bill to afford an opportunity for further discussion.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER said, he could not undertake to make the Bill a first Order of the Day; but it should be arranged to come on at a reasonable hour.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Main Question, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair," put, and *agreed to.*

Bill *considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

MR. BIGGAR understood that Mr. Speaker had only left the Chair *pro formâ;*

but the Motion having been made to postpone the Preamble, he would move to report Progress, because hon. Members who were absent, and who took a warm interest in the Bill, would not have an opportunity of discussing it upon its merits.

MR. MITCHELL HENRY seconded the Motion.

Motion made, and Question proposed, " That the Chairman do report Progress, and ask leave to sit again." — (*Mr. Biggar.*)

MR. ASSHETON CROSS hoped the House would keep to the understanding arrived at. It was not desirable to spend another evening in discussing the Preamble. The hon. Member for Meath had expressed a wish to say something more at a future stage of the Bill, and the Chancellor of the Exchequer had stated that it should be brought on at a reasonable hour.

MR. PARNELL thought it most unreasonable for the Government to ask hon. Members to give up the last practical opportunity they would have for the discussion of the measure. He hoped the Government would agree to the very reasonable Motion to report Progress.

MR. MORGAN LLOYD thought they would not be acting fairly towards the Government by supporting the Motion to report Progress.

MR. MITCHELL HENRY said, that if the House chose to give up the interests of the people, of course they could not be prevented. He thought that by allowing the 1st clause to pass hon. Members would find they had got into a trap, for the Chairman of Committees would only allow them to discuss each particular clause as it arose.

Motion *negatived.*

Preamble *agreed to.*

Clause 1 *agreed to.*

Committee report Progress; to sit again upon *Thursday* next.

MOTION.

COMPANIES ACTS AMENDMENT BILL.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Resolved, That the Chairman be directed to move the House, that leave be given to bring in a Bill to amend the Companies Acts of 1862, 1867, and 1877.

Resolution *reported:* — Bill *ordered* to be brought in by Sir JOHN LUBBOCK, Mr. COOPE, Mr. HERSCHELL, and Sir CHARLES MILLS.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 102.]

House adjourned at two o'clock till Monday next.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Monday, 17*th March*, 1879.

MINUTES.]—PUBLIC BILLS—*First Reading*—Marine Mutiny Act (Temporary) Continuance *.

Second Reading — Rivers Conservancy (20); Mutiny Act (Temporary) Continuance *.

RAILWAYS (IRELAND)—THE LETTERKENNY RAILWAY AND THE WEST DONEGAL RAILWAY BILLS.

RESOLUTION.

THE EARL OF REDESDALE (CHAIRMAN of COMMITTEES), in moving—

> " That it is desirable before the Letterkenny Railway and the West Donegal Railway Bills be further proceeded with that the Board of Trade should report to Parliament whether the character of the country through or of the traffic for which these lines are to be made renders it necessary or expedient that either or both of them should be constructed on a three feet gauge, with the reasons on which their Report is founded,"

said, the existence of two gauges in England had been found so inconvenient that, though sanctioned in certain districts by public legislation, one had been, for the most part, and probably, before long, would be altogether got rid of. A discussion had taken place on the subject of the advisability of allowing narrow-gauge railways to be constructed in certain districts in Ireland, when the general opinion arrived at was that it might be necessary in some cases; but that before Parliament legislated in the matter it would be desirable to have a Report of the necessities of each individual case made by an Inspector of the Board of Trade. These two Bills opened the question of the general introduction of a narrow-gauge in Ireland, whereby a serious interruption would be caused in the uniformity of gauge of Irish railways, as settled by public legislation, which might lead to considerable inconvenience. He therefore had felt it his duty to move the above Resolution, in order that Parliament might have that information in regard to these lines which the Government had declared was desirable before such a change of gauge was sanctioned.

Moved to resolve, That it is desirable before the Letterkenny Railway and the West Donegal Railway Bills be further proceeded with that the Board of Trade should report to Parliament whether the character of the country through or of the traffic for which these lines are to be made renders it necessary or expedient that either or both of them should be constructed on a three feet gauge, with the reasons on which their Report is founded.—(*The Chairman of Committees.*)

THE DUKE OF RICHMOND AND GORDON said, he could not agree to the Motion of the noble Earl. He could not see that sanctioning these two lines of railway would be equivalent to sanctioning a double line of gauge over all Ireland. It had been decided only the other night not to postpone these two Bills, and the suggestion which he threw out as to having a Report from the Board of Trade referred to future Bills and not present ones. Those Bills had now been referred to a Select Committee, and it would put the promoters to great expense if the Motion was carried, as they had no Notice that any such change was in contemplation.

LORD ABERDARE regretted that the Government had come to the decision they had. The disturbance of the general gauge in a country was a question of national interest. It was the business of the Government to report through the Board of Trade upon the general principle; and he failed to understand why, in the present case, that had not been done. He thought it was desirable that the Select Committee should have all the information which could be obtained put before it before it came to a decision; and the Report of an Inspector of the Board of Trade who had inquired into all the circumstances of the case would be of great assistance to them in coming to a just and proper decision.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR said, he knew nothing about the merits of the particular measures under discussion; but thought it would be unfair to the promoters of the Bills, seeing that they had been read a second time, to suspend the whole proceedings in order that a local investigation might be made, as to which no Notice whatever had been given. He knew of no case in which the progress of a Bill had been suspended after the second reading in order that the Board of Trade might conduct a local inquiry, the result of which was to be laid before Parliament. Such a course of proceeding would cause great loss and inconvenience to the parties interested. In the present case, the promoters were prepared to go on with the Bills, and they had no reason to anticipate that such a Motion would be made. It could not be supposed, as had been said by his noble Friend the Lord President of the Council, that the sanctioning of these two Bills would be sanctioning narrow-gauge railways all over Ireland; and he would point out that the discussion the other day showed the necessity of sanctioning them in these two particular districts. He differed from the policy of his noble Friend (the Earl of Redesdale), who, in his opinion, carried his enthusiasm for a uniform gauge a little too far. In Ireland the only choice in many cases was between a three-feet gauge and nothing.

THE EARL OF KIMBERLEY said, he thought it would be better to adopt the Motion, so that a full investigation of the special circumstances of the case should take place. The present case was not like a suit in which parties would be debarred from taking action because no notice had been given. All that was now proposed was that the Committee should not be debarred from getting that information which was always desirable in the case of Bills of this kind. There was no idea that a general rule affecting all cases should be laid down.

THE EARL OF REDESDALE (CHAIRMAN of COMMITTEES), hoped the Resolution would be carried, as he thought it would be an advantage to Parliament if the information he desired were laid before it. To sanction these Bills without due inquiry might establish an undesirable precedent, and all he wished was to prevent the adoption of a narrow gauge being agreed to without further information being obtained. He had brought the matter forward in the public interest, and should press it to a Division.

On Question? Their Lordships *divided:*—Contents 28; Not-Contents 36: Majority 8.

CONTENTS.

Bedford, D.

Lansdowne, M.
Northampton, M.

Airlie, E.
Cowper, E.
Derby, E.
Doncaster, E. (*D. Buccleuch and Queensberry.*)
Dundonald, E.
Ilchester, E.
Kimberley, E.
Lucan, E.
Redesdale, E. [*Teller.*]

Templetown, V.

Aberdare, L.
Airey, L.
Carlingford, L.
Clinton, L.
Ellenborough, L.
Monson, L.
Romilly, L.
Sefton, L. (*E. Sefton.*) [*Teller.*]
Silchester, L. (*E. Longford.*)
Stanley of Alderley, L.
Strafford, L. (*V. Enfield.*)
Sudeley, L.
Suffield, L.
Thurlow, L.
Zouche of Haryngworth, L.

NOT-CONTENTS.

Cairns, L. (*L. Chancellor.*)

Northumberland, D.
Richmond, D.
Somerset, D.

Salisbury, M.

Amherst, E.
Bathurst, E.
Beauchamp, E.
Bradford, E.
Cadogan, E.
Dartrey, E.
De La Warr, E.
Rosslyn, E.
Stanhope, E.
Wharncliffe, E.

Cranbrook, V.
Sidmouth, V.

Abinger, L.

Ashford, L. (*V. Bury.*)
Auckland, L.
Bagot, L.
Cottesloe, L.
De L'Isle and Dudley, L.
Dorchester, L.
Elphinstone, L.
Forester, L.
Gerard, L.
Harlech, L.
Hartismere, L. (*L. Henniker.*) [*Teller.*]
Heytesbury, L.
Kenlis, L. (*M. Headfort.*)
Norton, L.
Saltersford, L. (*E. Courtown.*)
Skelmersdale, L. [*Teller.*]
Sondes, L.
Stewart of Garlies, L (*E. Galloway.*)

Resolved in the *Negative.*

NAVY—EXPLOSION ON BOARD H.M.S. "THUNDERER."—OBSERVATIONS.

THE DUKE OF SOMERSET: My Lords, I rise to call your attention to the circumstances connected with the explosion that occurred on board H.M.S. *Thunderer*. I am sure that I need not apologize for troubling your Lordships on a matter attended with such disastrous results. The Report of the inquiry that has been made has now been laid upon your Lordships' Table. My Lords, for the last 20 years, or so—in fact, ever since armoured ships have been built—the great difficulty has been to manufacture guns sufficiently heavy to arm them. The experiments that have been made in the guns, in the rifling, in the projectiles, and in the powder, have been numberless, and every effort has been made for the purpose of securing the strongest cannon. Great sums — I may say millions—have been spent in these experiments, and one of the results has been the production of the 38-ton turret-gun. It was therefore with a feeling of the most acute disappointment—and, I may almost say, with feelings of dismay—that in January last we heard that one of our newest guns of the latest pattern had burst, killing all the men, or, at all events, killing and disabling all the men in the turret, and also killing or injuring 45 men of the crew of the ship. My Lords, for that terrible disaster of the 2nd January there is but one source of consolation, and that is to be found in the strict discipline which was maintained; for, notwithstanding the confusion arising out of the explosion, and the fact that all the lights in the vessel were at once extinguished and darkness prevailed throughout the ship, they nevertheless went direct to their various posts, and calmly performed every duty required of them. My Lords, I consider that the conduct pursued by them on that occasion reflected honour not only upon themselves, but upon the Navy at large. Well, my Lords, the accident having occurred, it was thought necessary that a Committee should be appointed to inquire into the cause of the explosion, and that Committee assembled at Malta on the 24th January, and at once proceeded with the investigation. Now, in the first place, it is necessary, in order that the House may appreciate the Report of the Committee, that I should state very shortly the nature of the arrangements for working the guns and the general arrangements on board the ship. My Lords, the ship is a vessel with two turrets, and in each turret there were two guns. In the after turret of the ship the guns were 35 tons; but in the forward turret there were 38-ton guns. These larger guns, being of the length of 16 feet 6 inches, it was impossible to load them in the turret, and arrangements were made to draw in the guns from their position, and lower or depress the muzzle, so that they might be loaded from the battery deck. In addition to this, there was an arrangement to wash out, as well as load, the guns by hydraulic power ; and there was also a contrivance that when the rammer which, made like a telescope in two joints, had reached the breach of the gun, it should indicate that the washing was completed, so that it might be known to the crew if the gun was not properly washed out. There was also an ingenious contrivance by which the head of the rammer admitted water into the gun, so as to allow it to be thoroughly washed out. Those were the general arrangements connected with the gun. Well, my Lords, on the 2nd January, an order was given for an electrical broadside to be fired. It was accordingly fired, and taking the Report of the Committee as correct—and I am not going to dispute that ; but taking it for granted that it is correct—according to the Report, the order having been given for an electrical broadside to be fired, out of the four guns two missed fire, one in the aft turret and one in the fore turret. The Report states that the 38-ton gun missed fire, but that none of the four men who were appointed specially to attend to the gun perceived it. When the gun was discharged there was a recoil, but that recoil was not always sufficient to admit of the gun being put into position to be re-loaded, and therefore the natural recoil was supplemented by its being drawn back by hydraulic power; after which it was depressed by means of a lever. The House must imagine an arrangement by which the lever was worked by one of the men, and the effect was that the gun was drawn back exactly into the proper position to enable it to be loaded. Now, the Committee report that the lever was drawn by the man, and that he brought back the gun without its having had the proper recoil; but the other three men who were watching the gun did not notice the circumstance, which is, to say the least, a little surprising. Then it appears that the next step was that the muzzle of the gun was to be lowered for the purpose of washing and re-loading ; and according to the statement of the Committee, the men whose duty it was to re-load it knew as little of the state of the gun as the men who were above and whose duty it was to depress it. It appears that the gun had not been washed out ; but, it was said, the indicator was out of order and did not act—the consequence was that they thought the gun had been properly washed out, and therefore they proceeded to load it. Now, my Lords, the gun being 16 feet 6 inches in length, it had already a charge in it occupying no less a space than 5 feet, and the effect of their putting another charge of 5 feet into it was that out of a space of 16 feet 6 inches—the whole length of the bore of the gun—no less than 10 feet was occupied by the double charge, and it was stated that the man who loaded it never discovered it. Here, my Lords, is a picture of the gun itself, by which you will see how very small a portion of it was left after two projectiles, two cartridges, and two wads had been rammed into it. Well, my Lords, the gun having been sent up, as it was supposed, all right, it was ordered to be fired, and the effect was that it burst with the most disastrous consequences. Now, my Lords, permit me to call your Lordships' attention to the failures which took place in reference to the gun. First of all, the electrical appliances failed to fire the guns; then the men above failed to see after the first firing that the gun had not recoiled; then the men below, who had still more important duties to perform, failed to see that the gun was not properly washed out; the telescope rammer failed to ram, the indicator failed to indicate. Such, my Lords, were the failures connected with the loading of the gun. Now, my Lords, I wish to call your attention to this—If these failures happened when the men were quietly at practice, without any excitement, without any enemy, what must be expected amidst the hurry, noise, and confusion of an action at sea ? My Lords, is the safety of our ships, and the honour of our flag, to be intrusted to these delicate and complex arrangements which fail even in common practice at sea where they are being worked in a quiet and leisurely manner ? My Lords, this is a very serious question ; but beyond that there is another question still more serious. My Lords, if, as it appears, these guns missed fire, it might also happen that the guns might hang fire, and if such an event occurred, and the gun hung fire, the men might not know it, it might be depressed for the purpose of re-loading, and if it went off when it was so depressed, it would infallibly sink the ship. A similar catastrophe might also follow if the sponge failed to work properly, for in that case the new cartridge might be prematurely ignited by the smouldering remains of its predecessor; it might explode in the process of loading, and the effect would be, probably, to blow out the side of the ship below the water-mark. Now, my Lords, in these days of scientific slaughter, our sailors are liable to be killed in a variety of ways; they have to encounter in their front these monster guns; they have Gatling guns pointed at them from above, and torpedoes in the water beneath them; and if, in addition to these dangers, they are to have guns that are apt to burst in the process of firing, I want to know how we can expect our sailors to go into battle with the resolute courage which has heretofore distinguished them? As to the Committee, I have noted what they say is the cause of this disaster, and I have looked with some attention to the evidence which was taken. It seems to me that the Report is not drawn in accordance with the evidence. The witnesses as to the recoil of the gun declare that it is impossible to suppose that the hydraulic action of the lever could have been mistaken for the natural recoil. However that may be, and whether they are right or wrong, it appears to me that it is necessary that there should be a most careful inquiry into the subject, because it is impossible to allow these heavy guns to be loaded and fired upon this principle without making provision for the safety of the men, and without making an improvement in the arrangement by which the guns are loaded. The Committee recommend the retention of this system of loading, but that improved arrangements should be made. My Lords, there is a great responsibility incurred by those who advocate the continuance of this mode of loading, and that certainly is a part of the subject which ought to be fully and carefully looked into. With regard to the Report of the Committee, I have examined the evidence, and find that Captain Noble, who is a member of the firm of Sir William Armstrong, was one of the witnesses, and the tendency of his evidence, it appears to me, was to throw the responsibility on the men and not upon the gun. The gun, it is true, was blown to pieces; but the pieces remain; the men, however, are dead and cannot be heard, so that there are no means of testing the accuracy of the evidence. But the Committee have accepted Captain Noble's view of the case, and attribute all these failures to the men to whom the arrangements for the working of the gun were intrusted, and the Committee think that it is shown conclusively that the gun itself was not to blame. I do hope that, after the Report of the Committee, the authorities will bring home the fellow-gun, and test it under exactly similar conditions. That is what the Committee recommended. The importance of the subject cannot be over-estimated, and therefore I trust that there will be a thorough inquiry, by scientific men acquainted with artillery, into these guns, as well as into the system adopted for loading them, and that that will be followed, if necessary, by the introduction of improved arrangements in order to restore that confidence to the minds of those who are engaged in the Naval Service of this country, in the working of the large guns which it is all important they should possess.

Lord SUDELEY: My Lords, I quite concur with the noble Duke (the Duke of Somerset) that this is a question of the greatest possible importance. So far as the Report of the Committee is concerned, it shows conclusively, I think, that the form and construction of the guns, and the manner in which they are welded together, is undoubtedly good. The noble Duke has criticized somewhat strongly the system of hydraulic loading; but it must be remembered that that system is being adopted by other nations, although it can only be regarded in its infancy. It is quite impossible, in the present day, when naval armaments are constructed of such enormous magnitude, that the working of the guns could be accomplished by manual labour, and, therefore, the use of machinery is a necessity. My Lords, the witnesses who were examined before the Committee have shown that two very satisfactory conditions have been proved by the explosion — First, that the hydraulic gear and loading apparatus is not really thrown out by concussion, and that the turret itself is not liable to jamb. So far as the loading apparatus is concerned, it is a remarkable fact, and one which has not been in any way disputed, that, notwithstanding the enormous concussion which must have taken place, the hydraulic apparatus was not destroyed, and the other turret gun was capable of being used immediately after the explosion. It may be, therefore, considered that that point concerning the suitability of the apparatus to the turret itself is disposed of satisfactorily. The Committee then proceed to point out the cause of the accident, which they attribute to three errors, which all occurred together, and they state that if the three had not occurred simultaneously the accident could not have arisen. First of all, the gun missed fire; secondly, the man having charge of the lever did not watch the gun when it was supposed to be fired; and, thirdly, the indicator of the rammer had been broken and had not been replaced. It appears, then, that if these errors had not occurred, the accident could not possibly have taken place; but still experience has now shown that dangerous accidents of this nature may be expected, and I therefore trust that the noble Lord will be able to assure the House that the Admiralty see no difficulty to making such improvements as will prevent the possibility of such an accident occurring again. There appears to me to be no good reason why all danger of such accidents should not be removed. I do not want to trouble your Lordships with any lengthened remarks, but I must say that, in my opinion, the noble Duke was a little severe in his criticisms of Captain Noble. That gentleman is well known as a great artillerist, and has a world-wide reputation as one of the most competent authorities on explosives. My Lords, I have ascertained that the Italian Navy, who have some of the largest ordnance worked by hydraulics on board their ships, have given orders that all matters connected with the management of the motive power to work the guns shall be placed in the hands of the officer who alone is authorized to touch the levers, and I think the same precaution should be taken in our ships. My Lords, we have now, not only 38-ton guns, but 100-ton guns, and everybody must be aware that it is absolutely impossible to do anything with them, except machinery is employed; it is therefore the duty of the Government to do all that they can to prevent the recurrence of such accidents. Your Lordships are perhaps aware that, during the last eight or ten years, numerous improvements have been made in naval gunnery; and Sir William Armstrong has discovered, in experimenting with a number of guns, that he is able to produce guns which, weight for weight with the present gun, possess double the penetrating power. This is a matter of enormous importance, and is effected by giving a larger powder chamber and considerably lengthening the guns—in fact, making them 26 calibres instead of 16. I think that it is most desirable that this matter should not be allowed to stand over, but that a competent Committee of artillerists and gunners should be appointed to consider the question. I am told that the Admiralty propose to re-appoint the Ordnance Select Committee; and, indeed, after the occurrence of this calamity, I think it is absolutely necessary that it should be re-appointed. I hope, also, that, if it is appointed, it will be a judicial Committee, and not an inventors' one; and that if any officer on that Committee became an inventor, he should at once retire from it. What we want is a thoroughly unprejudiced Committee, who shall be appointed to consider all these questions. With reference to the disaster itself I should like to say one word more, and that is, that the explosion of the gun on board the *Thunderer* having called general attention to the construction of our guns, I trust the Government will see the necessity of ascertaining whether it is not possible that some alteration should be made, and that, instead of the Admiralty being compelled to take all their guns from another Department of the Government—thus involving a double responsibility on it—they should be allowed to go into the open market and avail themselves of the assistance of persons possessing the highest skill and knowledge—as the Admiralty have the power of doing with respect both to ships and engines. It is a deplorable thing that on every occasion they should be obliged to hold themselves aloof from improvements, because they have not the authority of another Department to adopt them. On the first occasion when this ship was armed, 35-ton guns were put into her; but the Admiralty shortly afterwards discovered that that gun was no better than a 25-ton gun; and then, and not until then, did they seek advice outside the Department, when it was discovered that a larger gun than a 38-ton gun could be used if loaded by hydraulic power. We should be very much behind other nations if we continued to use the old system. I cordially concur with the noble Duke in hoping that the Admiralty will carry the wish of the Committee that the portions of the exploded gun, as well as its fellow, should be brought home to be examined. I must say that I am extremely glad that the Admiralty sent out Mr. Bramwell, a civil engineer of the highest eminence, well known for his judicial character and discernment. The naval officers on the Committee could not have been better selected. Admiral Luard, Admiral Boys, and Captain Singer were, without exception, admirably fitted for the task, and I think the First Lord deserves the highest credit for having selected them. The verdict of such a Committee cannot be controverted. In conclusion, I have to thank your Lordships very much for the patient attention with which you have received these few cursory remarks.

Lord ELPHINSTONE: My Lords, I think your Lordships will agree with me that many of the questions which have been brought before you in connection with this subject are extremely important. But, in the first place, before giving my answer to them, I may mention that some of the Papers on the subject were not issued before Saturday; and I fear that many of your Lordships have not as yet had an opportunity of reading the Report of the Committee, and still less the evidence on which that Report is based. I am, however, sure of one thing, and that is that the whole of your Lordships have read the short telegraphic summary of the Report which appeared in the newspapers some weeks ago, and that all of your Lordships must have read that communication with great astonishment. How is it possible, you must have asked yourselves, that a gun, manned as that was, could have been fired without notice having been taken that one gun only went off, and not two? If the gun had missed fire, would not the fact of the absence of the recoil have given clear testimony that it had not gone off?—and supposing these two points had escaped notice, is it possible to conceive anything more unlikely than that one charge should have been rammed home on the top of another without the fact being discovered, when we remember the enormous weight of the charge, especially when, as in this case, the charge occupied a space in the bore of the gun of no less than 4 feet 9 inches, upon which was rammed one of 4 feet 7 inches? These are questions, my Lords, which I say must have occurred to every one of your Lordship's minds, and they are questions which we might find it difficult to answer. Now, in order to make myself clear, or better understood, I may, perhaps, briefly explain the construction and working of the turret, although the noble Duke who introduced this question (the Duke of Somerset) has touched upon it. The turret may be described as a circular heavily-plated shield, revolving upon its own axis, about 31 feet in diameter, and weighing about 400 tons. Inside the turret there are two gun-slides placed parallel to each other, on which are the gun carriages bearing two 38-ton guns. These guns are loaded by hydraulic power, applied by means of a lever placed at the side of the turret and under the control of one of the gunners. Immediately below the firing port are two other ports, which open to what is called the battery-deck, which is below the other deck, and through it the operation of loading is carried on. The turret, when the gun is being loaded, is swung round until the ports are opposite to the hydraulic loading apparatus on the battery-deck, the muzzle is depressed, and the charge is pushed home by means of an hydraulic rammer, which I will explain presently more at length. The *Thunderer* had two turrets, one fore and one aft; the one aft being furnished with two guns of 35-tons each, worked and loaded by hand, and requiring 22 men in the turret; while the fore turret was furnished with two guns of 38-tons each, worked by the hydraulic apparatus, with 10 men in the turret as against the 22 required to work the lighter and shorter guns. I do not know that I need give your Lordships a detailed description of the turret, because it is described very clearly in the Report of the Committee, which is in your Lordship's hands; but I will at once proceed to answer the questions which have been suggested, and which really are but three in number. The first is as regards the sound. I know of more than one instance of miss-fire in which one gun went off and the other did not, and in either case it was thought by those within the turret that both guns had gone off. It is clear, therefore, that sound in itself is no indication whatever of the gun's having gone off—and it is a curious fact that the guns in the after turret being fired at the same time as those in the fore turret, it was found that one of them had missed fire also. Sound, or the absence of sound, therefore, being no indication as to whether the gun had gone off, what is to be said with reference to recoil, or the absence of recoil, which is more difficult to explain to your Lordships? All the witnesses who could have given evidence on this point, with the exception of one man, were unfortunately killed, and his evidence goes rather to prove that the gun did not fail, and that the recoil did take place; but on the supposition that he made a mistake—and the Committee evidently considered that he was mistaken—the absence of recoil not having been noticed may be explained in this way. In the first place, the recoil was not of itself sufficient to bring the gun in far enough for loading, and it had to be assisted by hydraulic power. The gun is fired and the recoil is checked by water compressors or buffers at the time of firing, and has to be supplemented by hydraulic running-in-gear. The man who has the lever in his hand has to apply it at the moment the explosion takes place, and in this instance he applied the hydraulic power directly he heard the explosion. The guns, at the time the accident occurred, were to have been fired simultaneously by electricity, not from the turret itself, but from the pilot-tower on deck, so that no one in the turret knew when to expect the discharge. The man stationed at the running-in-lever very likely—I do not say that it was so, but it is more than likely was not watching the gun at the time of the recoil, and then directly he heard the explosion, naturally thinking that both guns had gone off, he applied the lever, and the gun came in, though slower, it is true, than would have been the case if it had been discharged and the recoil had taken place. Then, I think, the gun being fired to windward, it is very likely, as the Committee suggest, that a good deal of smoke came back into the turret, so that the officer could not see. Your Lordships will recollect that it is only the first part of the recoil that is caused by the firing, the second part being caused by the hydraulic power. Under the supposition that both guns had gone off, the turret was brought into the loading position, and the order was given to "sponge and load." The loading was not effected there, but the gun was run on to the battery-deck, and a new charge was pushed into it by means of the hydraulic rammer. That rammer is telescopic—that is, it consists of two parts, an inner and an outer tube, and in loading the outer tube advances first and carries with it the inner tube, and when the outer tube has reached the fullest extent of its thrust, the inner tube commences to work and completes the ramming; so that, though the first part of the ramming can be seen by the men outside, the latter half—that is, the part done by the inner tube—cannot be seen. One of the experiments tried by the Committee was to see whether it was possible to double-load the gun without knowing it.

> "January 29.—Experiment F.—The object of this experiment was to ascertain whether two separate charges could be rammed home by the hydraulic rammer without the men attending the loading being made aware of it by the peculiar working of the rammer when sending home the present charge. The right gun of the foremost turret was loaded with a battering charge (dummy), Palliser's shell and wad, and then with a full charge (dummy), common shell and wad. Result.—The men attending the loading could not have noticed, by any peculiar working of the hydraulic rammer, that the second charge was being sent home."

I myself tried the same experiment on board the *Dreadnought* on Friday last. I had the gun double-loaded, and then the rammer forced home, and there was nothing whatever to indicate to me that there were two charges in the gun. The only way we have at present of knowing the position of the rammer within the bore of the gun is by means of a "tell-tale" to which is attached a piece of string secured to the rammer head; but this often got out of order, and we know at the time of the explosion the tell-tale was not in order. My Lords, I have now endeavoured to show—first, that sound is no guide; secondly, that the absence of the recoil, not being noticed, might be accounted for; and, thirdly, that two charges could be rammed home one on the top of the other without being noticed, provided that the tell-tale was out of order. What happened was this—the miss-fire was not noticed by those inside the turret; it was, of course, unknown to those outside the turret; the order was given to "sponge and load," and a second charge was rammed home;—the gun was fired, and burst. What followed I cannot describe better than by reading Captain Chatfield's own simple statement—

> "On the morning of the 2nd of January the squadron was dispersed for target practice, the guns were loaded with battering charges and Palliser shell. An electric broadside was fired at the target about 400 yards. The guns were then loaded with full charge (86 lb.) and a common empty shell, and the order was given to fire the guns independently—turret on the move. The right gun of the fore turret was then fired at 1,000 yards at the target. About two or three minutes afterwards the left gun was fired at about the same range when it burst, explosively, destroying the top of the turret and damaging the inside, but not sufficiently to prevent firing the right gun and moving the turret. The gases from the explosion went down below into the shell-room and aft through the stoke-holes into the engine-room, knocking down the stokers who were in the after stoke-hole attending the fires, and putting out all lights. The bulkheads on both sides of the shell-room were destroyed, and pieces of broken metal—turret and gun—damaged the deck in several places; otherwise the ship was not damaged. There were one officer and nine men in the turret at the time of the explosion; seven men and one officer were killed; captain of turret lived two days; captain of the gun that was fired, though severely wounded, is still alive; one officer and one man were killed on battery-deck and 35 men wounded. The burning material was blown in the shell-room by the explosion. The magazine and whole of the lower part of the ship were filled with black smoke, and the battery-deck was filled with burning materials. The 'still' was sounded immediately after the explosion, the fire-bell rung. Every man immediately went to his station. The shell-room was partly flooded, and the fire was almost immediately extinguished, no part of the ship itself having taken fire. The shell-room party went below into the shell-room and extinguished the fire without waiting for orders. Two men caught hold of the powder cases, containing 85 lb. of powder each, and took them upon the upper deck, the lids of one of the cases having been blown off by the explosion. I immediately signalled for medical assistance and steamed down to the Fleet."

Here, my Lords, it is plain that two charges were fired at once, and, therefore, there could be no doubt as to the cause of the accident. Here we have a ship engaged in simple gunnery practice, and, therefore, there was a total absence of that excitement which leads men to forget danger in action. In one moment, without warning, men were knocked down, lights were blown out, the deck below was filled with smoke, and burning materials were forced even into the shell-room. Within the turret all but two were killed, and without the turret the dead and wounded were mixed together in darkness. No one knew what had happened. The ship might be damaged, or she might be sinking. The "still" was sounded, and no one moved. The "still," I may explain, is a bugle-call, which, when sounded, obliges everyone, no matter what he is doing, to stand still and wait for the next order. The fire-bell was then rung, and everyone immediately went to his fire station. What I say is this—and I am sure your Lordships will admit it—that such conduct reflects the highest credit on Captain Chatfield and the crew, and shows the admirable state of discipline which must have prevailed. Well, my Lords, a Court of Inquiry was ordered, composed of the senior officers present; and they came to the conclusion that the gun had burst, owing to the projectile having slipped forward in the bore, leaving an air space between it and the cartridge. On the arrival of the ship at Malta, a second Court of Inquiry was held, consisting of three naval officers and three officers of the Royal Artillery, and their Report is in your Lordships' hands, and I think it is one of a most exhaustive character. They have made a series of experiments, in order to ascertain whether the charge slipped forward on the withdrawal of the rammer; and, although the projectile might have slipped, if not secured by a wad, the cartridge never slipped. But, as a fact, a wad is invariably used, and, on trial, it was found that it required a very considerable amount of force to move the wad after its having been rammed home. The Committee, therefore, looked, as your Lordships will, for some other conclusion than that which was come to in the Sea of Marmora. The evidence shows that it took the united power of four men to bring the wad down, and I have been informed by a telegram sent by Captain Noble that several experiments have been tried with respect to striking the wad in the bore, at distances of 2, 3, and 4 feet, and not the slightest damage was done to the gun. The noble Duke said—and I am bound to admit it—that the captain and two of the company are of opinion that three shots left the ship on that occasion; while, on the other hand, four men, stationed aloft, one of them a signalman, whose special duty it was to watch the firing, maintain that only two shots left the ship. Now, the third shot was safe in the 35-ton gun of the after-turret, and two only left the ship. What, then, became of the fourth shot, unless it was left in the gun owing to a miss-fire? The Committee rely, however, greatly upon the evidence of the gun itself—and that is a silent witness that cannot make a mistake. In the first place, the recoil, when the gun exploded, smashed the buffers in the rear, which, with one charge, could not have occurred; and, as I have already mentioned, the recoil has always to be supplemented by hydraulic power, in order to bring the gun sufficiently far in for loading. Then, there are marks upon the broken portions of the gun that show most clearly that a projectile passed down the bore in the rear of the charge that burst the gun, and part of a stud that had belonged to the shell first rammed home was also picked up; added to which, Captain Noble, who was examined at great length and whose evidence is well worth reading, maintains that an air space, even if it existed at all, would not have caused the bursting of the gun. The Committee, therefore, came to the conclusion that the explosion was caused, not by an air space, but owing to the gun having been loaded with two charges, and they came to that opinion unanimously. I say unanimously, for, in order to prevent the possibility of any one member of the Committee being biassed in any degree by the opinion of any other member, the president called upon each member to write his opinion on a slip of paper. They all did so, and when the papers were opened, not only were they unanimous, but the very words used were almost identical. My Lords, I will not dwell any longer on this part of the case. All that I will say is that the Admiralty fully approve of the Report, and accept the verdict given. I know that there are some men who do not accept it, and among them men whose opinions are entitled to great weight. Some men who are capable of weighing evidence do not accept it. But an opportunity will be afforded shortly for a settlement of this question; for I have to inform the House that it is the intention of the Admiralty to act on the recommendation of the Committee and bring the remaining 38-ton gun home, when it will be subjected to a series of test-trials which cannot fail to be of the greatest value. Now, my Lords, I will for one moment allude to the steps that are proposed to be taken to prevent the recurrence of such an accident. In the first place, I may say that the gun was a Woolwich gun, and not an Armstrong one. It is proposed that the hydraulic ram should be altered, so that the inner tube shall be the first to move, instead of the outer one, as at present, and so that we shall be able to watch the action of the last part of the ramming. It is also proposed that two "tell-tales" shall be used instead of one, so fitted, that if one of them gets out of order, the other will act; but if both of them get out of order, the rammer itself shall cease to work. It is proposed that the gun shall be searched after it has been fired, and before being re-loaded, in order to make sure that it has gone off. It is also proposed that there shall be a general order given that the charge shall be tested in the gun after loading and before firing; and by an improved mechanical arrangement the lever for running the gun in shall be so altered that it will not act until after the recoil of the gun; and, further, that greater facility for communication between those inside and outside the turret shall be provided, and—what is very important indeed—that a new kind of electric tube shall be supplied, which will be much less liable to miss fire. It will be a satisfaction to your Lordships to know that the materials and workmanship of the gun were everything that could be desired, and there does not appear to be the most remote reason to apprehend any danger in firing this description of gun with the heaviest charges. The hydraulic gear is not damaged, the turret was capable of revolving, and the remaining gun could have been worked after the explosion. As to the mode of loading, we do not propose to make any change, and for this reason—that owing to the length of the 38-ton gun, it cannot be loaded in any other way, unless we were prepared to increase the diameter of the turret, and so increase the weight enormously. If it be absolutely necessary to have a gun of such a length, it is also absolutely necessary that it should be loaded by an hydraulic rammer, and the experience of these experiments has shown us that no part of the accident is owing to the failure of the hydraulic rammer. The noble Duke has called attention to the danger that might arise from the depression of a gun, in the event of its hanging fire; but there is no instance on record of a large gun having hung fire, and even if it did, the danger is not so great as the noble Duke apprehends, because the muzzle of the gun must naturally be above the side of the vessel altogether, even when it is depressed for the purpose of loading. That leads me to a question that has been slightly touched upon, and that is the question of breech-loading. Before I say anything on that, I must point out the great differences of opinion that exist in all matters relating to gunnery. With every civilized Power endeavouring to arrive at the most perfect weapon, it may be supposed that there is some particular form of weapon that is decidedly superior to all others. But what is the case? Here, in England, there are eminent authorities maintaining that our present mode of construction is wrong, and the principal makers are at variance, not only upon the construction of the guns, but upon the very materials to be used. Sir William Armstrong uses steel and wrought iron; Sir Joseph Whitworth uses steel throughout; and Captain Palliser uses steel and cast iron for the manufacture of guns; while in construction Sir William Armstrong uses a large number of moderate-sized coils, and Woolwich a small number of large coils. Projectiles, also, differ in form and material, and there are also several kinds of powder in use. Looking abroad, we find a similar difference of opinion existing—the fact being that gunnery is an experimental science. Certain results may be obtained by a particular gun; but it by no means follows that by increasing the size of the gun a corresponding increase of result will follow, and so it is with breech-loading. Sir William Armstrong was what I may call one of the pioneers of breech-loading; but now he, from his increased experience, prefers muzzle-loading, and for this reason—that whenever the number of the parts of a gun is increased, the more likely is that gun to get out of order. In a turret or a casemate there is this objection also, that when the breech-piece is removed to load the gun, there is likely to be a rush of gas into the turret that would drive the men out. No doubt, this may be got over; but I merely mention it as one of the various objections that have been raised, and must be met. As to the comparative value of the guns, there seems to be but little difference between those loading at the breech, or those loading at the muzzle. One of Sir William Armstrong's many experiments was testing one gun against another under precisely similar conditions—one loading at the breech and the other at the muzzle—and the result showed no superiority for either. The Admiralty have no feeling one way or the other. They have no prejudice in favour of muzzle-loading; but all they want is to get the best weapon; and if it can be shown that breech-loading is the better system, breech-loading will be adopted. I may mention at the present time that the Admiralty have under their consideration the best mode of fitting turrets for heavy breech-loading guns; and if we go on increasing the length of our guns, it is possible that a different mode of loading them will have to be adopted, and everything points in the direction of increasing the length, for with the slow-burning powder now in use the length of the gun necessarily increases the power. To illustrate what I mean, I may say that when a 35-ton gun was increased 3 feet, it then became a 38-ton gun, and the penetrating power at 1,000 yards was quite equal to the penetrating power of the 35-ton gun at 500 yards. But, my Lords, I will not dwell on these technicalities. The subject is a very large one, and one that cannot be more than lightly touched upon in your Lordships' House. It is a question that will have to be submitted to the Committee, and it is the intention of the Government that it shall be considered by the Ordnance Committee forthwith. My Lords, in conclusion, I have only to thank your Lordships for the attentive manner in which the House has listened to this somewhat lengthened statement.

VISCOUNT CARDWELL: My Lords, I do not wish to occupy your Lordships' time by prolonging the conversation upon this intricate and difficult subject; but I do not think it would be right, after the statement we have just heard, if I did not acknowledge its exceeding clearness and power, and the admirable manner in which this technical subject has been explained to the House. I cannot but acknowledge also the great propriety of the course which the noble Lord opposite (Lord Elphinstone) has indicated. What we want is the very best gun that can be obtained, and, at the same time, the very safest one. We do not want to spare the money that is necessary for that purpose; but we want to get the best gun; and of all the considerations to be kept in view, safety is the first. I believe this is the first great gun that has ever burst on service since the Woolwich system was introduced; and that both Services, the Navy and the Royal Artillery, have had in the safety of those guns an unbounded confidence. I listened with great pleasure to the statement which my noble Friend, now Secretary of State for India, made last year of the excellence of our guns, and of his confidence in the muzzle-loading system now adopted at Woolwich, both as regards material and mode of manufacture. At the same time, it is quite right that the Government should always be open to consider whether any improvement is possible; and I think it is not improbable, though I am only expressing my own opinion, that in proportion as a gun is made longer, arguments may be brought forward in favour of breech-loading which have not been clearly shown in the smaller guns. One thing is apparent, as the gun is lengthened, so the power increases. You have also introduced a milder powder, and this may prove to be in favour of the breech-loader. I believe, however, the opinion of the noble Lord who has just spoken is still the prevailing one; and certainly I am not prepared to object to it. Whatever may be the opinion of the authorities of the Admiralty and the War Office as to the mode of loading, there is no question but that they are both interested in getting the best possible gun. The noble Duke (the Duke of Somerset) has brought to the attention of the House a most interesting subject, and it has been most ably treated. Some of the most experienced sailors and eminent artillerists have examined the matter very closely, and have come to an unanimous Report, with the aid of a very eminent civil engineer, which I hope will entirely disabuse the minds of any who have felt the slightest want of confidence in the guns in consequence of this accident. I trust that the Admiralty and the War Office will always work harmoniously together, and always command that confidence on the part of the community that is so necessary for the good of the country. My noble Friend near me (Lord Sudeley), in the interesting speech which he made following the noble Duke, expressed a hope that the Committee which is to be appointed will be a judicial one, and not one of inventors. I, for one, hope that it will be a Committee composed of persons in whom the country will have unbounded confidence.

RIVERS CONSERVANCY BILL.—(No. 20.)

(*The Lord President.*)

SECOND READING.

Order of the Day for the Second Reading, read.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª."—(*The Lord President.*)

THE DUKE OF MANCHESTER, in criticizing some of the provisions of the Bill, said, he was of opinion that greater powers should be given to the Conservators to improve the navigation of the rivers, and thus prevent that accumulation in their beds which was the cause of floods. The new Conservancy Board ought to take all the existing navigation powers; because it was too often the case that when private navigation companies possessed the power of navigating the rivers, their condition depended almost entirely upon whether the navigation paid, because, if it did not, they allowed the rivers to silt up, and thus obstructions were caused. There was one provision in the Bill to which he strongly objected. It proposed to give power to rate the uplands which were not benefited by the alterations or improvements made in the river. The reason for which the proposal was made was that the floods were largely caused by the new underground drainage system; but that was a view in which he did not concur, although the Committee of the

House of Lords did. On the contrary, he thought that underground drainage, by keeping the land dry, and thus in a condition to absorb water as it fell, tended to prevent rather than to increase floods. Most of the witnesses before the Committee asserted that under-draining caused floods, but gave no reasons for their opinion, except Mr. Bailey Denton, who stated that, if an inch of rain fell, half-an-inch went through the drains, in addition to the inch flowing off the land. He could not see where the extra half-an-inch came from. Mr. Rawlinson, on the other hand, contended that the floods were caused by the water falling on water; and he (the Duke of Manchester) was of opinion that the removal of obstructions in the beds of the rivers would materially lessen floods, and much would be done in the way of preventing the water remaining on the low-lying meadow lands. Under this Bill, however, occupiers of land in the Buckinghamshire hills would be taxed for improvements effected on the Ouse, miles away in the Fen district, and that appeared to him to be most unjust. No doubt, in some cases, very heavy works would have to be made in the outfalls; but he thought the Ouse might be easily dealt with, and that the works need not be of the very extensive character that had been proposed. It was most unfair to compel farmers, who were suffering from a succession of bad seasons, to pay a rate of this kind, which had never been demanded from them before, to effect improvements from which they would derive no benefit whatever.

Earl COWPER said, he was very glad that there was to be no serious opposition to the Bill in their Lordships' House, and he hoped that the measure would be as successful in "another place," where it would doubtless be thoroughly sifted. The floods might perhaps in some cases not damage meadow lands, yet they did most serious damage in many cases, and no doubt their Lordships were asked to make some compensation in consequence. With the exception of one gentleman, all the witnesses examined before the Committee of their Lordships' House which sat upon this question in 1877 stated in evidence that the draining caused a great increase in the floods. It made the rise of the water much quicker than before. There could be no doubt whatever but that the question as to whether the uplands should be rated for the purposes of the Bill would be seriously considered in "another place." As to the manner in which it was proposed that the Conservancy Boards should be elected, he contended that as the Boards were intrusted with rating powers, and as a certain amount of discontent existed from the way in which the rates were distributed, it would be right to allow the ratepayers to elect the Boards, rather than have them consist of life-members appointed by the Local Government Board, with power themselves to fill up any vacancy caused by death. The concession, however, might be guarded with the proviso that the person elected must be a landowner. By granting it, they would maintain the principle that taxation should always be accompanied by representation. Another point to which he objected was the extreme caution that was shown in guarding private property. This caution was carried to such an extreme extent as to interfere, he thought, with the operation of the Bill. For instance, the power to remove obstructions in rivers should be further considered, with the view of the provisions being made to work more efficiently against reluctant owners. Many of the provisions of the Bill would have to be carefully considered in Committee; but there could be no objection to its second reading.

The Marquess of RIPON considered that his noble Friend (the Duke of Richmond and Gordon) had very fairly fulfilled the pledge that he gave last year by bringing this Bill forward, which appeared to be founded altogether on the Report of the Committee of their Lordships' House in 1877. Having been a Member of that Committee, and having had his share in the responsibility for that Report, he naturally viewed the main provisions of the measure with approval; but there were one or two points connected with it on which he desired to make a few observations, and with regard to which he would be glad of some explanation from his noble Friend the Lord President. In the first place, he would not follow the noble Duke opposite into the question of the rating powers, as regarded uplands, given under the Bill after the judicious observations which his noble Friend behind him (Earl Cowper) had made upon the point; but the whole question was a most difficult one, and it must be remembered that it had been fully considered in Committee; and he must say that he shared in the opinion at which they arrived—that uplands should bear, at least, some share of the cost. He did not altogether understand how his noble Friend proposed to deal with the different existing Conservancy Boards. One of the great evils that existed at present in regard to this matter was the great number of different Conservancy authorities that had to deal with the same rivers. These different authorities often came into conflict with each other. The Committee had recommended that this state of things should, as far as possible, be brought to an end, and that a single Board should be established for each river. His noble Friend probably intended to get rid of the numerous existing authorities by the latter part of the 38th clause; but he (the Marquess of Ripon) felt by no means sure that the words proposed in the Bill would have that effect, especially where they were not consenting parties, and he hoped that point would be considered before going into Committee. Then, with respect to the election of the new Conservancy Boards, as governed by Sub-section 5 of Clause 6. He confessed that in principle he did not like the system of secondary election; but, waiving that question in the present case, what he wished to point out was, that whereas under this Bill the occupiers of land were to pay half the rates, the arrangements made for representing them upon the Conservancy Boards were altogether inadequate. Not less than one-third of the Board was to be composed of landowners owning land to the amount of £300 a-year, and the other two-thirds were to be elected by the sanitary or Conservancy authorities; even of that two-thirds, one-half must always be landowners, in many cases the whole, or nearly the whole, would be so; the result would be that the tenant-farmers might be almost wholly excluded. Under no circumstances could they form more than one-third of the Board. The question was one in which tenant-farmers took a considerable interest, and he thought the proportion of the representation allotted to them would not prove satisfactory. He belonged to a Conservancy Board on which farmers sat, and had found them always intelligent and useful members; and he thought that when they had to pay half the rates they should have a much larger share in the representation of the Board than was proposed in the Bill. He did not make these observations in hostility; but thought some improvement of this sort would facilitate its passing, and, at the same time, greatly increase its utility.

THE EARL OF REDESDALE (CHAIRMAN of COMMITTEES) said, that some of the provisions of the Bill would require careful consideration, especially the rating clauses. To place upon the proprietors of uplands a tax which had never been suggested before, and for which they obtained no advantage, was unjust. The artificial obstructions in rivers in the floodlands' districts by dams and weirs made therein by the proprietors for their own advantage were the chief causes of the floods complained of.

THE DUKE OF RICHMOND AND GORDON said, that it would be his duty to consider carefully, before the Bill went into Committee, all the points that had been raised in the discussion, and, if possible, to give effect to them. The noble Duke who had spoken first (the Duke of Manchester) and the noble Earl (the Chairman of Committees) had complained that the uplands were to be taxed under the Bill; but all he could say was that a noble Friend told him the other night that the Bill was a good one, but he could not see why lowlands only should have to pay. In dealing with a difficult subject, his difficulties had been much enhanced by so complete a divergence of opinion as existed between his noble Friends. On one occasion complaints were made that it was proposed to tax the uplands; on another that the lowlands would be taxed and the uplands let alone. If these conflicting views were attended to, the result would be that no areas at all would be taxed under the Bill. His task, then, had been arduous; but he believed that the Bill, in all essential particulars, would be found satisfactory. It was in all essentials in accordance with the recommendations of the Committee; and with regard to the suggestion of the noble Marquess opposite (the Marquess of Ripon) as to the 38th clause, he thought it gave sufficient power to carry out the objects for which the Bill was undertaken. He would, however, consider that point before the Committee was reached, and if he saw his way to improving it he would certainly do so. He must make the same remark in regard to the 6th clause, and he thought the noble Marquess would give him credit for not doing anything which was opposed to the interests of the British farmer. He proposed to take the Committee on the Bill on that day fortnight.

Motion *agreed to;* Bill read 2^a accordingly, and *committed* to a Committee of the Whole House on *Monday* the 31*st instant.*

DISQUALIFICATION BY MEDICAL RELIEF BILL.—(No 6.)

(*The Lord Aberdare.*)

SECOND READING.

Order of the Day for the Second Reading, read.

The Duke of RICHMOND and GORDON said, that the measure had come up from the other House; and as he should have to suggest some Amendments, which would not, however, go to the extent of rejecting the measure, he should prefer its postponement.

Second Reading *put off* to *Friday* next.

House adjourned at half past Seven o'clock, till To-morrow, half past Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Monday, 17*th March,* 1879.

MINUTES.]—Supply—*considered in Committee*—Army Estimates.

Private Bill (*by Order*)—*Second Reading*—Easton Neston Mineral and Towcester, Roade, and Olney Junction Railway*.

Public Bills—*Ordered*—*First Reading*—Employers' Liability [103]; Land Drainage Provisional Order (Bispham, &c.)* [104].

Considered as amended—District Auditors* [79].

Third Reading—Oyster and Mussel Fisheries Order (Blackwater, Essex)* [76], and *passed.*

QUESTIONS.

IRELAND—THE DUBLIN PORT AND DOCKS BOARD.—QUESTION.

Mr. M. BROOKS asked Mr. Attorney General for Ireland, If he is aware that it has been publicly reported in Dublin, and has been mentioned in the Town Council and in the local newspapers, that there are serious discrepancies in the accounts and considerable deficiencies in the moneys of the Port and Docks Board; and, whether he knows of any audit of the accounts of the Port and Docks Board, and, if of any, whether he will be prepared to recommend an inquiry into these alleged deficiencies, and as to the desirability of the appointment of a public auditor?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL for IRELAND (Mr. Gibson): Sir, I am aware that it has been mentioned in the Dublin Corporation, and reported in the newspapers, that there are discrepancies and deficiencies in the moneys of the Port and Docks Board; and I believe that the foundation for that statement is to be found in the printed Report, where it says—

> "In the course of the year the Board was called upon to pay £2,718 on account of grain delivered in error upon orders issued by the original owner, after he had transferred the grain to another merchant."

With regard to audit, under Sections 238 and 239 of the present Act regulating the Board, the accounts of the Board must be annually printed, and a copy furnished to anyone who applies on payment of a reasonable sum; and the Board are also bound to appoint each year two auditors to examine and inspect their accounts. In a Bill now before Parliament there is a section providing for the election of auditors by the same persons who elect representatives of traders and manufacturers. I do not think it necessary that I should try to interfere in the matter.

THE STRAITS SETTLEMENTS—INSTRUCTIONS TO BRITISH RESIDENTS.

QUESTION.

Sir CHARLES W. DILKE asked the Secretary of State for the Colonies, Whether there is any truth in the statement made in "The Straits Times" on the 17th of January last, that some official correspondence had been laid before the Legislative Council of the Straits Settlements, containing, amongst other documents, specific instructions to guide the British residents in the neighbouring Malay States in the performance of their duties; and, if so, whether he will lay upon the Table of this House Copies of those Instructions and any further Papers of public interest relating to the affairs of those Malay States?

SIR MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH: It is true that some official Correspondence was laid before the Legislative Council of the Straits Settlements, containing a Circular from the Governor of the Straits Settlements to the Residents, calling their attention to the instructions issued for their guidance by the Earl of Carnarvon in 1876, and reminding them that they were advisers, and not rulers, in the States to which they were accredited. The Papers which were laid before the Council can, of course, be presented to Parliament; and I will confer with the Governor, who has just arrived home on leave, in order that as full information as possible on the subject shall be presented to the House.

CYPRUS—ENFORCED LABOUR.

QUESTIONS.

MR. H. SAMUELSON asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether any proclamation has been issued in Cyprus requiring enforced labour?

MR. BOURKE: An Ordinance, not a Proclamation, has been enacted by the Legislative Council in Cyprus, laying down the Regulations under which villages and districts may in future be required to furnish labour for making roads and other public works. This Ordinance modifies the law heretofore existing in Cyprus, under which villages and districts were required to furnish labour for roads and public works without remuneration. The Ordinance which has just been passed permits persons to provide substitutes, and also provides for the remuneration of labourers, as well as for the remuneration of those whose vehicles are used.

MR. W. E. FORSTER: I wish to ask the hon. Gentleman whether the Ordinance is an Ordinance for enforced labour —whether it is for compulsory labour or not; and also whether the Government will lay the Ordinance on the Table of the House or not?

MR. BOURKE: There will be no objection to make the Ordinance known, of course. If, however, this Ordinance is laid on the Table of the House, it will be right to lay on the Table all the other Ordinances; and if any hon. Member wishes to ask me that Question, I shall be very happy to answer it. I should think it will answer all useful purposes if the Ordinances are placed in the Library of the House. The course proposed has not been adopted with regard to the Ordinances of any other Possession which Her Majesty administers. The pre-existing law of Cyprus was that districts could be called upon to supply labour. The right hon. Gentleman may call that enforced labour if he pleases. I have no objection to the word. I dare say it is; but, whether forced labour or not, the present Ordinance which has just been passed enables the authorities in Cyprus to call upon districts and villages to supply labour and substitutes for public purposes—that, is for making roads and works of public utility. Substitutes may be given if persons do not choose to labour; and in all cases the labour is paid for. I may also mention that all vehicles and horses called for will also be paid for. The Ordinance is really a modification of the law which has existed for many years.

MR. W. E. FORSTER: Perhaps I may be excused for saying that this is the first time within my recollection that we have had to ask Questions about enforced labour in any of our Colonies. Therefore, I will again ask the hon. Gentleman, Whether the Ordinance will be placed on the Table of the House, so that we may see the terms of it as soon as possible?

MR. BOURKE: If there is any strong feeling on that part of the House, I have not the slightest objection to lay the Ordinance on the Table; but it would be inconvenient to lay one or two Ordinances on the Table and not to place all of them there.

MR. H. SAMUELSON: I beg to give Notice that in consequence of the answer of the hon. Gentleman the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, I shall move that the Ordinance be placed on the Table of the House.

WEST INDIA ISLANDS — COOLIES IN GRENADA.—QUESTION.

Sir GEORGE CAMPBELL asked the Secretary of State for the Colonies, with reference to the recent Papers showing the ill-treatment of Indian Coolies in Grenada, Whether he proposes to take any measures more radical than the supercession of the recently appointed Protector of Emigrants, who, after some delay, brought these things to light; whether, especially, he intends to institute any independent inquiry into the state of things previously existing in the Colony, the treatment of the Coolies who arrived before the Hermione cargo, and the system under which such treatment as that of the Hermione Coolies became possible; whether the recent Papers have been communicated to the Government of India; and, whether he has supported the recommendation of the present administrator, that the importation of Coolies into Grenada should still be permitted?

Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH: I trust that it may be possible to prevent the recurrence of such abuses as have recently happened in Grenada by other changes in the system, as well as by the appointment of a new Protector of Immigrants; and on this question I may say that a new Immigration Bill, founded upon British Guiana legislation, has been prepared in the Colony, has been carefully revised in the Colonial Office, and has been returned to Grenada for enactment. I think there is scarcely ground for the inquiry suggested by the hon. Member. On the 31st of December, 1877, there were only 397 Coolies in the Colony, none having been introduced between 1871 and 1878, in which latter year the Coolies were brought, whose treatment has been referred to. No complaint has been made in connection with Coolies introduced before 1878; and as to those then introduced, it is but fair to state that the season of 1878 was an exceptionally unhealthy one in the Island, and that many public officers were laid up at the time with fever, and some persons died, whose names have been much mentioned in connection with the matter. As the Papers on the subject were published, I did not think it necessary that they should be specially communicated to the Government of India. No application has been received by me for immigrants to Grenada for the season 1878-9, just expired, or for the season 1879-80. But before arriving at a decision which might be so injurious to the Island as a refusal to permit any further immigration there, I think it would be but fair to see whether the changes to which I have referred will not be sufficient to prevent the recurrence of any further abuses.

Sir GEORGE CAMPBELL: I will take the earliest possible opportunity of calling attention to the subject, and will move—

> "That the present system of exporting Natives of India under indenture to the Colonies should not be continued until the House is satisfied that radical changes have been made in the means afforded for their protection."

IRELAND—IRISH BRANCH OF THE TREASURY.—QUESTION.

Mr. O'SHAUGHNESSY asked the Chief Secretary for Ireland, Whether it is the intention of Her Majesty's Government, during the present Session, to make arrangements for having an official representative of the Irish branch of the Treasury charged with the duty of explaining to the House the acts of the Treasury with regard to Ireland; if so, whether it is by Bill, on the Estimates, or by some other and what mode of procedure the proposal of these arrangements is to be made to the House?

Sir HENRY SELWIN-IBBETSON: If the hon. and learned Gentleman will allow me, I propose to answer the Question. It is at present certainly the intention of Her Majesty's Government during the present Session, if possible, to make arrangements such as those suggested by the Question of the hon. and learned Member. For that alone neither a Bill nor an increase of the Estimates would be required. But, as we hope to be able to make alterations in the powers of the Board of Works with a view of carrying out some of the recommendations of the Committee, an amending Bill for that purpose may be necessary, and it might then be considered whether alterations in the constitution of the Board might not be embodied in it.

NAVY CONTRACTS—THE PENINSULAR AND ORIENTAL COMPANY.

QUESTION.

Mr. BAXTER asked the Postmaster General, Whether, notwithstanding the admitted obligation upon all heavily subsidised Steamship Companies to maintain a fleet of steamers, some of which, at least, can be always available as transports when required, and notwithstanding frequent public declarations on the part of the directors of the Peninsular and Oriental Steam Navigation Company that their vessels are "available to the Government at an hour's notice," it is true that of the great number of steamers employed in the transport of troops to and from England, Malta, and India in 1878, only one vessel belonged to that Company; that several others were tendered and rejected; and that of the fifteen transports obtained upon an emergency for South Africa that Company did not supply even one; and, if before the signature of the new contract for a subsidy of £370,000 per annum any negotiation or Correspondence took place between the Government and the Company regarding the inability of the latter to furnish transports?

LORD JOHN MANNERS: My right hon. Friend the First Lord of the Admiralty has forwarded me the information necessary to enable me to answer the Question of the right hon. Gentleman. Only one of the ships of the Peninsular and Oriental Company was engaged at Bombay to bring up a part of the Indian contingent to Malta, and she was discharged as soon as possible in consequence of the high rate at which she had been chartered. Nothing is known at the Admiralty as to whether other ships of the same Company were tendered on that occasion. In the recent instance of sending troops to the Cape this Company, among others, was invited to tender, but did not do so. No negotiation or correspondence passed between the Post Office and the Peninsular and Oriental Steam Navigation Company before the signature of the new contract regarding the liability of the Company to furnish transports. The usual clause empowering the Admiralty to purchase or charter any vessels employed in the Mail Service will be found in the new as well as in the old contract.

ARMY—STAFF OFFICERS OF ARTILLERY.—QUESTIONS.

LORD EDMOND FITZMAURICE asked the Secretary of State for War, If it is true that this year the appointments of Brigade Major of Artillery proceeding to Africa, and last year of Cavalry Brigade Major in Ireland, were given to officers who had not passed through the Staff College, although it is laid down in the Queen's Regulations that

> "No officer will be appointed to the Staff as deputy assistant of the Adjutant and Quartermaster General's Department, or as Brigade Major, who shall not have passed the final examination of the Staff College,"

except in the case of "officers of proved ability on the staff in the field," who may be so appointed; if it is considered that the officers to whom the above appointments were given were of such "proved ability on the staff in the field" as to give them a prior claim to all the officers of the Staff College available for the above appointments; and, if the Quartermaster General and his deputy on Lord Chelmsford's Staff at the time of the recent disaster at Isandula had qualified in the Staff College?

COLONEL STANLEY, in reply, said, that at the time the appointment first referred to was made only five Artillery officers had passed the Staff College. Of these, two were in India, one was medically unfit, one was selected for other Staff employment, and one, he believed, was not considered suitable. Of the two who passed the College last December, one was abroad, and the other had embarked for the Cape for special service. As to the appointment of Cavalry Brigade Major in Ireland, the only Cavalry officer available at the time had previously held a Staff appointment, which he had only recently resigned, and it was not, therefore, thought advisable to select him. With regard to the officers to whom the appointments were given, neither of them had, as the Question put, "shown proved ability on the Staff in the field;" but one had been, in 1873, on the Staff of the Inspecting General of Cavalry at Aldershot, and the other was selected as being particularly fit for the post, and had held in the Royal Artillery one or more Staff appointments, though possessing no positive field service. With regard to the last part of the Question of the noble Lord, it was not required by the Regulations that these officers should pass through the Staff College. The Deputy to the Quartermaster General had passed through the College; and the other officer was selected on the spot by Lord Chelmsford, who was authorized by the Regulations to make such appointments on the field.

MAJOR NOLAN asked the Secretary of State for War, If an officer of the Royal Engineers has been admitted to the Staff College in place of another officer of Engineers, who has been ordered to Natal?

COLONEL STANLEY, in reply, said, that when vacancies occurred in the Staff College it was sometimes, but not always, the custom to fill them up. The Director General of Military Education said it was inconvenient to do so, because the officers so joining could not go through the full course; and, secondly, because the others might rejoin at any time before those who had taken their places had left, and thus supernumeraries were created in the College. An officer of the Royal Engineers had been admitted in the place of an officer ordered, not to Natal, but to India. This officer had twice passed third, and it was thought no harm would be done by letting him join.

ELECTION PETITIONS RETURN—IRISH CASES.—QUESTION.

MR. O'CONOR asked the Chief Secretary for Ireland, Why no Irish Election Petitions are given in the Return lately presented to the House, entitled "Return of Election Petitions tried within the United Kingdom, since the Dissolution of Parliament, which took place next after the passing of 'The Parliamentary Elections Act, 1868;'" and, whether there is any objection to the Return being completed by the addition of the Election Petitions tried in that country?

MR. J. LOWTHER: I understand that it was through some inadvertence that the Return was not orginally presented in a complete form, and there will be no objection to its being now made complete.

SOUTH AFRICA—THE ZULU WAR—NAVAL COALING DEPOTS.—QUESTION.

MR. GOURLEY asked the First Lord of the Admiralty, what coaling depôts are owned by Her Majesty's Government en route for the Cape of Good Hope, and the nature of the arrangements made for coaling the transports engaged for the conveyance of troops and stores intended to meet the emergency in Natal; and, if the commanders of the steam colliers chartered to carry coal for the use of the transports had instructions to call at St. Vincent, and if they were dispatched before or after the sailing of the troops?

MR. W. H. SMITH: In answer to the hon. Gentleman, I have to say that the Admiralty have no coaling depôts on the direct route for the Cape, as there is no English soil on that route; but we have coaling stations at Sierra Leone and Ascension, which are sufficient for the ordinary requirements of the Naval Service. Arrangements were made for the coaling of the transports at St. Vincent and the Cape, there being ample coal for the purpose at either place. At St. Vincent the quantity at Admiralty disposal was 7,500 tons; known to be in private hands, 11,000 tons; quantity shipped by transports at St. Vincent, 7,100 tons. At the Cape the quantity at Admiralty disposal was—Dockyard at Simon's Bay, 4,000 tons; bought at the Cape, 1,800 tons; total at Admiralty disposal, 5,800 tons. Quantity in contractors' hands, 8,000 tons; quantity shipped for the Cape, 10,000 tons (2,000 tons optional to be sent to Delagoa Bay). At Delagoa Bay the quantity sent out for transports was 3,100 tons. The mail steamers *Pretoria* and *Dublin Castle*, which took out troops, coaled at Madeira. No difficulty whatever has occurred in coaling the ships in the order in which they arrived; but the delay arose partly in consequence of the weather preventing the loading being carried on as expeditiously as possible and partly in consequence of the mail steamers and transports arriving simultaneously. A telegram received from the Consul at St. Vincent, dated the 14th of March, which also states that strong north-east winds were prevailing from the 2nd to the 14th of March, says—

> "Detention caused by accumulation of mails and transports, which necessitated their being coaled in turn. Had transports not arrived simultaneously they would have been more quickly despatched. Everything in contractors' power has been done to facilitate despatch. Labour and coal appliances not wanting. *Spain* and *Egypt* sail to-morrow."

It is hoped that these difficulties will not occur at the Cape. Part of the transports will coal at our own stores alongside the dockyard at Simon's Bay, and the others will be coaled by contractors at Cape Town. It is to be observed that it is only eight days' steaming from the Cape to Natal and back. The information was given to the House as to the order in which the transports arrived at St. Vincent's. I am glad to say they have all been dispatched. The unfortunate delay which occurred was simply due to the fact that labour could not be found to coal them more rapidly under the circumstances in which they arrived.

NAVY—H.M.S. "VANGUARD."

QUESTION.

MR. D. JENKINS asked the First Lord of the Admiralty, If any, and what, steps are about to be taken to remove the wreck of Her Majesty's ship "Vanguard?"

MR. W. H. SMITH: It is intended to remove the masts of the *Vanguard* as soon as the weather is sufficiently fine to enable us to do so; but there is no intention at present to remove or destroy the wreck of the ship, being advised that the wreck will not be dangerous to the navigation.

ELEMENTARY EDUCATION ACT, 1876—DRUMMER BOYS.—QUESTION.

MR. SIMONDS asked the Vice President of the Council, Whether Sergeants of Militia, enlisting and employing as drummer boys children above ten years of age and under thirteen, who have not obtained the necessary certificate of proficiency or of school attendance, are liable to the penalty of 40*s.* as provided by "The Elementary Education Act, 1876," section 6?

COLONEL STANLEY: I have conferred with the Vice President of the Council on the subject, and my noble Friend has advised me that sergeants of Militia, enlisting and employing as drummer boys children above 10 years of age and under 13 are not liable to the penalty, inasmuch as they are not in the position of employers and the boys not being in their service. If the parents of such children are, as they are in many cases, non-commissioned officers, they are bound to attend schools; and it is not the intention of the Government, even where that is not the case, that the spirit of the Elementary Education Act should be in any degree violated.

POST OFFICE—THE PACIFIC MAIL CONTRACTS.—QUESTION.

MR. MAC IVER asked the Postmaster General, Whether the mails to be conveyed to and from Peru, and ports on the South Pacific, under the proposed contract with the Royal Mail Company, will at times be detained as much as five and six days at the Isthmus of Panama, in consequence of the contract not providing for a close connection between the steamers sailing between Southampton and Colon, and those conveying the Mails on the Pacific Ocean; and, if he intends to make any arrangement to obviate this serious inconvenience?

LORD JOHN MANNERS: Both under the contract now in force and under that recently concluded, mails for the Pacific, despatched fortnightly to the Isthmus of Panama by the West India mail packets, will be due at Colon on certain fixed days of each month. From Panama the mails for ports on the South Pacific are carried by a line of packets, which sail on fixed days of each week. Occasionally, therefore, the mails may be detained on the Isthmus, and to the extent of five or six days. No contract exists for the conveyance from Peru, or other States of the South Pacific, of mails for the United Kingdom. All such mails brought to Panama are despatched from Colon twice a month, on fixed days of the month, by the British (West India) mail packets; and when they arrive after the departure of a British packet, but in time to be forwarded by a French packet, or by a United States packet *viâ* New York, they are so forwarded. An arrangement is now under consideration which, it is suggested, would obviate the possible inconvenience.

NAVY—ROMAN CATHOLIC CHAPLAINS.

QUESTION.

MR. ERRINGTON (for Mr. O'REILLY) asked the First Lord of the Admiralty, What steps have been taken to carry out the intentions of the Admiralty with regard to meeting the spiritual wants of Roman Catholic seamen, as stated by him on the 15th March 1878, when he said,

> "It will be the duty of the Admiralty to endeavour to make such provision, by attaching a Roman Catholic clergyman to a fleet of, say, five or six large ships operating at distance from its base or from any port; and, if there should be a hospital-ship, it will not be difficult to pro-

vide for the accommodation of a chaplain in that ship?"

MR. W. H. SMITH: The Commander-in-Chief in the Mediterranean was directed by the Admiralty Letter of the 12th of June, 1878, to give effect to the Admiralty Minute (laid before Parliament). A telegram was received from Sir Geoffery Phipps Hornby, dated Ismid, 13th March, to the following effect:—

> "In reference to Roman Catholic chaplains, Board Minute of June 7, 1878, has been carried out. This Squadron not having been absent from a port where services of a Roman Catholic priest were available, except for the short time we were at Artaki, when we were in daily expectation of orders to return to Malta, Roman Catholic officers and men have attended Divine service here and at Prince's Island as usual."

CRIMINAL LAW—CASE OF WILLIAM HABRON, CONVICTED OF MURDER.

QUESTION.

MR. MITCHELL HENRY asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, What progress has been made in the investigation of the case of William Habron, a young Irishman, convicted in August 1876, of the murder of a policeman at Whalley Range, near Manchester, but now alleged to be innocent; whether he has read a letter which appeared on the subject in "The Times" on the 12th instant; and, whether pending the investigation the convict has been relieved from the severities of penal discipline?

MR. ASSHETON CROSS: As the House will remember, I stated some time ago that when the man Habron was convicted, I came to the conclusion, which the learned Judge who tried the case agreed with, that the evidence tended to show that he was certainly not the person who fired the shot, and upon that ground the sentence was respited. The circumstantial evidence placed before the jury, and certain expressions used by the man himself, led them to the conclusion that he was implicated in the murder, and therefore he underwent sentence, under their verdict. When the confession was made by Peace, before his execution, I felt, of course, that it was quite necessary to consider very carefully the whole circumstances of the case again; and I stated to the House that, owing to that confession, it would receive the most anxious consideration of the Secretary of State as to how far the sentence should be allowed to stand. At the same time, I said that a confession so made was one which would undoubtedly require the most rigid scrutiny which could be applied to it. I, of course, have had every assistance from the learned Judge who tried the case; and I thought it only right to lay the whole matter before the Law Officers of the Crown in concert with one of the ablest Queen's Counsel at the Bar. The result to which I certainly myself have come is that the statement made by the man Peace has been so entirely corroborated in many important points, that I shall feel it my duty to recommend the Crown to grant a free pardon to William Habron. It will be satisfactory to the House to know—and it is a very great satisfaction to myself—that in that conclusion I have the entire concurrence of the learned Judge who tried the case, and of the Law Officers of the Crown. The House very well knows that if persons, however unfortunately, have been convicted, it has never been the practice in this country to make compensation to persons who have so suffered; but still I hope that I may be allowed to state that I think I see my way to making certain arrangements, by which care will be taken that the future of this most unfortunate and most unhappy man will be attended to.

MR. MITCHELL HENRY: Mr. Speaker, in consequence of the answer of the right hon. Gentleman, I beg to say that I shall, on Monday next, ask him publicly what compensation he will recommend the Government to make to this unhappy victim of the fallibility of the law.

INDIA—THE FINANCIAL STATEMENT.

QUESTION.

GENERAL SIR GEORGE BALFOUR asked Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, If the reports in the newspapers about the finances of India are fairly accurate; and, whether he will arrange to keep the House of Commons informed from time to time, and promptly, as to the state of the revenue, expenditure, war charges, cash balances, debt, and remittances?

MR. E. STANHOPE: The reports in the newspapers, so far as we can judge from the figures we have as yet received, appear to be accurate. The Government will place the detailed figures before the House on as early a day as possible, and will endeavour to give early information of any important changes. As regards the Debt, I have already promised the hon. and gallant Member to obtain from India much more complete information than any that has yet been given.

ARMY—OUT-PENSIONERS.

QUESTION.

MR. BARRAN asked the Secretary of State for War, If his attention has been called to a letter which appeared in the "Leeds Express" newspaper, on the 6th of March, complaining of the manner in which the out-pensioners of the Army, Navy, and Royal Marines are treated in that district, by being compelled to remain in the streets in the most inclement weather without shelter while waiting to receive their pensions; also complaining of the very inconvenient position of the station, it being situate quite on the outskirt of the town, and a great distance from the homes of the great majority of the men; and, whether he will consider the desirability of providing accommodation under cover, and in a more central situation?

COLONEL LOYD LINDSAY, in reply, said, attention had been called to the letter, and the report of the officer in charge had been called for. The usual practice was that some public building should be given for the purpose of paying the pensioners. If there was no such building, some office was usually engaged. He did not know whether other accommodation could be provided, but the matter would be attended to.

NAVY ESTIMATES—SHIPS BUILDING.

QUESTION.

MR. SAMUDA asked the First Lord of the Admiralty, If he will lay upon the Table of the House, before the Navy Estimates are again taken, a Statement showing in detail the programme of the work in the dockyards and by contract, as promised last year, and the actual amount of work that has been performed on each ship?

MR. W. H. SMITH: The Return the hon. Gentleman alludes to shall be laid upon the Table of the House as soon after the end of the financial year as possible, and before further Votes are taken.

SOUTH AFRICA—THE ZULU WAR—SIR CHARLES W. DILKE'S MOTION.

QUESTION.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE asked Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, When he proposes that the debate upon the Zulu War should be begun?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: I must point out to the House that, in consequence of the advanced state of the financial year, it is imperatively necessary for us to have the Supplementary Estimates passed in order to get the Ways and Means Bill through before the end of the financial year. I am afraid, therefore, that I cannot fix an earlier day than Thursday week for the discussion of the hon. Gentleman's Notice.

METROPOLIS—PAROCHIAL CHARITIES OF THE CITY OF LONDON.

QUESTION.

MR. FAWCETT asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether he can inform the House when it is likely that the inquiry, which is now being carried on by a Royal Commission into the Parochial Charities of the City of London, will be completed?

MR. ASSHETON CROSS: I have written to the Secretary of the Commission on the subject, but have not yet received an answer. I hoped to receive it in a day or two.

TURKEY—PAPERS.—QUESTION.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, When the further Papers relating to Turkey, which were promised some time ago, will be laid upon the Table; and, whether those Papers will include the Reports relating to the insurrection in Macedonia, and the communications which have taken place with reference to Easter Roumelia?

MR. BOURKE: A Blue Book of 300 pages was prepared and printed last week, and ought to have been presented then; but I am told there was some difficulty in regard to the binding. From information I have received, I believe that it will be in the hands of hon. Members this evening or to-morrow morning. It will contain Papers relating to the insurrection in Macedonia, and communications which have taken place with reference to Eastern Roumelia which the hon. and learned Gentleman requires; and, upon the whole, will bring down the history of events to the 10th of December.

ARMY ESTIMATES — CONTAGIOUS DISEASES ACTS.—QUESTION.

In reply to Mr. Hopwood,

Colonel STANLEY said, he had no option but to proceed with the Vote which provided for the expenses of carrying out these Acts; but the attention of the Government had been directed to the subject, and, without expressing any opinion, he might announce that the Government had come to the decision to appoint a Committee to inquire into the operation of the Acts.

PARLIAMENT — BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE—INTOXICATING LIQUORS (LICENCES) — THE ADJOURNED DEBATE.—QUESTION.

Sir WILFRID LAWSON wished to ask his hon. and learned Friend the Member for Dewsbury, Whether, when the debate again came on, he intended to persevere with the Amendment which stood in his name?

Mr. Serjeant SIMON: Yes, Sir, it is my intention.

Sir WILFRID LAWSON: Then, Sir, I may as well perhaps now give Notice that if the debate comes on I shall give my support to the Amendment of the hon. and learned Member for Cambridgeshire (Mr. Rodwell).

ORDER OF THE DAY.

—⸗o⸗—

SUPPLY—ARMY ESTIMATES.

[*Progress.*]

Supply—*considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

(1.) Original Question again proposed,

> "That a sum, not exceeding £4,598,000, be granted to Her Majesty, to defray the charge of the Pay, Allowances, and other Charges of Her Majesty's Land Forces at Home and Abroad (exclusive of India), which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1880."

Mr. PARNELL said, he hoped the Committee would not consider him unreasonable, when he asked the right hon. and gallant Gentleman the Secretary of State for War (Colonel Stanley) to postpone these Votes until hon. Members had had an ample opportunity of examining the Report of the Controller and Auditor General on the Appropriation Account of the money they voted for the Army two Sessions ago. This Account and Report of the Controller and Auditor General were only issued on Saturday last; therefore, it must be obvious to everybody that no sufficient time had elapsed since then and now to admit of the great majority of the Members of the Committee making themselves acquainted with the contents of that very valuable and necessary Report. He himself, although very much interested in the question, was enabled, by working most of Sunday, to make out a very cursory and slight examination of the many accounts contained in that Appropriation Record. He was sure that the right hon. and gallant Gentleman himself (Colonel Stanley) would admit that the short interval which had elapsed since Saturday morning and to-day was really not sufficient time to examine those publications, if there was any value whatever in the Appropriation Report, and if the Committee attached any importance whatever to the Report of the Controller and Auditor General in reference to the Appropriation Account. He was confident that it would be the opinion of everybody that no sufficient time had been given by the Army authorities for them to examine this Account. He might at this point remark that the Appropriation Account on the Civil Service Estimates, and, he presumed, the Report of the Controller and Auditor General upon that Account, was ordered by the House to be printed so long ago as the 14th of February. The Appropriation Account on the Navy Estimates, voted two Sessions ago, and the Report on that Account, was ordered by the House to be printed on the 26th of last February. The Appropriation Account on the Army Estimates, and the Report of the Controller and Auditor General upon that Account, was only ordered by the House to be printed on the 7th of the present month. Consequently, wherever the fault might lie, the Committee had had no real opportunity of making itself acquainted with the details of the Account, or with the very valuable Report of the

Controller and Auditor General. The Committee was aware that the Estimates were a series of proposals to vote certain sums of money for certain specific purposes; but they offered little detailed information by which any Member of the Committee could give an intelligent judgment upon the subjects with which they dealt. The customary Statement of the Secretary of State for War, when introducing the Estimates, dealt only with general principles, or treated such Votes as were specially referred to only in broad outline; so that the only means available to Members of the Committee by which they could thoroughly grasp the details of the Estimates were the Appropriation Account and the Report of the Controller and Auditor General upon that Account. Of course, they would have to wait some time for the Appropriation Account of the sums voted for the Army last Session; but there did not seem to be any sufficient reason why the Appropriation Account of the money which the Committee voted the Session before last should not be in the hands of Members before Saturday morning last. It was scarcely fair to the Committee to bring on these Estimates without the usual Statement or Report on the Appropriation Account being in the hands of Members for a reasonable time. To ask the Committee to vote money under these circumstances was asking them to vote money blindfold. In order to put himself in Order, he begged to move that the Chairman do now report Progress; and he strongly appealed to the right hon. and gallant Gentleman the Secretary of State for War, under the circumstances of the case, to show that he, at least, had some sense of the value of the Report of the Controller and Auditor General. He asked the right hon. and gallant Gentleman to allow the Votes to be postponed, at all events, until such a time as hon. Members had any opportunity of examining the Report to which he had referred.

THE CHAIRMAN: Do I understand the hon. Member to move that I do now report Progress?

MR. PARNELL: In order to put myself in Order.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Chairman do report Progress, and ask leave to sit again."—(*Mr. Parnell.*)

SIR ALEXANDER GORDON, although not wishing to support entirely the view of the hon. Member for Meath, was not surprised at the course which the hon. Gentleman had chosen to pursue. It would be in the recollection of the Committee that nearly a fortnight or three weeks ago he asked the Secretary of State for War if he would place on the Table of the House a Statement showing how the money of the Vote of Credit had been expended, as regarded warlike stores, medicines, and so forth? The right hon. and gallant Gentleman assured him that the Appropriation Account would be in the hands of Members in a few days, and it would contain the information which he (Sir Alexander Gordon) and other hon. Gentlemen sought. The Appropriation Account, however, was only placed in their hands on Saturday morning last, and it did not contain the detailed statement he and others wished to have. The Account was not made out in that clear way that the Naval Appropriation Account had been made out. The Naval Appropriation Account had in parallel columns the ordinary Estimates and the Vote of Credit, so that they could see in a glance what had been expended on stores and other things. As regarded the Army, matters were not so clearly stated—in fact, they were so mixed up that, although he had read the Appropriation Account very carefully, he was not in a position to analyze it satisfactorily. He would ask, therefore, that the right hon. and gallant Gentleman would postpone Votes 4, 9, 10, 11, and 12, which were Votes affecting the Stores and Manufacturing Departments, until hon. Members had time to see what materials they had for criticism. He suggested that they should take the Votes for the Forces, and Pay, and various Departments, but postpone the Votes having reference to Stores and Manufacturing Departments.

MAJOR O'BEIRNE remarked, that as the Appropriation Account was only furnished to hon. Members on Saturday, there had been no opportunity afforded to study it. He should, therefore, give his support to the hon. Member for Meath (Mr. Parnell) in his Motion to report Progress.

COLONEL STANLEY said, that with all deference to the hon. Member for Meath (Mr. Parnell), he could not see that it would be convenient at the present time to report Progress. He had no control—at least, he was not aware that he had any control—over the presentation of the Appropriation Account, further than in answering queries. The Appropriation Account was placed in his hands at no earlier date than it was in the hands of the hon. Member for Meath; but if the hon. Gentleman felt disposed to ask him any question on that Account, he should endeavour to answer him to the best of his power. He could not assent to the proposal of the hon. and gallant Gentleman (Sir Alexander Gordon) to postpone the Estimates; because he did not think that would be at all for the convenience of the Committee, or for the convenience of hon. Members who had come down for the discussion of the Estimates. The hon. and gallant Gentleman pointed out that he (Colonel Stanley) had not given him the precise Statement he desired as to the Vote of Credit. Perhaps the hon. and gallant Gentleman would do him the honour to recollect that, by the direction of the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer, to whom he addressed his Question about the distribution of the Vote of Credit, he (Colonel Stanley) pledged himself to explain to him why they could not render, in the form of the Vote as originally voted by the House, the precise amounts that had been distributed amongst the different Votes; but he asked the hon. and gallant Gentleman whether he would be good enough to confer with him, and he would endeavour to give him the information he desired. He had not had the honour of a communication from the hon. and gallant Gentleman. He had no doubt it was owing to the pressure of other business, or to the fact that the hon. and gallant Gentleman had overlooked the matter. As far as he was concerned, he was agreeable to render what information he could; and he hoped, after what he had said, that it would not be thought necessary, at this early period of the evening, to report Progress.

MR. CAMPBELL - BANNERMAN said, he had a good deal of sympathy with what the hon. and gallant Gentleman the Member for East Aberdeenshire (Sir Alexander Gordon) had said; because, if he was not mistaken, before the Navy Estimates were discussed, a Statement was laid on the Table showing how the Vote of Credit and the Supplementary Estimates of the last year were spent; and it would be of very material assistance to the Committee to have a similar Statement as regarded the Army. If they took the Clothing and the Store Votes, they found that very large sums indeed had been expended out of the Vote of Credit, and also out of the Supplementary Estimates under these heads; and, with the exception of the very meagre information given in the Auditor General's Report, none whatever was afforded as to the manner in which the expenditure was made. He thought it was a matter upon which his hon. and gallant Friend had a right to complain; but he was not disposed to go so far as with him as to support the adjournment of the Votes upon that ground.

GENERAL SIR GEORGE BALFOUR hoped his hon. Friend would not persevere with the Motion, but thought he was quite justified in making it. He would remind the Committee that the Audit Act of 1866 required that the Appropriation Accounts of the Army and Navy should be presented to Parliament on the 31st of January in every year; whereas, during the last two or three years, these Accounts only reached Parliament in March. Seeing this delay he had been moving in the direction the hon. Member for Meath had now properly taken, with a view to securing, if possible, an early presentation of these Accounts. He was always very reluctant to press anything that might be considered harsh upon the Government; but, at the same time, he could not but say that in delaying these Accounts they were commiting a great illegality. He was well aware that the Secretary of State for War had not now the same control over the Appropriation Accounts as he had formerly, because that control had been unwisely taken from the War Office and solely placed in the Audit Office. It was the Audit Office, therefore, that was solely and entirely responsible now for delays. The remarkable thing was that at the time when the Secretary of State for War was responsible for the due completion of the Accounts, not a year passed without the Audit Office complaining of the delay of the Secretary of State in presenting the Appropriation Accounts for the final examination of the Audit Department; but now they had been given over to the Audit Office, they had this great danger—that with regard to the Controlling Departments, which ought to bring to light the shortcomings of other Departments, there was no person to bring to light its shortcomings. He said that was a great evil; and he hoped the Chancellor of the Exchequer was listening to him, and would attend to it. [*A laugh.*] He knew very well that hon. Gentlemen on the other side were very fond of laughing, and if millions of money were wrongly spent from the Accounts and Audit not being duly made, they still laughed; but he thought that the time might come when they would regret that they ever laughed at defective control over expenditure. The important point he wished to notice was this—which he had discovered in the short time he had been able to examine the Accounts — He found, on page 148, that on the 28th of November, 1878—that was, 10 months after the year had expired—the Secretary of State applied to the Treasury for permission to appropriate the savings on some Votes of the Army, amounting to the very large sum of £1,600,000 in meeting the large excesses of the proper expenditure on other Army Votes, and that the Treasury, another Controlling Department, without the slightest regard for the financial interests of the country, and without a careful scrutiny into the causes which had led to such excessive amounts on the respective Votes, at once assented to the transfer. Now, he said that was not right, and that any sum of money so allowed to be spent after the year expired should not be brought into that year, and to do so was contrary to practice, contrary to the regulations of the Treasury, and at variance with the Appropriation Act. But he could not take up a page of the Appropriation Accounts without finding a violation of the Act in every page. The only safe and right principle was to insist on all sums of each Vote, which were not needed for the service of that Vote, being returned to the Treasury, and all expenditure on any one Vote in excess of the sum granted by Parliament for that Vote, being separately estimated for, and specially granted by Parliament. If the Secretary of State for War and the Chancellor of the Exchequer would give them an assurance that the Audit Office should be called upon to perform its duty, and to render Appropriation Accounts in the way that was desired by the Act of 1866, he would not support his hon. Friend the Member for Meath in the Motion which had been made. It was necessary not to delay the passing of the Votes. The Business of the country must be done, and funds provided for the Army charges; and therefore they must now overlook the past, in the hope that the future would give them more regularity and more exactness.

LORD EUSTACE CECIL said, he should be very glad to repeat the explanation of the various items which was given on the Vote of Credit. He had the items at hand; but he did not think it was necessary to detain the Committee now, as on the progress of the Votes he would be enabled to give every explanation. As to the question raised by the hon. and gallant Gentleman (Sir George Balfour), he need not go into that now, and would leave it for the Secretary of State to answer, in the hope that they might now be allowed to proceed to Business.

MR. RYLANDS said, he was very much disposed to support the hon. Member for Meath (Mr. Parnell) in the complaint that the Appropriation Accounts were delayed until the very last moment. If they were not presented until last Saturday, he thought his hon. Friend was fairly entitled to insist upon the delay of this Vote. They had had to go through the Accounts under great difficulties. He wished to point out to the Committee the difficulty in which they were placed in having to vote the Estimates without the opportunity of instituting a comparison with the previous year's Estimates. They were not able to judge of the amount of the actual expenditure of the different Departments this year. They had been told by the Chancellor of the Exchequer that there had been on the Army Estimates, during the expenditure of the present year, a saving something like £400,000, which was applied to the purposes of the South African War.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: A saving on the Votes of 1877-8, not on this year.

MR. RYLANDS replied, that then it ought to be shown in this Appropriation, and it appeared to him that was hardly a sufficient explanation. According to the Statement they had had before them on the Appropriation Account of 1877-8, there was an account of the Vote of Credit which was granted; and in addition to the Vote of Credit, there were certain savings from the different Departments, which went, no doubt, in favour of the purposes for which the Vote of Credit had been intended. On page 15 of the Appropriation Accounts, it would be seen that the aggregate amount of surplusage was £184,943; but there was no evidence of any such saving as £400,000 having been carried to the credit side for the purposes of the South African War. He believed he was correct in saying that the Statement of the Chancellor of the Exchequer was really that the £400,000 had been included in the Expenditure up to the 31st of March, 1878; but certainly, in this Appropriation Account, there was no such surplus as £400,000 applied to the South African War. But he could tell the right hon. Gentleman where it was. In the year ending 1878, there was an Expenditure accounted for which was given in one of the tables at page 160—for the purposes of the Cape of Good Hope, £238,451. Then, there were further sums of £141,991, and £86,032. That made a total of between £400,000 and £500,000, towards which the savings, amounting to £185,000, were applied; and if the right hon. Gentleman wished him to understand that that was all the money which had to be provided for the South African War, he (Mr. Rylands) would remind him that that was paid before the 31st March, 1878.

The CHAIRMAN said, the hon. Member was not in Order in anticipating a discussion of the items of other Votes which were not before the Committee.

Mr. RYLANDS wished to be excused, if he had been out of Order. He had spoken of the items, because he wanted to show that they required more information upon the Estimates. He was afraid he had been technically out of Order, and he did not wish to raise an irregular discussion. He had shown that there had been considerable expenditure provided for in March, 1878, on account of the South African War; but inasmuch as the war continued some months longer, he understood the Chancellor of the Exchequer to state that there was the further sum of £400,000 in addition, which would bring it up to the end of the present financial year. [The Chancellor of the Exchequer: No.] He would be very glad to find that he had misunderstood the Statement of the right hon. Gentleman the other evening; but it did appear to him that when the House was asked to come to a consideration of the Army Estimates, it was most important that the Appropriation Accounts should be produced at an earlier period. He should be very glad to hear from the Government that influence would be brought to bear upon the Audit Department to secure that.

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER said, he quite agreed that they ought to have the Appropriation Accounts presented at an earlier period, if they could get them. But with reference to the particular point of which the hon. Member for Burnley was speaking, the hon. Member had misunderstood what he had said on former occasions. What he had continually stated was that in August last, at which time he had to make certain proposals with reference to the finance of the present year, he brought forward a Vote to cover the expenditure of the war for that current year; but he stated at the time that he expected that when the Accounts for the year 1878 were finally made up, it would appear there was an excess to be provided in respect of that year—1877-8. He told the House they must be provided to meet certain excesses, which might, perhaps, amount to something like £400,000. Well, when they came to find what the position of the Appropriation Account in March was, it appeared there was no such excess as £400,000 to be provided for, because the savings on other Votes had been enough to cover the excess on the expenditure in South Africa. It had no reference to the expenditure in this year, but to the excess in 1877-8.

Lord FREDERICK CAVENDISH said, he thought the Appropriation Accounts had, under the circumstances, been presented at the earliest possible moment. He thought anyone would agree in that opinion, when they remembered that the Auditor General only received the Accounts on the 31st December, and when they saw also the amount of work that had to be done, and the great difficulties under which it was performed. He referred to the examination of the items, and the want of suitable premises, and repeated his belief that no unreasonable delay had occurred.

SIR JOSEPH M'KENNA thought that greater facilities should be given by the War Office to the Auditor General. When the Committee were asked to discuss these items, with the Appropriation Accounts only in their hands last Saturday, they were asked to proceed on very imperfect information. No doubt, it would all turn out rightly in the end; but this financial irregularity should not occur in the future.

GENERAL SIR GEORGE BALFOUR said, the noble Lord (Lord Frederick Cavendish) had pointed out that the Auditor General did not receive the Army Appropriation Accounts until December; and, therefore, the Secretary of State for War had to bear the blame of two months' delay, because by Act the Accounts should leave the War Office in October. If the War Office performed its duty in sending in the Accounts on the date required by the Act of Parliament, then the Audit Office could be held fully responsible for presenting them to Parliament on the 31st January, as the 1866 Audit Act enjoined. He hoped the Financial Secretary would take a note of it, and give the Committee an assurance on the point.

MR. J. HOLMS was of opinion that a valuable discussion had arisen out of the objection; but it should be remembered that the Auditor General had only lately taken office, and some allowance should be made on that account.

SIR ALEXANDER GORDON said, the suggestion he had made was precisely what the Committee did last year. On March 6 they voted £4,500,000; on June 14, £1,450,000 were voted; and then they voted nothing more until the 7th of August, when they voted £10,000,000 in one night. If, on the present occasion, the Government got £5,000,000 or £6,000,000, that would be enough to carry them on.

MR. PARNELL said, he really did not wish to do anything unreasonable; but when he had fully explained to the Committee his reasons for asking the Government to postpone the Vote, it would be seen that it was the Government, and not himself, that was acting unreasonably. What had this debate shown them? It had shown them that the majority of hon. Members had not had an opportunity of examining the Report of the Controller and Auditor General, which was only issued on Saturday last. That was very natural; but what was one of the consequences of that want of opportunity? Why, that hon. Members ran away with the idea that it was the Controller and Auditor General who was in fault for the late presentation of that Account. It was not the Controller and Auditor General who was in fault—it was the War Office. It had been shown that it was only within the last two years that the audit of the Accounts of the War Office had come within the province of the Audit Office. Previously, the War Office conducted it by a Departmental Audit; and it was only by a long fight, and a long insistance upon the part of the Audit Office, that those Accounts should come, like all other Public Accounts, under their examination and control, that the War Office yielded, and submitted its Accounts to that examination and control. But what had been the course which the War Office had since pursued? They had placed constant obstructions in the way of making a proper examination. They had refused to place proper premises at the disposal of the Controller and Auditor General, although they had promised that premises should be ready. In consequence, the Controller and Auditor General had been unable to make the test-audit which he held to be necessary. He would refer the Committee to paragraphs 4 and 5 of the Controller and Auditor General's Report for 1876-7 on that subject, and to paragraph 2 of the Report just published. It now appeared that the Controller and Auditor General hoped shortly to be in possession of certain rooms in the War Office in Pall Mall, and to be in a position to apply the test-audit, partially to the Accounts of 1878-9, and fully to those of 1879-80. Up to the present time the War Office had refused the necessary material for a test-audit; and the Controller and Auditor General's request for a codified statement had been refused on one pretext or another by the War Office authorities, although there was every reason to believe that they had at their own disposal sufficient information to enable the Controller and Auditor General to make the test-examination which he considered to be necessary for the efficient carrying on of the Accounts. He would also refer the Committee to paragraph 9 of the Report for 1876-7, with reference to the want of a codified statement. He wished to ask one very important question. Had there not always been an audit of the Working Accounts in the War Office itself? If not, what course had been followed? If there had been this examination, and if the War Office authorities had a staff available to perform those duties, why should they not have furnished the Controller and Auditor General, in response to his repeated requests, with the information which he required? It was hardly necessary for him to ask whether the War Office had furnished the necessary assistance to the Controller and Auditor General, because, on the Report of that official, there was an overwhelming case against the War Office. Although it might be thought that he was taking up too much time in pressing these matters, yet he must ask, what no hon. Member on the Treasury Benches had done, that there might be an amendment in the future in the course which had been adopted by the War Office to the Controller and Auditor General. He would prove an overwhelming case against the War Office of neglect to reply to the reasonable requests and requirements of the Controller and Auditor General. He need scarcely remind the Committee that the Controller and Auditor General was the officer whom the House of Commons must look to for a check upon the Expenditure of the Government. He was the official appointed for the purpose of putting that check upon the Government, and the necessity of attention to his reasonable requests could not be too strongly enforced upon the War Office. But what could show a more utter disregard of his complaints than the 6th paragraph of his Report. He was reading from page 7 of his Report of last year—

> "In paragraphs 47 and 49 of my Report of last year, I called attention to the fact that no steps appeared to have been taken to carry out the requirements of the Regimental Debts Act of 1863, in which provision was made for the disposal of the unclaimed residues of soldiers' effects. As it seemed desirable that this matter should be kept in view, a letter was addressed to the Under Secretary of State for War on the 18th of December last, in which I requested to be informed of any steps that might have been taken to carry out the intentions of the Act. To this communication I have received no reply. Nor am I aware whether any inter-Departmental Committee has been appointed 'to consider in what mode effect should be given to Section 18 of the Regimental Debts Act of 1863, as noticed by the Public Accounts Committee in their Report of last Session.'"

There were many such paragraphs in this Report. In some cases the Controller and Auditor General stated that he had received no reply to his letters addressed to the War Office; and it would be found, from many passages in the Report issued on Saturday, that the real reason why the Report was issued so late was that the Controller was waiting to the last moment for replies to his communications addressed to the War Office. It would be found, with regard to five several distinct cases, that it was only on the 28th of February that the War Office replied to his communications. It was abundantly evident that the Controller and Auditor General was obliged to keep back his Report to the last moment in order to give the War Office time to reply to his letter, which ought to have been answered months before. He said—

> "To this communication I have received no reply. Nor am I aware whether any inter-Departmental Committee has been appointed 'to consider in what mode Section 18 of Regimental Debts Act as noticed by the Public Accounts Committee in their Report of last Session.'"

That was only one question upon which the War Office authorities appeared to have made no attempt to meet the representations of the Controller and Auditor General; for he found, on referring to paragraph 4 of the Report issued on Saturday last, that they had not done, in many cases, what the Controller and Auditor General requested. In some cases they had made a reply; but in others they had entirely neglected his representations. It was of great importance that the representations of the Controller and Auditor General, and the fact of no steps being taken in response to them by the War Office, should be properly considered by the House; and the point he wished to make was this—that hon. Members had not had an opportunity of considering the important question of the manner in which the money voted by Parliament in former Estimates, as shown by the Appropriation Accounts, had been expended. Further, upon the Report issued by him, it was clear that the War Office had endeavoured to prevent investigation by the Controller and Auditor General. At the end of paragraph 10, on page 8 of his Report of 1877, he made the following observations:—

> "Considerable sums of money rightly belonging to the public are, as it appears to me, under the present mode of procedure, likely to escape my cognisance. I may mention two cases in point that have recently occurred. In the first, a regiment having been disbanded, a sum of about £200 has been ascertained to be due to the Exchequer. In the second, a sum of £6,856, issued and charged to the Vote, was found not to have been expended, and is now being refunded by the late commanding officer by half-yearly instalments of £500."

As he had previously said, in asking for facilities for examination of the Appropriation Accounts of two years ago, the Committee was now being asked to vote away money blindly, for they did not know the way in which the sums already granted had been spent. On paragraph 12 of the same Report, he read—

> "The sanction of the Lords of the Treasury was obtained for an annual expenditure not exceeding £4,000 on account of the Intelligence Department for certain services connected with the defence of the United Kingdom. In the year 1876-7 the payments made on account of this Service amounted to £4,520 17*s.* 5*d.*, and the War Office explain the excess by stating that a liability incurred in the previous year had come into course of payment in 1876-7. The amounts included in the annual Estimates are, however, intended to meet all charges which may come in course of payment during the year, and as I presumed that their Lordships had this principle in view when they limited the annual expenditure to £4,000, I called their attention to the subject by a letter dated 25th January last, in which I suggested that a separate sub-head should be opened for this Service. This course not being adopted, and the expenditure not being kept distinct in the books of the War Office, it is difficult to ascertain correctly the total payments on account of the Intelligence Department in any one year."

Upon these extracts it was clear that the supposed check exercised by the Controller over the expenditure of the Government was illusory in the highest degree; and if no notice were taken of the past representations of the Controller, there could be no check on future expenditure. Money, to the extent of many thousands of pounds, was voted by the House and charged against the Army Estimates; but it was not expended at all. And year after year large sums remained unpaid, although no notice of the fact was given by the Minister asking for more money. The control over the expenditure, which the detailed statements of certain Votes appeared to show, was utterly irreconcilable with the ultimate cost of the works performed. This might appear to be a strong statement; but its truth was shown by the words of the Controller and Auditor General. In paragraph 13 of his Report for 1876-7, he said—

> "In the year 1871-2 an Estimate was taken for £200,000 for the defences of the new Dockyard at Malta, in respect of which the following sums have been voted and expended—namely:—

	Voted.	Charged against Votes.	
		Expended.	Deposited with Colonial Treasurer.
	£	£	£
1871-2	40,000	18,373	8,000
In hand	3,300	3,226	—
1872-3	20,000	18,087	—
1873-4	20,000	14,610	—
1874-5	25,000	20,417	3,227
1875-6	25,000	19,820	5,060
1876-7	25,000	34,598	—

In paragraph 14, Sir William Dunbar said—

> "It appears to have been the practice in some years to hand over to the Colonial Treasurer a portion of the sum unexpended, with the view of its being available for the purchase of land in connection with the work. The result of this practice has been that up to the year 1875-6 sums, amounting together to £16,287, have been charged to Army Votes as final payments, although the value of the land of which the purchase had been completed at that date amounted to £7,463 15*s.* 11*d.* only. A balance of £8,823 4*s.* 1*d.* was thus left to be accounted for on the 31st of March, 1876, which sum has been charged in the War Office Books against the Colonial Treasurer, and passed to the credit of 'Exchequer Extra Receipts' as a refund on account of sums improperly charged against Votes of prior years."

That point was taken up again by the Controller and Auditor General on page 9 of the Report of 1876-7—

> "From Returns furnished by the collector of land revenue at Malta, it appears that the value of land purchased in the year 1876-7 was £2,714 10*s.* This sum has been charged against Vote 13 in respect of this Service, and allowed to the Colonial Treasurer, although no proof has been produced of the actual payment of the purchase money to the vendors. The circumstances of the case were submitted to the Treasury by the War Office in a letter, dated the 29th of December last, and the sanction of their Lordships to charge the amount against Army grants was asked for; but I am not aware whether the same has been obtained."

He thought he had now shown how absolutely necessary it was for the Committee to pay some regard to the representations of Sir William Dunbar, before giving more money for the purposes of the War Office. It must have a most dispiriting effect on that gallant officer, if he found the House of Commons paying no regard to his representations. The consequence of the present system was that the War Office required more money, without showing how the sums previously voted had been spent. It appeared that £20,000 or £30,000 had been given away in the name of gratuities. As no money was available for that purpose, the course adopted had been to use the Militia money. Then, again, there were the soldiers' balances. For years and years there had been thousands of pounds from soldiers' remittances remaining unclaimed. In page 12 of the Controller and Auditor General's Report, he thus noticed the matter—

> "Observing that a balance of £8,247 8*s.* 2*d.* appears to be still standing to the credit of the 'Remittance' Account in respect of remittances made by soldiers and others prior to the 1st April, 1871, I have requested to be informed of the items of which such balance is composed, and also whether any steps are taken, from time to time, to discharge the liability of the War Office in respect to the various amounts unclaimed. To this application I have received no reply."

He wished to ask whether it was right that public money should be distributed in this way, or that Public Accounts should be kept in this manner, notwithstanding the representations of the officer appointed for the purpose of auditing them? Unless the Government gave some reasonable reply to the effect that they would, in future, pay some attention to the Controller and Auditor General, and that they would afford him facilities, in the shape of taking a test audit, he must oppose the grant of further money. The War Office ought also to reply, in reasonable time, to the letters addressed by the Controller and Auditor General with regard to the various matters on which he required information to enable him to prepare his Appropriation Account in reasonable time. And without assurance from the Goverment that these matters would be attended to, he did not think that they should vote any further money.

COLONEL STANLEY said, that the War Office had not the slightest wish to evade the check of the Auditor General. On the contrary, within the last three years the test-audit had been extended in a fuller form to that Department. With regard to the Appropriation Accounts, he was not able to follow the hon. Member into those of previous years, at all events, without Notice. He did not think it convenient that he should do so on that occasion; but he would remind the hon. Member that, so far from the representations of the Auditor General being passed over without notice, they came every year before the Committee of the House on Public Accounts; and, so far as his experience went, were fully and fairly considered by that Committee. It was his desire to afford the fullest opportunities to the Committee, and such recommendations as they had made had been acted upon. With regard to the delay in the issue of the Appropriation Accounts this year, he did not wish to throw any blame upon the Auditor General, for he knew well the arduous work which that gentleman and his staff had to go through. All he had said was that he had himself been subjected to as much inconvenience as other hon. Members, the Report having reached him at the same time as it reached the rest of the House. He was desirous that the Accounts should be presented to Parliament at as early a date as possible. He believed that in many respects last year was an exceptional one; and he was glad that the criticisms of the Auditor General should be extended to all the matters brought under his notice, as he deemed his observations to be a great advantage to the Department and to the Public Service. So far as the delay in the issue of the Auditor General's Reports was attributable to the War Office, he would point out that for many years past an audit of Accounts in the War Office by the Auditor General had been impossible, by reason of the want of accommodation. Owing to the changes which had taken place in the War Office, he believed that the Auditor General would now be able to have full facilities for making his investigations. He was not aware of any complaints having been made by the Auditor General as to suffering inconvenience; and he believed that the fullest facilities were given to him and his staff to inquire fully into all matters brought under their examination. He did not think it necessary for him to go in detail into the matters to which the hon. Member had alluded, because all these things had come before the Committee of Public Accounts.

MR. BIGGAR observed, that one of the complaints made by Sir William Dunbar, referred to in the 3rd paragraph of his Report, was as to the necessity of a codified statement being prepared by the authorities. He also said that he had not the Regulations for the Army allowances. Although the right hon. and gallant Gentleman might not be himself to blame for the matters of which the Auditor General complained, yet he was bound to see that the requirements of the Auditor General were complied with, and that he was enabled to make a correct Report. It seemed to him that the War Office threw all possible obstacles in the way of the Auditor General. That was clear from what the Auditor said about the negligence of the War Office officials in furnishing him with the materials he required. In paragraph 6, sub-section 1, of the Report, the Auditor General complained of the action of the War Office with regard to Ceylon; and with regard to Honduras, a similar complaint was made. The expenditure in these cases ought to have appeared in an earlier Appropriation Account, and that complaint was repeated year after year by the Auditor General, and received no sort of attention from the War Office; and, more than that, he might say that, so far as he was able to form an opinion, they intentionally disregarded his requirements. All the contribution which the Cape and Natal made to the cost of our Army was £14,000, which was £10,000 from the Cape, and £4,000 from Natal. That represented an allowance of 3*s.* per day for the officers, and nothing for the soldiers. That was all the contribution these Colonies made, instead of paying £70 for each Artilleryman and £40 for each Infantryman, as the others did. All this formed a strong argument why time should be given them for looking into these matters, and comparing the Estimates with those of past years, in order to see how the different sums were expended. He had not had time to do more than look over the Auditor General's Report, and had not been able to examine the correspondence; but already he saw that there were some things in it which seemed to require clearing up. For instance, in the allowances to the Foot Guards, the War Office had given not a specific sum, but a sum to each regiment, with the result that the Coldstream, Fusilier, and Grenadier Guards got £600 more than they were entitled to. In that case, at any rate, he thought the right hon. and gallant Gentleman would admit that the War Office had set the wishes of the Auditor General at nought. Again, Militia officers drew lodging money while they were under canvas, for which they were also paid, so that they thus drew a double allowance, which seemed to him thoroughly irregular. Again, in regard to the railway at Woolwich, some £5,000 of the cost of that was charged to the cost of the Russo-Turkish War. That seemed to him very queer sort of book-keeping. The Auditor General went on to say—

> "It is difficult to see why one portion of this Service is treated as ordinary Army expenditure and the remainder as being incidental to the War in Europe. The correspondence between the Treasury and the War Office on the subject will be found in the correspondence appended to explanatory paper, No. 5, page 138."

He might remark that there were constant complaints in the correspondence that the Auditor General wrote letters to the War Office and received no reply. If the Auditor General was responsible for the good government of his Office, his complaints ought to be replied to, and in a few days, not left for months unanswered, as was sometimes the case here. There were also the cases of the pay of a surgeon at Chelsea Hospital, and the gratuities for long service, which required explanation. A still more important part of the Report was that headed "Extension of Test Examination to Manufacturing and Store Accounts of the Army." It was a very important part of the document, and he would like to have read it in full, for the reason that the Auditor General was anxious that an examination should be made, not only of the quantity of the stores bought, but of the quantity of the stores issued. The War Office seemed to think it was sufficient to keep a check upon the quantity of goods brought into store, without any reference to what were sent out. If he were keeping a large stock account, he certainly should keep an account of the goods sent out, as well as of the goods brought in, and so the Auditor General contended. The War Office, however, in the most persistent way, had thrown obstacles in the way of a settlement of the question. The Minute was given at page 17, and it showed that the War Office and the Treasury were trying to throw all the obstacles in the way of the Auditor General that they could. The Auditor General had written twice to ascertain their views, and had got no reply; and, therefore, he thought it would be well to postpone this whole matter, in order to give an opportunity of comparing the Accounts. He had no doubt, it they were able to make a careful comparison of these Votes, they would find that large sums had been asked for on particular Votes which, if spent at all, should be spent on other Votes. He, therefore, pressed for an adjournment, in order that the right hon. and gallant Gentleman himself might have an opportunity of explaining these matters.

Mr. PARNELL observed, that the right hon. and gallant Gentleman the Secretary of State for War had excused himself from following the Report of 1876-7, on the ground that it was a very old Report, and he expressed his wonder that they did not go back to 1870. Now, it was a remarkable fact that the other night the right hon. and gallant Gentleman wanted them to go on with this Vote—the Report of 1876-7, which he now described an an old Report, being at that time the very latest Report thay had to inform them with regard to the expenditure of these large sums of money. The fact would show that the right hon. and gallant Gentleman was not very candid in the excuse which he made, the real fact of the case being that he could not contradict the statements he (Mr. Parnell) had made. The statements to which he referred in the Report of 1876-7 were the statements of the Controller General, and to this day they had not been attended to; and he submitted that the Government ought to pay some attention to the suggestions of its officers. The Chairman of the Select Committee on Public Accounts said that if there was anything wrong, that Committee would have attended to it. But it was a reference to the Report of that Committee that first showed him (Mr. Parnell) the necessity of calling the attention of the House of Commons to this matter. In their Report they said that the Treasury, by their Minute of the 20th of March, 1876, required a test examination to be made. That was three years ago; but to this day the War Office had not furnished the Auditor General with the materials for that test audit. The right hon. and gallant Gentleman said he had a great desire to pay attention to any recommendations he received; and he could not do that better than by not requiring these Votes year after year, when the Report of the Auditor General was kept back to the very last moment. If the right hon. and gallant Gentleman would show his sense of the practical necessity of attending to this matter, by requiring that this Report should not be kept back till the very last moment, and by endeavouring to bring it on as early as possible, then he would withdraw his Motion. But unless he had some such assurance, he must press the Motion to a division.

Mr. BIGGAR, in reply to the statement of the right hon. and gallant Gentleman, that the Committee of Public Accounts examined the Report of the Accountant General carefully, and were satisfied with the Report of the Auditor General, said he would just show their sentiments by reading one or two words from their Report of last year. That for this year had not yet been issued. In section 23 they called attention to the importance of consolidating the various Royal Warrants regulating the pay and allowances. Again, in Clause 27, they pointed out that no vouchers had been produced for £270 charged against Vote 13, and that charge had not been allowed. Then, again, the Committee reported twice that sums had been spent in ways not authorized by Parliament; and these were charges not brought by him, but by the Select Committee. Therefore, he thought it would be far better to adjourn this Vote for a few days, in order that they might have a better audit of the Accounts.

Mr. RYLANDS hoped the Motion would not be pressed to a division. The hon. Gentleman had, no doubt, made out a very strong case, showing that it was certainly very important that the Appropriation Accounts should be presented at an earlier date; and he had also put forward very strong reasons for getting earlier attention paid to the requirements of the audit. But both the Chancellor of the Exchequer and the Secretary of State for War were equally anxious that the audit of the Accounts should be presented at an earlier date; and therefore he hoped the hon. Gentleman would not think it necessary to divide.

MR. PARNELL said, he was very unwilling to put the Committee to the trouble of dividing, especially as the smallness of the numbers who would vote with him would diminish the strength of the case he had made out—a case which must command the attention of the War Office before this time next year. He would, therefore, ask permission to withdraw his Motion.

Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Original Question again proposed.

MAJOR NOLAN called attention to the question of musters in the Army. No doubt they were still useful for horses; but he did not think they were of any use for the men, and he had never found anyone who thought they were. If all men were mustered, the old system might still be of value; but 35 per cent of them never came up at all. At present one-thirtieth of the men's time was spent in mustering, and they could not waste their time without wasting also the time of the country. This system was merely a survival from the bye-gone past, and he believed might be done away with now without the least detriment to anybody.

SIR ARTHUR HAYTER called attention to the inequality which existed in the rates of pay of the various commissioned ranks of the Army, arising from the circumstance that there had been no revision of such rates since the abolition of purchase. By way of illustration of the inequalities to which he referred, he would first call the attention of the Committee to the differences existing between the rates of pay of the officers in the Household Cavalry and those of corresponding ranks in the Cavalry of the Line. A lieutenant-colonel in the former received £532 5*s.* 10*d.* per annum, or at the rate of £1 9*s.* 2*d.* per day; while a lieutenant-colonel in the latter received £419 15*s.* per annum, or £1 3*s.* per day. And from those figures it would be seen that a lieutenant-colonel in the Cavalry of the Line received £113 annually less than his brother officer in the Household Cavalry. And similarly throughout the other ranks, for it would be seen that a major in the Household Cavalry received £1 4*s.* 5*d.* a-day, or £445 per annum, and a major in the Cavalry of the Line 19*s.* 3*d.* a-day, or £351 per annum. So that the latter officers received £94 a-year more than the former. The pay of the remaining ranks was as follows:—

	Household Cavalry.		*Cavalry of the Line.*
Captains ..	15/1.	....	14/7.
Lieutenants	10/4.	....	9/-
2nd Lieutenants	8/-	....	8/-
Adjutants ..	13/-	....	11/6.

From this, it would be seen that there existed a very marked inequality, and particularly in the pay of the adjutants, which told very much against the officers of the Cavalry of the Line. Turning to the Foot Guards and the Infantry of the Line, it would be found that there were corresponding differences between the pay in the various ranks of officers, which were as follows:—

Household Brigades.

	Per day.	Per annum.
Majors	23/-	£419.
Captains	15/6.	£282.
Lieutenant-Colonels ..	26/9.	
Lieutenants	7/4.	
Second Lieutenants ..	5/6.	

Infantry of the Line.

	Per day.	Per annum.
Majors	16/-	£310.
Captains	11/7.	£211.
Lieutenant-Colonels ..	17/-	
Lieutenants	6/6.	
Second Lieutenants ..	5/3.	

Looking, therefore, at the aggregate expenditure of a battalion of Foot Guards, and the aggregate expenditure of a battalion of the Line, it would be seen that in the former case it amounted to £26,000, and in the latter—taking the greatest strength of the battalion at 800 men—to £20,983. Thus a battalion of Foot Guards cost annually £5,000 more than a battalion of the Line. He now wished to draw attention to the striking anomalies which appeared to exist in the pay of the Artillery and Engineers as compared with the other branches of the Service. It would be remembered that the preparation for the Scientific corps was, in point of time, just double that for the Line, many of the officers of which entered through the Militia, receiving their commissions after passing at Sandhurst; and, further, that in the case of the Scientific corps, a very severe competitive examination in the higher branches of education had to be passed, and that, again, was followed by another severe examination at Woolwich. There appeared to be a slight advantage in favour of the Ordnance officer, in point of the age at which young men were allowed to enter at Woolwich, as compared with Sandhurst; but, notwithstanding that difference of one year, it must be borne in mind that, as a rule, the men who went to Woolwich were older than their comrades of the Line. Although the pay of the second lieutenants was nearly the same in all three branches, yet when they came to the higher ranks it would be seen that the pay of a captain in the Engineers was 11*s.* a-day, as compared with that of a captain in the Foot Guards, who received 15*s.* 6*d.* a-day. It was argued that the promotion in the Guards was slower than in the Engineers and Artillery; but he found, on reference to the latest Army List, which he held in his hand, that such was not the fact. On the contrary, the senior lieutenants in the Guards, now waiting for promotion to the rank of captain, had all joined since 1868; whereas the senior lieutenants of the Royal Artillery waiting for the same step of promotion dated from 1867. They were, therefore, very considerably worse off in point of promotion. Again, there was an important comparison to make between the pay of the lieutenant-colonels, who received in the Field Artillery and Engineers 18*s.* 9*d.* and 18*s.* a-day respectively; while officers of the same rank in the Foot Guards received 23*s.* a-day, or an excess of 5*s.* a-day over their comrades in the Scientific corps. These were all points that the right hon. and gallant Gentleman the Secretary of State for War ought to regard with considerable attention, with a view to their rectification; because he (Sir Arthur Hayter) found that a proper revision had taken place in the pay of the non-commissioned ranks. Under the new scale, it appeared that the sergeants of the two Scientific corps received 2*s.* 11*d.* a-day; whereas the sergeants in the Foot Guards and the Line received 2*s.* 3*d.* and 2*s.* 1*d.* per day respectively. And, again, with the corporals. These received 2*s.* a-day, as compared with 1*s.* 9*d.* a-day paid to the corporals in the Foot Guards. The non-commissioned officers of the Scientific corps also received, in addition to those advantages, a very considerable sum as working pay, irrespective of their ordinary daily pay. He would not say that any feeling of dissatisfaction existed amongst the officers of the Artillery and Engineers; but he trusted that as the right hon. and gallant Gentleman was about to institute an examination into the questions raised by the Motion of the hon. and gallant Member for Hereford (Colonel Arbuthnot), that it would come within the scope of the Commission to take into consideration the revision of the rates of pay to commissioned officers in the different branches of the Service, among which so many anomalies existed.

Colonel ALEXANDER took the opportunity of referring to a Question put by him upon a former occasion to the right hon. and gallant Gentleman, and which received an affirmative reply—

> "Whether it is the case that a regiment on foreign service is kept below its regulated establishment of subalterns, if the regiment with which it is linked has supernumeraries of that rank, in consequence of its establishment being reduced?"

It was the case that the establishment of subalterns of a regiment on foreign service stood at 18, while a regiment on home service had only 14. Supposing that a regiment were ordered to Malta, it became at once entitled to four additional subalterns; but if it happened to be linked to a regiment about to return, say from the East Indies, it would be kept below its establishment of subalterns until the regiment to which it was linked had got rid of all its supernumerary subalterns. This caused great discontent, by the loss of mess and band subscriptions, and by increasing the duties of the officers of the regiment and preventing a due proportion of them obtaining leave of absence. He knew of a regiment abroad which for more than a year had four subalterns below its proper establishment. Either the officers of linked regiments were interchangeable or they were not; if they were interchangeable, the supernumerary subalterns of the regiment returning home should be given to the regiment on foreign service; if they were not interchangeable, the vacancies in the regiment on foreign service should be at once filled up.

GENERAL SIR **GEORGE BALFOUR** said, the Committee would be astonished to find in the Estimates a charge of no less than £20,000 on account of the Island of Cyprus. Of this sum only £2,000 was specifically stated in the body of the Vote for military works; whereas all the other items were only to be seen in the appendixes in the smallest type, which calculated to prevent these charges from being seen. If it were true that they were bound to give any money on account of that Island, it ought to have been taken upon a direct Vote. It should have been done by the responsible Government coming frankly before the House and saying we require £60,000, or otherwise, for the expenses of Cyprus. This sum was mentioned because, in addition to the £20,000 in the Military Estimates, no one could conceive that, under the head of Civil Charges, in a total of £35,000, there would be included the sum of £26,000 on account of a military corps, to be specially raised for service in that Island, leaving £9,000 for telegraphic and postal communication. Such an act was most unconstitutional; and it was a cruel and unjust thing for the Government to come forward and levy from the impoverished poor people of this country so large a sum, and constitutionally wrong to include a charge for such a body of men under the head of Civil Charges. Let the body be called pioneers, or anything else, it was a military establishment; and to treat them as a non-military body was most injudicious; for in the case of mutiny, which might break out at any moment, the men could not be punished. To allow these officers and men to act as a military body, without being subject to military law, was so unconstitutional a thing, that he believed many hon. Members on the opposite Benches would be roused against the wrong which had been done. He could never have anticipated that so constitutional a Minister as the Chancellor of the Exchequer should allow charges for military services on account of the Island of Cyprus to be included under the head of Civil Charges, without a distinct understanding with the Representatives of the people of the country. As the act of a great Constitutional Party it was perfectly inconceivable; and when he found the Government falling into greater irregularities of the kind than had ever been committed by those who occupied the Opposition Benches, he grieved to think that the great Constitutional traditions of the Conservatives were being set at naught. There was also a grave question as to the cost of the occupation of this Island to the heavily taxed people of this country. The direct charges in the Civil and Military Estimates amounted to about £54,000; but there was the cost of the Infantry battalion, of Engineers, and Artillery, where pay and allowances must be as much more, so that they were yearly adding to their outlay fully £120,000 with barracks. He now wished to call attention to the number of officers maintained at the present time for our Army; and, in doing so, desired it to be understood that he was not one of those who thought that they should be satisfied with an insufficient number of officers for each military body; for, in his opinion, whatever might be the organization of the Army, proper provision ought to be made for making up the officers, so as to cover those that might be lost to the Army by death and otherwise. But a great abuse was springing up in the over-officering of the Army; and the Committee would probably be surprised to learn that they had now for the Infantry of the Line 1,000 officers more than they possessed in 1855, when Lord Hardinge considered the Army to be thoroughly well officered, and when they had as many privates in the Infantry as at the present time. Another great abuse was annually extending, because changes had been allowed to take place in the Army regulations of an important character, without their having properly considered the consequences that would follow from them. It was a well-known fact that a Warrant might be issued having one meaning in the eyes of those who framed it, and another quite different as understood by persons affected thereby. Out of this kind of mismanagement had arisen the practice of adding to the already over-officered Army seconded or supernumerary officers to replace those withdrawn from their regiments for Staff duties. At first the numbers supernumerary were few. In 1875 and 1876 they had the modest number of 16 supernumerary captains and subalterns of Infantry; but they had gone on increasing the number year by year, and made additions to those corps of Cavalry Guards and Infantry which, of all others, were well officered. In that way, they had added to the Cavalry of the Line in this year's Estimates as many as one major and eight captains; and to the Foot Guards, five captains and two subalterns, in all seven supernumerary officers to the Guards; the supernumerary officers of the Infantry of the Line being 72 in number; and the total number of supernumerary colonels, lieutenant-colonels, majors, captains, and subalterns now stood at 178, as compared with the 16 which they had 24 years ago. He had no hesitation in saying that the number of captains of their Line Infantry approached very nearly to that of the German Army, with its enormous and over-done military establishment of 400,000 privates. Year by year the Secretary of State for War came down to the House asking for more money. The Commander-in-Chief also asked for more money, and promised certain beneficial results from the outlay; but he never once thought how he could organize the Infantry arm, so as to do away with the great expenditure for unnecessarily officering the Army, to which he had referred. He (Sir George Balfour) complained publicly of the Military Authorities, inasmuch as they had not aided the Secretary of State in carrying out those great improvements which the abolition of purchase was intended to effect. And when he looked at our wonderful Establishment of wretched Infantry organization, he felt bound to complain that, when a time of necessity arrived, as recently, they had the discreditable scene of men drafted from one battalion to another, as was recently the case when it was required to send re-inforcements abroad. Instead of being able to send 20 or 30 battalions out of the country at 24 hours' notice, they had men transferred from at least nine different battalions to complete only a few for Service. He thought such a necessity was disgraceful to their military system, and it had occasioned a slur on the English Army which it ought not to bear. It was solely due to the defective and costly system of organization. He hoped the discussion in the House that evening would tend to strengthen the hands of the Secretary of State for War, so as to enable him to make the changes necessary to make the Army more effective for taking field than it was at present.

Lord ELCHO said, that in every Liberal speech, and at every Liberal caucus, they were represented as living under the despotism of one man who defied Constitutional liberty, and it had been repeated so often that he had come almost to believe it; but he was relieved from his apprehensions by hearing the belief which the hon. and gallant Gentleman (Sir George Balfour) expressed, that the Chancellor of the Exchequer was the last man in the world to assent to anything unconstitutional.

General Sir GEORGE BALFOUR said, the Conservatives were called the Constitutional Party; but their practices belied their name.

Lord ELCHO said, that if the Chancellor of the Exchequer was a man who could not assent to any unconstitutional act, it might be assumed that he had not done so up to this time. And the hon. and gallant Gentleman had further told them that it was on his own side of the House that unconstitutional practices prevailed. Being a soldier, the hon. and gallant Gentleman doubtless remembered and appreciated the unconstitutional conduct of his own Party in reference to the Army Purchase Bill.

Mr. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN said, it was not for him to take up the gauntlet thrown by the noble Lord by his reference to that celebrated proceeding in connection with the abolition of purchase which had stood the noble Lord and his Party in good stead ever since. Neither the noble Lord nor the present Prime Minister challenged the conduct of the late Government on that occasion, however; and he presumed that if the use of the Prerogative had been a very gross stretch of power, such a high Constitutional authority as the noble Lord or the Prime Minister would not have passed the opportunity of pointing out the fact. They did not do so, however; because, when they looked into the matter, they found there was no case for them; but, nevertheless, the use of the Prerogative on that occasion had stood the noble Lord and the Party opposite in good stead ever since; and as they found it so useful a weapon he would be sorry to grudge them the use of it. The principal reason for his rising was not to answer the noble Lord, but to ask a question with reference to the Forces in Zululand. He thought the Vote for instruction in Army signalling was included in this Estimate; and he thought it would be satisfactory to know whether there was any corps, or any officers and men, specially instructed in Army signalling with the Forces in Zululand; and, if so, whether they were supplied with the heliograph, an instrument by which the flashing signal was communicated? They had read in the papers that it had proved most satisfactory in Afghanistan. He, therefore, asked if there had been any special provision for Zululand of men accustomed to use these instruments? There had been a great deal of money spent in forming signalling classes, and he trusted that they had been utilized.

Colonel ALEXANDER, referring to the remarks of the hon. and gallant Gentleman (Sir George Balfour), said, he thought the hon. and gallant Member was in error, and he was not aware of any increase of officers in the Guards since 1854. In that year 12 companies—namely, four to each of the three regiments—were added, with a proper proportion of officers.

General Sir GEORGE BALFOUR said, what he complained of was that though, at the present time, there was the same number of men as in the past, there were more officers—that they were overdone with officers—in fact, that the seven battalions of Guards on the war with Russia breaking out were increased to 70 companies from 58, and now, in the present Estimates, there were seven supernumerary officers added.

Major O'BEIRNE complained of the Vote of £3,600, allowances to commanding officers of brigade depôts. He remarked that battalion officers only got 2*s.* a-day; and he could not understand for what reason brigade officers were paid 5*s.* a-day. The number of men was only 120, and it rarely exceeded 70 to 80. It was only the other day he heard of a brigade officer inspecting nine men and nine officers on parade. He was sure there were half too many officers in these brigade depots, and that they not only did no good, but were actually doing harm to their regiments. They had absolutely nothing to do; and he therefore thought some way of how they should be employed might be devised.

The CHAIRMAN: Does the hon. and gallant Member propose to reduce the Vote?

Major O'BEIRNE: Yes, by the amount set down as payable to officers of brigade depôts.

Sir ALEXANDER GORDON said, he should like to know what became of the horses purchased with the £124,000 out of the Vote of Credit of last year? That would cover about 3,000 horses, in addition to replacing the ordinary supply; but if they turned to page 13 of the Estimates, they would find there was not a single addition to the number of permanent horses. He wanted to know what became of those horses? They certainly did not go out to Turkey. Again, he found there was a large increase in the General Staff. Last year it was 78, this year it was 237, and yet there was no explanation of the change.

Colonel STANLEY said, he would endeavour to answer the questions *seriatim.* The hon. and gallant Member for Galway (Major Nolan) had asked a question about the system of musters. There was no doubt that system belonged to an earlier stage altogether; and he had asked his hon. Friend the Accountant General to see whether quite sufficient security was not given, by checking the Forces' pay-list, to guard against any possible irregularity which the system of musters was intended to guard. Of course, it was a different question at the time when all the men's pay was made over to the colonel; but now, when that system had disappeared, and every man was paid under a complicated and, he trusted, an efficient system, the necessity of musters was not so imperative; and he hoped that before long he should be able to pay attention to that matter. With regard to the question of inequality of pay amongst officers, that was a difficult one at all times; and he must frankly say that he was not in a position to reduce the pay of the officers in the Army. Of course, if they were starting for the first time, they might have very good reason for placing the question of pay on a system of equality. But under special circumstances, in cases where the pay had been built up for particular reasons, he did not think that constituted an abuse, or demanded the immediate attention of Parliament. With regard to the inequality of the pay of the Household Troops with that of the Line, the hon. and gallant Gentleman (Sir Arthur Hayter) must bear in mind that an officer in the Guards was placed in a very different position in London to the Line officer. The officer in the Guards was not supposed to hold the most economical of positions; and, except when on actual duty, he was not provided with quarters in any way. If they were to strike the balance between the officer of the Guards and the officer of the Line, putting the latter in the same position as the former, he thought the balance would be by no means in favour of the Guards, and he should advise that no further movements were made in that direction. With regard to an equal number of officers to each regiment, he believed his noble Friend near him (Lord Eustace Cecil) had given a correct reply. In reply to the next question, he might say that the Warrant of 1873 made every officer who entered the Army after that date liable to be transferred, with or without his own consent, to the linked battalion. But it was not held to have a retrospective effect, as it was felt to be a hardship to officers long in the Service that they should be so transferred. They would rather not go by the strict letter of the law in a Service like theirs, scattered over the face of the earth; but they wished to proceed with a certain regard to the welfare of the Service generally, and with an endeavour not to throw undue hardship upon particular officers. For instance, it would be obviously hard, in the case of supernumeraries of the corresponding battalion, where officers were short in the front battalion, to send out those officers to India, perhaps knowing that almost directly those officers would be called to the home battalion. At the same time, his hon. and gallant Friend (Colonel Alexander) was perfectly correct in saying that those officers were available under certain circumstances. The hon. and gallant Gentleman (Sir George Balfour) asked why certain military charges incurred in respect of Cyprus were not found in one place, instead of in several? No doubt, that was so. They were like all other military charges, except in this respect.

General Sir GEORGE BALFOUR: It is a pity the right hon. and gallant Gentleman should waste time in replying to objections which were never made.

Colonel STANLEY said, he had understood the hon. and gallant Member to object to the items being distributed, and he would explain. The fact of the matter was this. At the present moment, the proportion of foreigners in Cyprus was limited; and, being foreigners, they could not be enlisted in greater porportion than somewhere about 2 per cent per company, or 2 per cent of the total number of men. These troops, if they might be called so, were intended to be employed as engineers and pioneers; and though they were so far disciplined, and placed under military control as to render them available for heavy duty in the plains, they would not come properly under the head of police; and, therefore, they were put in what appeared to be their proper position in the place of pioneers. Inasmuch as they were not enlisted under the Mutiny Act, they could not form any portion of that particular Vote by Parliament; and he held that it would have been as improper to have included them in the Estimates, as it would be to include any other corps of police which might be raised in any other part of Her Majesty's Possessions. This Force was intended to be utilized, quite as much for constructing roads, bridges, and other public works, as for military purposes. The hon. and gallant General referred also to the number of officers who were supernumerary; and the Warrant to which he referred was that, no doubt, which followed the recommendation of the Royal Commission on Promotion and Retirement, to the effect that officers of the Staff should be borne as supernumeraries. For his part, he had always understood that in allowing officers employed on the Staff to go back to their regiments they were following an excellent example set them by the best foreign Armies. With regard to the question of the hon. Member for the Stirling Burghs (Mr. Campbell-Bannerman) on the subject of signalling, he could not say off-hand that a distinct body of officers and men had gone out; but every corps had now a certain number of officers and men proficient in signalling, and he was almost certain that in every corps which had gone out to Zululand there were a large number of officers and men who had been trained in signalling. As to the instrument mentioned by the hon. Gentleman, they had received a request that a certain number might be sent out; and he was happy to say that they had already anticipated that requisition. In addition to that, and with a view to meeting the requirements of the Cape in respect of signalling, he had caused a telegram to be sent asking whether it would be practicable to use a balloon for military purposes? They had not yet received a reply, and should not send out the balloon unless it would be of practical use. A question had been asked him with regard to the depôt allowance for colonels; and the hon. and gallant Member who propounded it (Major O'Beirne) said that the allowance was excessive, and such as the duties of the colonel of a depôt hardly justified. He must remind the hon. Member that the colonel of a depôt held a position differing in many respects from that of officers commanding regiments. He occupied a *quasi*-Staff position, and the allowance had to be made to meet the expenses incurred by his travelling about, and otherwise being put to expenses for which command allowance was generally given. The hon. and gallant Member for East Aberdeenshire (Sir Alexander Gordon) asked him what had been done with the horses for which so large a sum was voted last year? When they found that they were not likely to be required they made inquiries, in order to ascertain whether it would be best to keep or to sell them; and they came to the conclusion that they would sell the greater number. That was done; but, at the same time, they took care, in some cases, to increase the stock of horses in regiments, keeping some of the best, and only throwing on the general market such horses as were of inferior quality. In their disposition of the horses, they had in view the process of replenishing the Army with the best class of horses. He believed that no exception was made in the case of the money received for the sale of those horses; but that it would be carried in ordinary course into the Exchequer Receipts. With regard to the question that had been asked about the increase in the extra pay of the Guards—a question, he believed, which was asked by the hon. Member for Meath (Mr. Parnell)——

Mr. PARNELL said, his question was not connected with that subject.

Colonel STANLEY said, he was mistaken in supposing that the hon. Member asked that. His question was with regard to the General Staff. He (Colonel Stanley) might say that the item to which the hon. Member referred had arisen from the transfers that had been made, owing to the Royal Warrant, in relation to seconding. He (Colonel Stanley) thought that was the only explanation that he could give. With regard to the extra pay of the officers of the Foot Guards, he thought he had not rightly apprehended the question put by the hon. Member for Meath.

Mr. PARNELL said, there were two questions; and perhaps he might state to the right hon. and gallant Gentleman that the question of the allowance to officers in the Foot Guards was referred to in the last Report of the Controller and Auditor General. It had been raised by another hon. Member; but he (Mr. Parnell) proposed to raise the question later on.

Colonel STANLEY said, he thought it would be very convenient to the Committee that they should take the question of the Stock Purse now. He was hardly aware of the actual circumstances under which the difference had arisen. In the year 1855, when the question of the Stock Purse was last dealt with, it was found insufficient to enable the regiments to be recruited up to their full establishment; and it was settled that the officers should receive a commutive allowance, in lieu of the previous allowance from the Stock Purse. It was calculated on the average of three successive years, and the amount was fixed at about £80 a-year. As stated in the Auditor General's Report, in practice it amounted to a little less in the Scots Guards, and to a little more in the Coldstream Guards.

The CHAIRMAN: Does the hon. Member for Meath wish to move an Amendment?

Mr. PARNELL wished to know whether the balances of deserters' accounts, amounting to £1,506, to be found on page 109 of the Estimates, under the head of "Exchequer Receipts," included any amount from the effects of deserters from the Guards; and, if so, how much? It appeared to him that the balances of deserters' accounts were still open. He wished to point out, with regard to the matter, that the right hon. and gallant Gentleman last Session, in answer to the hon. Member for Clonmel (Mr. A. Moore), said that the provisions in the Regimental Debts Act and the Royal Warrants applied to the Army generally; but that some reservations appeared to have been made on the point by the legal authorities. He, therefore, wished to press his question as to whether the £1,506 included any amount from deserters from the brigade of the Guards; and, if so, how much? If it did not, what, then, became of the effects of deserters from the Guards? If the reservations had reference to the Guards, who were the legal authorities that authorized the exemption of the Guards from the Act of Parliament governing the matter? What were the grounds for it? The reservation ought also to be brought under the notice of the House; and he would point out to the Committee that every captain of the Foot Guards received an allowance of £20 7*s.* 6*d.*, to cover the possible loss which might accrue to him from death or illness. He was desirous also of pointing out generally that the Estimates, as presented, appeared to show a decrease of £343,976. But, in reality, such a reduction had not taken place. The original Estimates for 1878-9 did not include all the money voted, for there was a Supplementary Estimate of £370,000. If this Estimate were compared with the original Estimate, it would be found that there had been an increase in the present year. They had no assurance that the House might not be asked to pass another Supplementary Estimate of a far greater amount during the present year. Putting the Supplementary Estimate aside, and comparing the original Estimates, it would be found that the increase in the Vote amounted to £32,000. That increase had arisen in spite of the fact that the expenses of discharged soldiers, which last year had amounted to £8,000, did not appear in the present Estimates.

Lord ELCHO wished to ask, with regard to these scientific instruments with a long name, whether they were in the possession of the troops by the 22nd of January, or whether they had been sent out since that date?

Sir ALEXANDER GORDON observed, that when officers were taken off regimental establishments and added to the General Staff their pay ought to be deducted from the regimental establishment. The Estimates showed that there was a total of 200 more officers than last year; but it appeared to him that those officers had been counted twice over.

Colonel STANLEY said, that the explanation he had previously given was the accurate one. There was a certain increase in the charge which had arisen from the transfer of some officers employed in the Intelligence Department.

Sir ALEXANDER GORDON said, that according to the statement on page 6, those officers were borne twice, both as Regimental and Staff officers.

General Sir GEORGE BALFOUR remarked, that there was always great difficulty in finding out what these increases meant. No one who had paid attention to the numbers inserted in the table at page 6 of the Army Estimates, as the established strength of the Army and Staff, could have failed to see that it was, in the main, thoroughly unreliable. From the confused manner in which the Estimates were prepared, it was almost impossible for Members to find out what they really meant, although one Secretary of State after another had promised amendment. He should be happy to second any Motion which should have for its object the putting pressure upon the War Office to state these numbers in a proper form. A matter of some importance arose in connection with Cyprus. What reason was there why coloured regiments should not be raised in that Island? What had become of the West Indian regiments? There must be some strange and unexplained cause for raising a military regiment of nearly 1,200 men for service in Cyprus, and charging the cost in the Civil Estimates. He objected also to the manner in which the Secretary of State for War had alluded to his observations, and had put words into his mouth which he had never uttered, about the charges in the Army Estimates of about £20,000 for military establishments for Cyprus. A distinct Vote for £2,000 was granted on account of Cyprus in only Vote 13 of the Estimates; whereas the balance of £18,000 was spread amongst many of the appendices in a way to render their detection difficult. He repeated, that the charges with regard to Cyprus should not be muddled in the manner in which they were found in the present Estimates. It was also a great pity, in spite of the recommendations of the Commission, that the organization of the Army should be so defective as to require that so many should be made supernumerary to replace officers taken away from their regiments upon other duty. This never ought to be done to such an extent as to leave a battalion or company without its proper compliment of officers—a matter which frequently occurred at the present time—because the battalions and companies were far too many for the number of privates in the Army.

SIR PATRICK O'BRIEN said, that when he last had an opportunity of addressing the House on a subject connected with the Army he found that, outside the House, but little of what he had said was reported, and he supposed that any observations he might make that evening would be as totally ignored by the Press as on former occasions. Therefore, anything he might say would be only for the ears of the few hon. Gentlemen then present in the House. Still, as long as he remained a Member of that House, he should consider it his duty to lay before it such arguments as he thought it necessary to raise. Referring to the question of the Horse Guards management, and the statement he made on Friday night with a view of remedying the evils that now existed, he would venture again to put forward views of a similar character. On more than one occasion he had, in various ways, brought before the House the question of the establishment of a regiment of Irish Guards. When he asked a Question of the right hon. and gallant Gentleman opposite, who held the position of War Minister, with regard to it, he was treated like a child. The reply made to him was in this form—"What a gallant people you are. You have ever distinguished yourselves as British soldiers. We all admire your 88th Connaught Rangers." The Secretary of State for War had informed him of the existence of that regiment, as if he had never heard of it before. But if hon. Gentlemen had studied the question, and considered the part that Irish soldiers had played in history—and that night was no inappropriate time to remember it—they would not have spoken of them in that way. He should test the question that night, in his small way, by taking objection to certain items in the Vote, for that was the only way in which Irish views on this subject could be made apparent. Laymen in that House might not be conversant with military technicality; but that did not prevent their possessing a knowledge of military history; and as regarded the prolonged contest in the beginning of the century in the Peninsular, he fearlessly asserted that the large proportion of the Infantry of the Line engaged in that contest were Irishmen. The other day he had moved for a Return of the different nationalities of the men composing the British Army. If he had had the honour of a seat in that House 35 years ago, and had moved for such a Return, it would have been refused him on political grounds. And why? Because it would not have suited the Government of the day to have acknowledged officially that two-thirds of the British Line then, as they had been in the time, 1808-1812, were Irish. He would wish to point out that it was not only military men who were acquainted with the history of the British Army. It was not only the few soldiers who occupied seats in that House who were acquainted with military history, for the subject was distinct from the calling of a soldier; and not only soldiers, but civilians, were aware of that history. In 1808 and 1812 there were records of very glorious deeds; and he might instance that Napier, in chronicling the conduct of the 92nd Gordon Highlanders as having performed deeds at the Maya that would have graced Thermopylæ, stated it was entirely composed of Irishmen. He would say that two-thirds of the Line of the British Army was, in those times, composed of Irishmen, for then no Roman Catholic was admitted into the Artillery. When he moved, some five years ago, for a Return of the nationalities in the Army, there were found to be some 44,000 Irishmen and 15,000 Scotchmen. He would call the attention of the House to the fact that the two nationalities were represented in a very different manner upon the Army List. He had not brought the document; but he could say, from memory, that there were 17 Scotch regiments and six Irish bearing a national designation. If a man had fought at Minden in the old days, his nationality was ascribed to Scotland. To show how strong the feeling was even at the present day he would say he had lately seen, in *The Illustrated London News*, the Scotch trews depicted as worn by a regiment in an engagement in which no regiment wearing trews was engaged. It was picturesque, and, as the journal was made to sell, no doubt the public liked it. The fact that, for the last 80 or 90 years, Irishmen had formed the principal element in the British Army, was totally disregarded. Why were these distinctions drawn between the nations? For his part, he should not object if national regimental distinctions were universally removed; and in that respect he was an Imperialist. There was no reason why old jealousies should be kept up by the retention of these names. But, so long as the names were retained, the fact that a considerable proportion of the Army was composed of Irishmen should be recognized by their territorial distinctions. He would be asked why did he not bring the question before the House formally? He was not what was called an Obstructionist in the House; but he rather wished to sweep away and level down, as far as possible, the difficulties which existed between the two nations, and what he did was what he believed it was his duty to do. He had done something, at various times, to induce his countrymen to enlist; but he certainly should not continue his efforts, if he was to be answered in the way he had been. They had at present three regiments of Guards —the Grenadiers, the Coldstreams, and the Fusiliers. The Coldstreams were not Scotch, although they took their names from a river over the Border; but there could be no doubt about the Fusiliers being a Scotch regiment. The name Grenadier Guards at once suggested the "British Grenadier"—an air which he believed was the quick-step of that regiment. He might be told all this was mere sentiment. Well, suppose it was? How many people were ruled by mere sentiment? He knew what was wanted. The Government wanted them to make a fuss, to come down and make a row on the Army Estimates, and then they would have a regiment of Irish Guards next Session. He was one of those who thought that business should not be conducted in that way, and who did not wish to interfere with the ordinary procedure of the House. He did not mean to impute to the right hon. and gallant Gentleman (Colonel Stanley) fault in the remarks he was making; but for the last eight years he had endeavoured to bring forward that question, but had always been met with a sneer, and the question had been treated in a slighting manner. If the right hon. and gallant Gentleman would get up and tell him that, despite the Horse Guards—that despite the wrong which existed in that particular locality—that there was to be a new military system of administration—that they were no longer to know regiments as English, Irish, or Scotch regiments—that they were to make numerical arrangements, and to call them the first, second, third, or fourth—then, *cadit quæstio.* He had nothing to say. But so long as particular nations were allowed to have specific regiments, so long should he object to the present arrangement. The Scotchmen only gave the Army 15,000 men, and yet had 17 regiments in the *Army List* with a Scottish designation; while Ireland, which gave the Army 44,000 men, had but six regiments with specifically Irish names. He had been told to put down a Motion; but what support would he get? It would be regarded, he was sorry to say, in the way in which too many Irish questions were regarded. Therefore, he thought he was entitled to bring this subject forward in the way he had done that night. Did the Horse Guards imagine that the Irish people were an amusing and playful people, who could be humbugged in this fashion? He thought the best way he could bring the question to an issue would be to move that the Vote before the Committee be reduced by £10,000, which he ventured to do.

Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That a sum, not exceeding £4,588,000, be granted to Her Majesty, to defray the Charge of the Pay, Allowances, and other Charges of Her Majesty's Land Forces at Home and Abroad (exclusive of India), which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1880."—(*Sir Patrick O'Brien.*)

Sir HENRY HAVELOCK said, he should like to make some inquiries which came under the Vote for levy money and recruiting parties. They were at present in a rather critical state with regard to the brigade depôts and the linked battalions now serving abroad. He should also like to know what steps were being taken by the right hon. and gallant Gentleman to fulfil the promise he had given, and which had been, to some extent, departed from—that the first 18 regiments should be kept up to a strength of 820? He understood the right hon. and gallant Gentleman to say that he was taking steps to carry out that promise from one or two different sources; but, on looking at the latest monthly Return presented to the House by the Army Quartermaster General, he was at a loss to reconcile the facts with that answer. For he found no regiments whatever on that increased strength, or anywhere near it. When this system of linked battalions was first formed there were 141 battalions, of which 70 were to serve abroad, and 71 at home. That arrangement had, however, now been considerably departed from. There were now in India five extra battalions—55 battalions instead of 50; 28 at the Colonies, including the Cape, instead of 21; leaving only 58, instead of 71, at home ready to be drawn upon for all the exigencies of the Service. In another and still more important respect the arrangement of which he spoke had been departed from. For there were 10 regiments which were in the abnormal position of having both battalions abroad, instead of having one abroad and one at home. Five of them had one battalion in India and one in some other Colony; while the other five were actually in the condition that one of the battalions was in India, where, if not actually in the field, it might be called upon at any moment, and the other was in the field at the Cape. This was not only a departure from the state of things originally intended, but it presented also a crisis which, in his opinion, ought to be met by some exceptional means. The right hon. and gallant Gentleman had given the House to understand that he had under contemplation some mode of carrying out the recommendations of the Committee of 1876 over which he presided, and of which Sir Garnet Wolseley was one member, and he (Sir Henry Havelock) another. That Committee recommended that when both battalions were serving abroad some provision for the emergency should be made by expanding the depôt. He should also like to know whether the right hon. and gallant Gentleman was making any provision against the recurrence of the contingency which happened in the 91st regiment? There the rule was followed of sending out no men who were over 19 years' service, and none who had not one year of service. The result was that the battalions were reduced to 400, and had to be filled up by a depletion of other regiments. When the supply of recruits was exceptionally large—the Army was 3,000 over the Establishment at the present moment—care should be taken not to enlist very young men, so that when named for service it should not be necessary to take off 300 or 400 men, but the battalion should embark almost as it stood.

MR. O'DONNELL said, while he fully recognized the excellence of the intentions and the soundness of the arguments of his hon. Friend the Member for King's County (Sir Patrick O'Brien), still, under the circumstances in which the British nation and the Irish nation were placed, he should feel it his duty to oppose the suggestion. No doubt, as an Irish gentleman, proud of the great part which Irish valour played in the support and the extension of the British Empire, he felt a natural wish that Irish valour should be as openly recognized as it was generally utilized. Though, perhaps, Irishmen did not any longer constitute the majority of the British Line, they certainly constituted a very considerable part of it, and he did not wonder that the hon. Baronet desired some open recognition of it. In support of his contention, however, he quoted some facts which rather militated against his view of the case than supported it. He wished for national regiments, and yet he amused the Committee by reminding them that a great many so-called Scotch national regiments were by no means Scotch in their composition. He would point out to the hon. Baronet that, even if the Government conferred upon Ireland the distinction of having a body of Royal Irish Guards, it would be a poor satisfaction to him to know—as, in all probability, he did know—that the so-called Royal Irish Guards should be more properly styled Royal "Hirish" Guards, from the predominant accent of the recruits. He could not, moreover, too clearly remember that, under the present system of Government, it was not recognised as safe to encourage a national spirit in the Army. Other Governments, and other Empires, unlike the English, could build up their Armies upon national feeling. The German

Army had many corps, each of which was grounded in the whole strength and spirit of its contiguous district; but that was contrary to the whole spirit in which the British Army was organized and established. The hon. Baronet might, by simply glancing at the Army List, satisfy himself upon that point, and see how utterly hostile to the spirit of British administration was the recognition of any such national sentiment. He found, under the various Army corps in Ireland, the Edinboro' Militia, Royal Lanark Militia; and among the divisions of troops forming part of the same Army corps the West York Militia; and that Cork was the head-quarters of the West Somerset Militia, Limerick of another, and so on. Those centres were largely filled up by troops hailing from the greatest possible distances from the Irish localities named. Nor was the system confined to England alone, for they found the same sort of thing in the Indian Army, where two companies of one nationality served beside two companies of another. The whole organization of the British Army at home and abroad rested upon the balance of possible conflict which might take place between different races which would be prevented making any use of their national sentiments. They were very distant from the time when the British Government would be able to rest upon national feeling; and, until that was attained, the Army could not be founded upon national feeling. The British Government had to bear in mind that it had to cope with discontent in every portion of its Dominions; and where it governed, it had to direct the ignorance of one portion of its subjects against the ignorance of the other portion. It was not a National Government, but an Imperialism of the worst kind; and its Military Forces were arranged upon the old Roman principle of "Divide and govern." He had stated that he entirely sympathized with the motives of the hon. Baronet, and only wished there was any near approach to the era which he contemplated; but as things were, and were likely to remain under this distinctly anti-national Government, there was not the slightest probability that it would arrive for many years to come. And he further considered that, under present circumstances, the Irish nation would be justified in rejecting, with utter disdain, any such puny and paltry recognition of Irish nationality as the granting of a regiment of Guards to a people from whom the English Government had stolen its Legislature. There would be no need for Irish Guards until they were required to escort the Sovereign to the opening of a restored Parliament. Then, indeed, they would be welcome; but the introduction of Irish Guards for the purpose of performing some imaginary part was, at the present day, an anachronism; while his opposition to their establishment was strengthened by the knowledge that, under the present system, their first duty would be the coercion of the Irish people.

Sir PATRICK O'BRIEN said, that he could understand the position assumed by the hon. Member for Dungarvan (Mr. O'Donnell). It appeared to him the hon. Member was too much given to adopting the "Poluphloisbo" style of oratory. He (Sir Patrick O'Brien) had been asked to sit there that evening for the purpose of criticizing the Army Estimates, and not for the purpose of talking about the Greeks and Romans, the glory of Empires, and the other grand subjects upon which the hon. Member delighted to speak. Bulwer Lytton once said—

> "Those politicians are common enough now. Propose to march to the Milennium, and they are your men; ask them to march a quarter of a mile, and they fall to feeling their pockets, and trembling for fear of foot-pads."

Such was the manner in which the hon. Member treated the small but practical suggestions which he had ventured to make. If a man simply confined himself to practical matters, little would be known of him; but if he talked about what nobody understood, and in grandiloquent language, people would say—"Who is this? It is some new, gorgeous light that has come upon us." And he was afraid that was the kind of light which the hon. Member for Dungarvan wanted to shed upon the House. He was not there to talk that kind of bastard Nationalism, nor to endeavour to make a reputation by sacrificing even a small interest of his country. He repeated, they were there to criticize the Estimates, and not to talk about what was occurring in Zululand, in Afghanistan, or the French Parliament. At the same time, he denied the right of the hon. Member to lecture Irish Gentlemen, who expressed their opinions as to what was proper to be done, and who came there with an honest intention of doing what they conceived right. He might be wrong in saying that an Irish Guard ought to be raised. Probably he was, and he was open to rebuke; but no one had a right to tell him, when he came forward and made the proposal in a humble manner, and as a Member of the House, that he was ruining the country, simply because he was not bringing them back to the Firbolgs, with whom the hon. Gentleman said he was connected long before the Milesians arrived in Ireland. He would not permit the hon. Gentleman to lecture him.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member is out of Order. The Question before the Committee is the reduction of the Vote by £10,000.

Sir PATRICK O'BRIEN said, that in order to refer to the reduction, it was necessary for him to call attention to the circumstances under which he proposed it. He was told to criticize the Estimates, as there were many things that required to be criticized; and he knew there were hon. Gentlemen there well able to enter into details; but the moment he, who for 15 years had been criticizing this particular Vote, begged, in a humble manner, to offer his criticisms, he was told that he was out of Order. But if they were to maintain an Imperial Army, Parliament ought to recognize the three Nationalities that constituted the Empire. If they were not to recognize them as separate Nationalities, then make them one, without regard to national emblems or designations; but so long as the separate Nationalities continued, he thought is was due to the sentiment of those three nations that they should be recognized. His Motion was made in that direction. Perhaps he spoke too warmly. If so, he begged pardon; but the unfair attack which had been made upon him——

Mr. O'DONNELL rose to Order. The Committee was aware that, so far from his having made any attack upon the hon. Baronet, his references to him were conveyed in terms of strict Parliamentary courtesy. He said he sympathized with the intentions of the hon. Baronet; but advanced reasons why, in his opinion, the suggestions of the hon. Baronet should not be received. While he admitted that the hon. Baronet was entitled to carry his criticism, in reply, to a considerable extent, he did not think he was right in saying that any attack had been made upon him.

Sir PATRICK O'BRIEN accepted the explanation, and would say that he had made statements reflecting upon his conduct instead. In order to raise the question to which he had referred, he would move the reduction of the item for regimental pay by the sum of £10,000. If, however, it would be more convenient to the Secretary of State for War to discuss it upon any of the smaller items, he would defer his Motion to another stage of the Vote. He requested leave to withdraw his first Amendment.

Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Original Question again proposed.

The CHAIRMAN reminded the hon. Baronet, that he had already proposed to move the reduction of the entire Vote by the sum of £10,000.

Sir PATRICK O'BRIEN begged leave to move the reduction of the item for regimental pay by the sum of £10,000.

Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That the Item Sub-head C, for Regimental Pay, of £4,390,000, be reduced by £10,000."—(*Sir Patrick O'Brien.*)

Mr. O'DONNELL desired further information respecting the Stock Purse Fund. From the explanation which had been given, it appeared the deserters' balances in the Guards went to the Stock Purse Fund, which was taken possession of by the officers of the Guards, so it practically amounted to this—that the officers had an interest in desertion.

Mr. PARNELL suggested that it would be better to postpone the reduction just moved to a later period of the evening, when the Secretary of State for War would have an opportunity of replying to various questions of technical detail which had been raised on the Vote. If the hon. Baronet would withdraw his Amendment and move it later on, he (Mr. Parnell) would like to say a few words upon the subject.

Colonel STANLEY said, it was immaterial whether he answered the hon. Baronet then, or later in the evening. He was not aware that he had omitted to reply to any questions. [Mr. Parnell: The deserters' balances in the Guards.]

He was not able to say whether the deserters' balances in the Guards were included in the Treasury Receipts or not; but he apprehended that they would be taken in aid of the Vote in the same manner as heretofore. However, a Motion would soon be made by the hon. Member for Meath on that very question of the Stock Purse Fund, and he thought it would then be more convenient to discuss the matter as a whole, instead of by fragments. He was aware that the hon. Baronet (Sir Patrick O'Brien) had, on many previous occasions, raised the question of Irish Guards; and, with regard to the subject in question, he thought he must remind him that the history of our Army was not entirely a new one. The hon. Member for Stirling Burghs (Mr. Campbell-Bannerman) would, he believed, corroborate him when he said that there would be a considerable amount of inconvenience and difficulty in proposing to suppress any of the Scotch regiments with the view of converting them into Irish ones. That, however, was a question of nationality into which, even on a day like that, he did not wish to enter. But the organization of the Army as it now existed was traceable to the way in which particular regiments had been raised, some of them having been associated with particular localities, and some with particular names, from the time when they were first formed. Apart, therefore, from any other consideration, there would, as he had said, be considerable difficulty in entertaining so large a question as that now raised by the hon. Baronet, who did not now command for his Motion the support of those who, upon other occasions, had acted with him. He trusted that it would not be supposed that he had any wish to blink the subject, or put it on one side; but, at the same time, he was not in a position to agree to the Amendment; and if the hon. Member challenged a vote on the sum required for regimental pay, he would be obliged to oppose its reduction.

Mr. PARNELL said, before going into the question, he wished to remark that the Secretary of State for War appeared to be under a misapprehension in supposing that the deserters' balances had anything to do with the question of the Stock Purse Fund. The question he had asked was, Whether the sum of £1,506 13*s.* 2*d.* included any amount from the effects of deserters from the Guards; and, if so, how much? The Stock Purse Fund had no reference whatever to the amount accruing from the effects of deserters. In the Returns which he held in his hand, no mention was made of any sum of money voted for the Stock Purse Fund or deserters' balances. Of course, he would be perfectly satisfied to bring on the latter question when he brought on the question of the Stock Purse Fund; otherwise, it would be inconvenient to introduce a matter which was entirely irrelevant. With regard to the allowances for the officers of the Guards, the right hon. and gallant Gentleman seemed to be again under the misapprehension that it also had something to do with the Stock Purse Fund. The two subjects, however, were perfectly distinct; and he referred the right hon. and gallant Gentleman to page 9 of the Appropriation Account for the year 1877-8, where the Controller and Auditor General said—

> "I now proceed to notice the questions which have arisen on this years' account. Allowances to regiments of Foot Guards. Certain charges included in the pay lists of the several regiments of Foot Guards appear to call for some remark. The Royal Warrant of 1846, regulating the pay and allowances of these regiments, authorizes as follows:—To captains of companies, collectively, an allowance in lieu of the pay of non-effective men formerly borne upon the Establishment—namely, to the Grenadier regiment, per annum, £3,393 15*s.* 2*d.*; to the Coldstream and Fusilier regiments each, £2,088 9*s.* 4*d.* per annum. The amounts at present drawn by the regiments in respect of this allowance are as follows: — Grenadier Guards, £3,915 17*s.* 6*d.* per annum; Coldstream and Fusilier Guards, £2,610 11*s.* 8*d.* per annum."

He pointed out to the right hon. and gallant Gentleman that these were the allowances referred to by the hon. Member for Kendal (Mr. Whitwell) as relating to non-effective men; but the Stock Purse Fund was an allowance for recruiting. The Controller and Auditor General went on to say, with reference to the question of the hon. Member for Kendal—

> "In answer to inquiries as to the authority for the increased amounts, I have been informed by the accounting officer that these allowances have been treated as company allowances of £130 10*s.* 7*d.* per annum, and that the increase is consequent upon the addition in the year

1854 of four companies to each of the regiments in question. The wording of the Royal Warrant would hardly seem to justify the allowances being considered to be of an elastic character; they are granted to 'captains of companies collectively,' not to each captain, and would appear to be more in the nature of a regimental than of a personal allowance."

Sir ALEXANDER GORDON said, that the right hon. and gallant Gentleman had not answered the question which he had put; and he therefore begged to give Notice—

"That, in the opinion of this House, it is not conducive to the regularity of Business that in voting the total numbers of the effective establishment of the Army the same persons should be reckoned twice in the same Vote."

Colonel STANLEY said, what he had endeavoured to explain was that the total number of officers under Warrant was only increased to the extent of the number of officers serving as Staff officers, instead of remaining in their place, and that the regimental establishments remained the same as before.

Sir HENRY HAVELOCK said, he hoped the right hon. and gallant Gentleman would be good enough to give specific answers to the three questions he had put to him. He was not given to exaggerate matters, nor had he any wish to embarrass the right hon. and gallant Gentleman; but the questions he had gone into were not slight ones. Therefore, he should be glad to know, before the Vote was disposed of, what the right hon. and gallant Gentleman proposed to do on the three points?

Sir PATRICK O'BRIEN remarked that before the right hon. and gallant Gentleman rose to reply, he should be glad to know why the 30th Regiment and the 5th Fusiliers, 2nd Battalion, which he understood were fit to take the field and were first on the roster for foreign service, had been passed over for service at the Cape for other regiments not on war standing? He wished to know why these regiments had not been sent, instead of the Government going round the country picking up waifs and strays to fill vacancies in the regiments chosen?

Mr. O'DONNELL said, the Stock Purse Fund appeared to him to be a sort of *peculiarum* to the officers in the Guards. If the right hon. and gallant Gentleman had wished them to understand that the proceeds of the sale of deserters' effects stuck to fingers instead of going into the Exchequer, he thought that was a very strange mode of the arrangement of the Army. He asked if the proceeds of the sale of deserters' effects went to swell the Stock Purse Fund; because, if that were so, they would be led to understand that the officers of the Guards would have a pecuniary interest in the number of deserters from their regiments. It was quite clear, if the proceeds of the sale of deserters' effects went to the Stock Purse Fund, and that Fund went to the officers, the officers pocketed the proceeds of the deserters' effects.

Mr. PARNELL said, he hoped the right hon. and gallant Gentleman would let them know when they were to discuss the question of the pay of non-effectives, and the use of the amount accruing from the sale of deserters' effects. Of course, if it were more convenient to take the discussion later on, he would be perfectly willing; but he must ask the right hon. and gallant Gentleman to give them a distinct answer then.

The CHAIRMAN pointed out that the question raised by the hon. Baronet the Member for King's County (Sir Patrick O'Brien) was confined to one item, and therefore it was not in Order to discuss questions affecting the other items in the Estimates.

Mr. PARNELL said, he would put himself in Order by speaking on the question raised by the hon. Baronet; and he would say that, although there was a great deal in his remarks with which he entirely agreed, yet he could not believe the necessity for a brigade of Irish Guards. In fact, he could not help looking upon this question as one of the "hobby-horses" of the House. A brigade of Irish Guards was the "hobby-horse" of the hon. Baronet, and the fact was illustrated when the hon. Baronet stated that he had never succeeded in bringing it before the House in a satisfactory way until that evening. They had had, from time to time, questions raised very much Royal—Royal Residents, Royal Princes—and various other very little Royal things—by Members, and this was another. The hon. Baronet had raised the question of a Royal regiment of Guards for Ireland in a perfectly legitimate way. However, up to the present time, the predilections of a large class of people in Ireland had only been granted so far as the appointment of the Royal Irish Constabulary —a body which was not "Royal" when it was established, but which he supposed had become so since it had taken the lives of some of its own fellow-countrymen. He had in his hand that night a telegram from Belfast, stating that the same distinguished body had fired upon a number of the people in the streets——

THE CHAIRMAN: I must point out to the hon. Member that the Question before the Committee is not the conduct of the Royal Irish Constabulary, but whether this Vote should be reduced by £10,000, in order that the Government should enrol an Irish brigade of Guards.

MR. PARNELL said, he was quite aware of the fact, and he had only alluded incidentally to the point, in order to show that the predilections of the hon. Baronet for Royalty in Ireland had been, to a certain extent, gratified by the distinction conferred on that Force. For his own part, he did not think further inducements ought to be given to the Irish people to join Her Majesty's regiments. The population of Ireland, from which recruits were obtained, were in a starving condition; and the wiles of the recruiting sergeant were already sufficient, without his having the additional allurements of an Irish regiment of Guards into which to entice the people. It was true that Irishmen had fought and spent their blood for England, and that no one doubted the valour of Irish soldiers. At the present moment at least one-half of the regiments at the Cape were composed of young Irishmen from Tipperary and Connemara. He thought they were fools for their pains. They were fools, he meant to say, to enlist in regiments which were to be sent to Zululand to become the holacaust of that Imperialism which had lately become so much the fashion. These peasants, unfortunately, were very poor, and were in need of the necessities of life; and when the recruiting sergeant came round, they said to themselves they would see a little life, and they wanted a little fighting, of which they were fond; and therefore they would enlist. As an instance of the desire of his countrymen to see active service, he stated that while acting as a Justice of the Peace recently in Wicklow, a deserter was brought before him by a member of the Royal Irish Constabulary, to whom he had surrendered. The deserter stated that when he deserted there was no fighting going on; but that after being away several years he had given himself up, in order that he might join his regiment "on the frontiers of Afghanistan." He told the man that he had made a bad move, for, instead of being ordered to join his regiment, he would most probably be sentenced to a long term of imprisonment. This was the way the Government treated men who desired to fight for them; and, therefore, he had no sympathy with the Motion of the hon. Baronet. He again repeated that they ought not to increase the inducements which now existed for getting Irishmen into the English Army, because they were only sent abroad to carry out cruel and unjust wars. He should be very sorry to have to vote against a countryman of his own in a Motion of this sort; but if it was pressed to a Division, holding the views which he had now expressed, he could not refrain from doing so.

SIR PATRICK O'BRIEN said, he had introduced this Motion without premeditation. He had come down to the House for the purpose of criticizing the Estimates, and when he looked at them and saw the expenditure which had occurred, he thought that he had a right to ask that an Irish regiment should be included amongst them. If he had said anything unbecoming in reference to the hon. Member for Dungarvan, he begged to apologize. He would not intentionally say anything disrespectful to any Member of the House; but when the hon. Member spoke of him in the way he had done, he thought the style would be more honoured in the breach than in the observance.

MR. O'DONNELL: The hon. Baronet was out of the House when I referred to him. If, in the lively course of his remarks——

THE CHAIRMAN: The hon. Baronet is in possession of the Committee, and it is out of Order for the hon. Member for Dungarvan to interrupt him.

SIR PATRICK O'BRIEN said, he did not wish to add any more acidity to this debate; but he must say it was a too common practice for certain Gentlemen from Ireland to impute motives to those who uttered views different to those which they themselves held. He held notions which were consistent with loyalty to the Crown. And why should his views be taken to task by the hon. Member for Meath, who, it appeared, was a Justice of the Peace, and who, therefore, could not surely make a disclaimer of not being a loyal subject? Why, he believed, the hon. Member for Meath, in his Commission of the Peace, was addressed by Her Majesty as her "trusty and well-beloved," or some other similar appellation. There had not been a single statement made from the opposite Benches against the statement that the people of Ireland, as events showed, took pride to themselves in the conduct of their forefathers—the actions of whom were now relegated to Scotch and English regiments. He did not make this a grievance of a great character, though he had heard of very many lately which would require a microscope to discover, and required to be talked about for hours together, not as a salve for the woes of Ireland, but as a small grievance, with long speeches. He was one of those who did not believe in the universality of knowledge; and he sometimes felt that the arguments of his hon. Colleagues were wanting in logic, and that they were receiving on this Guards' question the thanks of a Government which had nothing to say for itself.

LORD ELCHO said, as he understood the Motion, it was for a reduction of the Vote by £10,000, the object of the hon. Baronet being to get a regiment of Irish Guards. He was of opinion that, as they had English and Scotch Guards, there should also be a regiment of Irish Guards. If the hon. Baronet would bring forward a Motion on the subject, he would certainly support it.

MR. O'DONNELL said, the hon. Baronet, who, a few minutes before, appeared to have apologized for statements made by himself (Mr. O'Donnell) while the hon. Baronet was out of the House, had again repeated that which he had acknowledged was offensive. The hon. Baronet suggested that there should be a regiment of Irish Guards. His opinion was that that might be a very admirable thing in its way, and under other circumstances; but that, under present circumstances, he did not believe that the Irish nation would feel the smallest gratitude for such a trifling favour, when in every other detail the Government was anti-Irish in each degree. He made no personal reference to the attack of the hon. Baronet on himself, but discussed the Motion on its merits. He concluded by stating that he should refuse to support the proposal for a regiment of Irish Guards until there was a probability of those Guards acting as an escort to the first Session of the restored Irish Parliament. Until then, Irish Guards would be a mockery and an insult to the Irish nation.

MR. BIGGAR said, he believed the Irish people would not be gratified with the proposal of the hon. Baronet. In fact, he thought they had no sympathy in common with the English Government, and that, had a war with Russia taken place last spring, a very large majority of the Irish people would have been pleased if the Russians had proved victorious.

GENERAL SHUTE trusted that his right hon. and gallant Friend the Secretary of State for War would favourably consider the wish of some Irish Members, that an Irish regiment should be added to the Brigade of Guards. He could say for himself, and a good many other Members, that he should like to see a regiment of Irish Guards officered by the hon. Gentlemen who sat below the Gangway—a condition being that it should be sent at once to the Zulu War, which would much expedite the conduct of Business in this House.

MR. BIGGAR remarked, that many Members would, no doubt, be very pleased to see them all sent to Zululand; but that was the very thing they did not intend to do.

Question put.

The Committee *divided*:—Ayes 5; Noes 120: Majority 115.—(Div. List, No. 45.)

Original Question again proposed.

MR. PARNELL expressed a hope that the right hon. and gallant Gentleman the Secretary of State for War would, before the discussion of the Estimates proceeded further, reply to the questions which had been put to him by the hon. Member for King's County (Sir Patrick O'Brien), and one or two other hon. Members.

Colonel STANLEY was not aware that there were any questions of any particular importance which he had failed to answer. As to the two regiments to which the hon. Baronet the Member for King's County had referred—the 30th Regiment and the 5th Fusiliers—he could not say why they were set on one side in the order for foreign service, if, indeed, it was the first, which he did not admit, that they had been passed over. On the contrary, he believed that the roster for foreign service had, up to the present moment, been accurately followed out. If the hon. Baronet were not satisfied with that reply, he would, perhaps, be good enough to put his Question on the Notice Paper, and he would, on a future occasion, endeavour to give him fuller information on the subject. As to the question which had been put to him by the hon. and gallant Member for Sunderland (Sir Henry Havelock) with regard to linked battalions, and the necessity of expanding depôts in those instances in which both battalions happened to be abroad, he wished to explain that every means had been employed by the War Department to add to the strength of the depôts by recruiting, and, as he had indicated a few nights before when introducing the Estimates, by allowing Reserve men to return to the Army, within certain limits, for service abroad. He had already stated that the present system, which, as the Committee were aware, was not proposed by the Government now in Office, required careful investigation, although he did not wish in any way to throw discredit upon it.

Sir PATRICK O'BRIEN said, that in again rising to speak he had no desire to trouble the Committee with a purely Irish question, which he knew was always distasteful to the great majority of hon. Members, as was evident from the Division which had just taken place. The question which he was now about to press on the attention of the Committee was one of an Imperial character, although the right hon. and gallant Gentleman who had just sat down had treated it in a very off-hand fashion; for, if he were to act upon the right hon and gallant Gentleman's suggestion, and come down to the House some evening and ask his Question, the probability was that he would receive a reply with which he would not be satisfied; and if, in consequence, he were to move the adjournment of the House, he might be called to Order by the Speaker—a proceeding which might be followed by something else still more disagreeable. Now, that was a position in which he, for one, did not care to be placed; and believing the question to be one of Imperial interest, he hoped the Committee would be kind enough to give him its attention on the present occasion. They had heard a great deal about the men who had suffered in the engagements which had occurred both in Afghanistan and South Africa, and some comments had been made on the physique of the troops who had been sent out to those places. That being so, he had ventured to ask the Secretary of State for War why it was that the 30th Regiment and the 5th Fusiliers, which were stated to have their full complement and which were next on the roster for foreign service, had not been despatched to Zululand? That, surely, was a question which admitted of an easy answer. One of those regiments had served in the Crimean War, and the other during the Mutiny in India, while they had been brought together under the same command at Chatham with the intention of sending them abroad. Why, then, numbering as they did some 800 or 1,000 men each, had their turn for foreign service been postponed, seeing that flying columns had been sent round the country to pick up waifs and strays, children and boys, to fight our battles in South Africa? The 30th Regiment and the 2nd Battalion of Fusiliers were complete; and when he asked the right hon. and gallant Gentleman why these regiments who were properly prepared, equipped, and seasoned, were not sent out to the seat of war, all the information he could get was an unsatisfactory reply across the Table, although the right hon. and gallant Gentleman was fully aware of the harum-scarum way in which men were sent all over the country to get up a kind of scratch pack. The right hon. and gallant Gentleman had scoffed at the views which he had ventured a short time before to submit to the Committee, with reference to the establishment of an Irish regiment of Guards; but the question why the two regiments of which he was speaking had not been sent into action was one he could assure him that would not be regarded lightly by the British people. He observed the noble Lord the Member for Haddingtonshire (Lord Elcho) jumping up from his seat, eager for the fray. He could understand the noble Lord's anxiety to defend an arrangement of which he, no doubt, was one of the moving spirits; but he objected to matters of the kind being settled by some eight or ten men who considered themselves *militaires*, who believed they could lead a nation in arms, and who spoke of themselves as if each was an Alexander or a Napoleon. He, too, could speak on military matters as well, perhaps, as those amateurs, who prided themselves on their military capacity; but he was not now addressing himself to the noble Lord, but to the right hon. and gallant Gentleman the Secretary of State for War, a soldier born and by education, and who was at the head of the British Army. From him he should like to learn what were the real facts of the case which he had brought under the notice of the Committee.

LORD ELCHO said, he was glad he had endeavoured to catch the attention of the Chairman, inasmuch as the hon. Baronet who had just spoken had, in consequence, been afforded an opportunity of airing his eloquence, even although it was at his expense. The hon. Baronet was, however, entirely mistaken if he supposed that his object in rising was to reply to his observations. He rose for the purpose of referring to what had occurred in the discussion which had preceded the Division which had just been taken. What took place in the course of that discussion was, he thought, matter of Imperial interest; for the hon. Member for Cavan (Mr. Biggar), in the remarks which he made in opposition to the Motion of the hon. Baronet, took occasion to say that if an Irish regiment of Guards were established, as was proposed, it might be employed in Zululand, in Afghanistan, or even against Russia, in the event of our being at war with that country. Then the hon. Member went on to state, and to repeat more than once, his firm conviction that if an Irish regiment of Guards were employed against Russia, the whole of the Irish people—[MR. BIGGAR: No, no!] He had heard the hon. Member's words distinctly; and if his ears did not completely mislead him, he expressed it to be his belief that the whole Irish nation—[*Cries of* "No, no; a majority!"]—would have rejoiced at the defeat of England in the contest. The hon. Gentleman might substitute the word "majority" if he liked; but a nation, he would remind him, was represented by the majority. Now, he had listened to those remarks, he would not say with astonishment, as coming from the hon. Member for Cavan, because the House had by this time got accustomed to a good deal of strange language from that quarter. But he was, he must confess, greatly surprised to find that there were many Irish Members sitting in the vicinity of the hon. Member who heard the observations to which he was alluding, and who had not risen in their places to protest against such a libel on their countrymen and their nation, and upon the Irish soldier. Though not himself an Irishman by birth, he had Irish relations; and he knew that, whether they looked to the past or present, no more loyal or gallant soldiers than the Irish were to be found. He believed, too, that the Irish nation took a deep interest and pride in the welfare of this great Empire; and therefore it was that he had risen, not only to protest against the speech of the hon. Member for Cavan, but to express his astonishment that no Irish Member had entered his protest against the use of such language.

MAJOR NOLAN said, he felt he had quite enough to do, notwithstanding the surprise expressed by the noble Lord, to answer for himself, without undertaking to answer for any observations which might be made by his hon. Friend the Member for Cavan (Mr. Biggar), who, it should not be forgotten, represented one of the largest constituencies in Ireland. But he would point out to the noble Lord that the remarks which had fallen from the hon. and gallant Member for Brighton (General Shute), to whom he always listened with great respect when speaking on military questions, were, to say the least, quite as much open to objection as that of which the noble Lord complained; for in desiring to see an Irish regiment officered by Members from Ireland who sat below the Gangway on the Opposition side of the House, the hon. and gallant Gentleman seemed to imply that he would like to see all those hon. Members swept off the face of the earth. When, however, volunteers had been demanded for Zululand, a very large proportion of Irishmen had offered to fill the ranks of the regiments ordered on foreign service.

Mr. O'DONNELL would venture to suggest that the noble Lord the Member for Haddingtonshire (Lord Elcho), who seemed to wish to act as the Representative of the Irish people on that occasion, that it would be well if his reproaches were addressed to his own Party, and to the Government, of which he was a supporter, who consistently acted as if they disbelieved in the loyalty of the Irish nation, rather than to his hon. Friends near him. Why did the Leader of the House congratulate young Members of his Party who dared to speak of the majority of the Irish nation as drunken and degraded? Let the noble Lord not presume to address such remarks to Irish Members, or to accuse them of disloyal or dishonourable conduct. Let him address his reproaches to that Government who, while they lavished benefits on England, seemed to make it the main object of their administration to intensify the discontent of the people of Ireland against their rule.

Mr. BIGGAR said, the noble Lord had entirely misquoted the expressions of which he had made use. That which he had to say he usually said very carefully, and he spoke plainly that only which he had thought over with due consideration. What he really had stated was—and he was prepared to repeat it—that a large majority of the Irish people—which was not the whole Irish people, for in Ireland, as everywhere, differences of opinion existed—of the Irish race all over the world, cared a great deal more for the honour and interests of Ireland than they did for those of England, and were for Ireland first, and England after. He would tell the Committee a story which he had a short time ago heard from an Irish-American from California, and who was not, so far as he was aware, in any way mixed up with political affairs. He asked the gentleman to whom he was referring his views as to the opinions of the Irish race in different parts of America——

The CHAIRMAN said, that the statement of an Irish-American from California was not relevant to the Question before the Committee.

Mr. BIGGAR said, the question had been raised by the noble Lord opposite as to what extent the Irish people were in favour of the interests of Ireland as compared with those of England; and he simply wished to give an illustration in answer to the remarks of the noble Lord, which it would not take him half-a-minute to lay before the Committee. He was accustomed to be heard, and he could assure hon. Gentlemen opposite that they were not going to put him down by clamour.

The CHAIRMAN: I must point out to the hon. Member that it is disrespectful to the Committee to disregard the ruling of the Chair.

Mr. O'DONNELL asked if the remarks of the hon. and gallant Member for Brighton (General Shute) were in Order, in which he accused the Irish Members of disloyalty?

The CHAIRMAN: If the hon. Member was of opinion that the remarks of any Member of the Committee were out of Order, it was his duty to have called attention to them at once.

Mr. PARNELL observed, that the Government and hon. Members sitting opposite were allowed to rise and hurl sweeping charges against Irish Members and others sitting on that side of the House; but Irish Members were not to be allowed to speak in their own defence.

Mr. BIGGAR said, that he had been attacked by the noble Lord opposite (Lord Elcho), and he did think that he was called upon to vindicate himself. He would not further refer to the opinion of his friend from California after the ruling of the Chairman. He might, however, say that it was given him confidentially, and he was at perfect liberty to communicate it. But he was going to tell the Committee what the opinion of the Irish race all over the world was upon this question. First, they cared for the welfare of Ireland, and after that for the welfare of England.

Mr. PARNELL said, that now they had got out of that troubled atmosphere, he wished to call attention to a few little matters in connection with these Estimates. He might here notice that he considered that a great many things in those Estimates showed very strongly the extreme carelessness with which they had been prepared. He could point to many matters which showed that the Estimates had been drawn in a most careless and negligent manner. In future years he should ask that these Estimates should be drawn in the same manner as the Civil Service and Navy Estimates. There was no reason why that should not be done—the War Office was in a very flourishing condition, and had a great many more clerks than it wanted. There was no reason, therefore, why such careless Estimates as these should be submitted to the House. On page 15 of the Estimates he found that the sum of £1,630 was put down to Contingencies on the General Staff. On the Estimates for 1876-7 the item appeared at £1,533, in 1878-9 £1,587, and now the sum had increased to £1,630. The item put down under the name of contingencies to General Staff he thought required a little more explanation. Would the Secretary of State for War inform them whether this item was always increasing? There was another matter under the sub-head C, that of Regimental Pay, including Deferred Pay. He would wish to ask the right hon. and gallant Gentleman whether that item of Deferred Pay was included in the Estimates for Regimental Pay?

SIR PATRICK O'BRIEN said, that as he had had no answer to his Question, he begged to move the reduction of the Vote on account of Deputy Adjutant and Quartermaster General, put down in the Estimates at £1,686, by the sum of £1,000.

THE CHAIRMAN: The hon. Baronet will not be in Order in proposing to reduce the items A and B, after having moved the rejection of item C.

SIR PATRICK O'BRIEN said, he would meet the objection, by moving the reduction of the Vote by the sum of £250 for Miscellaneous under the letter O.

MR. PARNELL thought it would be better to move a reduction under sub-head C as Regimental Pay, otherwise hon. Members would be shut out from many reductions in the items preceding the letter O.

SIR PATRICK O'BRIEN accepted the suggestion, and moved that the Vote be reduced by the sum of £1,000 under the head of Regimental Pay.

Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That the Item Sub-head C, for Regimental Pay, of £4,390,000, be reduced by £1,000."—(*Sir Patrick O'Brien.*)

SIR ALEXANDER GORDON asked whether the extra pay to the General Staff was drawn on the General Staff Pay List, or the Regimental Pay List? The General Staff Pay List was not increased by any sum, and it seemed to be reduced by £3,000. He wished to ask whether the pay of the 160 officers who had been struck off the Regimental List and transferred to the General Staff List was drawn on the Regimental or the Staff Pay List?

COLONEL STANLEY hoped the hon. Baronet the Member for King's County would not think that there was any discourtesy in the reply which he had made to his question. He replied in the way he had, as he thought it the most convenient course. He had asked why the 5th and 30th Regiments had not been sent abroad in their turn? His answer was intended to convey to the hon. Baronet that he was not aware that they had been kept at home out of their turn. He could not profess to carry all these matters within his recollection, subject, as they were, to all sorts of changes from Colonial and other arrangements; but he had no doubt in his own mind that there was some reason for what had occurred. Therefore, if the hon. Baronet would be good enough to address his question to him on another occasion, he would do his best to answer it. At the present time, he might add that he had found that a battalion of the 5th was at Peshawur, and it was not unlikely that heavy drafts might have been required for the necessities of the Service there. With regard to the question which the hon. and gallant Gentleman (Sir Alexander Gordon) had addressed to him, he apprehended that the pay of the officers he had mentioned would be drawn from the agent in the usual way, whether returned upon the Staff or Regimental Pay List he was not at that moment able to say, but it would be charged in the agent's account in the usual form; and he apprehended that if the officer was found in the Army List, with his name in the list of his regiment in italics, as serving on the Staff, he would be borne upon the Staff, and not upon the Regimental Pay List. He could not, however, speak on the subject from his own knowledge. With regard to the contingencies to General Staff, he had no special reason to give for the increase in the present year except this—that all the charges included under the head of Regimental Pay were increased by last year being Leap-year.

Sir PATRICK O'BRIEN begged leave to withdraw his Amendment, after the explanation which had been given.

Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Original Question again proposed.

General Sir GEORGE BALFOUR was strongly of opinion that this part of the Estimates should be made clearer, and he thought the hon. and gallant Member for East Aberdeenshire (Sir Alexander Gordon) was quite right in raising the question he had. The Secretary of State for War might render useful service in revising the table of strengths at page 6 of the Estimates.

Mr. PARNELL observed, that the right hon. and gallant Gentleman had not answered his question with respect to deferred pay. He wished to know whether that was included in the regimental pay? Moreover, his explanation with regard to contingencies was very unsatisfactory. He explained that an increase of nearly £100 was due only to the fact of one more day's pay having to be provided for, owing to its being Leap-year. He must again ask him to inform him whether all the deferred pay was included under the regimental pay?

Colonel LOYD LINDSAY: Deferred pay is included in the regimental pay.

Mr. PARNELL could not find that that was stated in the Estimates at all. On pages 10 and 11 the numbers of the Infantry of the Line were set forth. They found there that the total number of non-commissioned officers and men of the Line was 67,278. They received deferred pay at the rate of 2*d.* a-day, and that would amount to a sum of £204,637. On reference to pages 148 and 149, they found that the amount paid in respect of deferred pay to officers of brevet rank was £167,158. That was £37,500 less than the deferred pay of the soldiers of the Line. That was to say, the additional pay and deferred pay of the officers of brevet rank amounted to less by £37,500 than the deferred pay of the soldiers of the Line. Either the calculation was erroneous, or the present statement, that all the deferred pay was included in the regimental, required some explanation.

Colonel STANLEY said, he did not think that the discrepancy to which the hon. Member alluded would really be found to exist. With regard to the deferred pay, the difference in the Estimate would be found to depend upon the fact that the pay, although it had to be calculated on the number of men borne, yet in itself it depended upon the actual service of the different men. Therefore, they could not bring the actual amount estimated for in exact accordance with the amount paid. In fact, those who were cognisant with these matters told him that it was impossible to tell what these amounts would come to until the deferred pay was drawn in the ensuing year.

Mr. PARNELL observed, that it was very difficult, in Committee of the Whole House, to go thoroughly into these Accounts. His point was that the additional deferred pay, and the pay of the officers of brevet rank, as shown at the bottom of page 149 to be £167,158, amounted to less than the calculation of 2*d.* per day for 67,000 men, without taking into account the allowances for officers of brevet rank. The difference between the two sums amounted to £37,500.

Sir HENRY HAVELOCK said, that the discrepancy which the hon. Member for Meath appeared to see did not really exist. Not only the deferred pay, but the additional pay of the officers of brevet rank was less than the calculated amount, for allowance had to be made for all sorts of contingencies. A number of men did not receive the amount of deferred pay which it was estimated they would. There would also be a deduction on other accounts. Then, again, a great number of men would not receive their deferred pay until a later period, in consequence of their taking further service, so that the explanation which the right hon. and gallant Gentleman had given was perfectly correct.

Mr. PARNELL was much obliged to the hon. and gallant Baronet for the explanation he had given. Under subhead D there was an item in respect of regimental extra pay. A little book called *Tommy Atkins; or, the Soldier's Hand Book*, was placed in the hands of every soldier, and it contained a considerable amount of information for his enlightenment. A soldier was bound to possess the book, and it informed him as to the good-conduct pay and pensions which he might earn. By the Royal Warrant of 1870, soldiers were to reckon their service, both in the Army and in the Reserve, towards their deferred pay. In that respect *Tommy Atkins* and the Army Warrant coincided; but other Royal Warrants had been issued which did not coincide. The Army Warrant of 1874 provided that service in the Reserve should not count towards deferred pay. Notwithstanding that, soldiers were still told in *Tommy Atkins* that service in the Reserve did count towards deferred pay. In 1878 a special War Office Circular was issued, which laid it down that men enlisted after a certain date should reckon their service in the Reserve for pensions only, and not for deferred pay. He wished to know what the men generally knew about War Office Circulars and Royal Warrants? All they understood was their *Tommy Atkins*, and they knew nothing about those Circulars and Warrants; and he submitted that it was exceedingly unfair to deprive soldiers, who had enlisted under the terms of a Royal Warrant of 1870, by subsequent Warrants, of that which was promised. The Secretary of State for War, in reply to the hon. and gallant Member for Hereford (Colonel Arbuthnot), admitted that the General Order, No. 36, dated 1st of May, 1878, laid it down that service in the Reserves was reckoned towards pensions, and not deferred pay. That statement was inconsistent with the terms upon which the men entered the Reserve. The right hon. and gallant Gentleman also said that the alteration had been made, and was about to be published; and he wished to ask him whether the anomaly had been corrected, in accordance with his promise, or whether it still continued?

COLONEL STANLEY had every reason to believe that the Circular was published in accordance with what he had stated; but he must refer entirely to the documents laying down the subject. Soldiers were to be guided only by the Army Circulars and Royal Warrants, and he had no reason to believe that any case of inequality had arisen.

MR. PARNELL asked if hon. Members were to understand that this Vote provided for the inequalities that had arisen? But there was another question which he must raise with regard to depôt brigades. He had not quite caught all the observations upon that subject, and was not aware whether the point which he should now bring forward had been touched upon. Some years ago, when the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Greenwich (Mr. Gladstone) was Premier, the present Premier attacked the Government, and spoke in strong terms of our attenuated battalions. Whether that epithet was more justly applicable to the Army now than then he would not say; but, in view of the recent statements of the Secretary of State for War, that one of the regiments sent to South Africa had to be recruited by volunteers from eight regiments, and that another battalion obtained recruits from 11 regiments, he thought that there was some reason for now designating our regiments by that name. He should like to know whether the right hon. and gallant Gentleman was satisfied with the present system, by which a regiment was never fit for service when wanted; and whether he wished it to be continued? Some portion of the present Vote was on account of gratuities. The necessity for gratuities to volunteers arose from the fact that the brigade-depôt system was a failure. He had not quite caught the point raised by the hon. and gallant Baronet the Member for Sunderland (Sir Henry Havelock); but as he thought it was in connection with that matter, he should not trouble the Committee by raising it again.

MR. O'DONNELL wished to call attention to the system under which military bands were now kept up. If they were really worth anything, they ought to be fully recognized as necessary to the efficiency of the Army, and should be fully paid for by the State. At present, they were bolstered up by a very peculiar system. Every officer was mulcted of eight days' pay, for the purpose of supporting the band of his regiment. He could understand such a thing as officers of specially musical tastes being allowed to contribute to the bands of their own regiments; but it was not right that the expenses, which, if necessary, should be borne by the State, should be cast upon the officers. If the bands deserved the support of the country, why were they not supported altogether by the country, like any other branch of the Military Service? Why should officers be mulcted out of their scanty pay of eight days' pay for what was necessary to the Army? Why should not the band allowance be paid altogether from the general fund? Why did not the Secretary of State for War put the full charge upon the Estimates, and not go about in this shabby way, mulcting their hard-worked and not over well-paid officers to support bands which were recognized as useful for the country at large? He had heard nothing in justification of the present system, and he knew it was a very great grievance, especially to the poorer class of officers. He would remind the Committee, also, that under recent Regulations there were likely to be more poor officers than ever in the Army; and since the abolition of Purchase had brought about the abolition of the old rich-officer system, they ought to deal with their officers as men who were not paid one penny too much for their services.

Colonel STANLEY said, the practice of volunteering from one battalion to another was by no means confined to making up battalions for active service. The Vote for volunteering was also taken to cover the gratuity of £2 paid to men to extend their period of service when under orders for India. It was a complaint that men went to India having only a short term to serve, and came back, at great expense to the country, before the time came for the return of the regiment. The Government thought it advisable to take power to extend the service of the men, with their own consent, for two years, and for that purpose increased the gratuity. With regard to the bands, that was one of the open questions upon which a great deal might be said on both sides. In a great many distinguished regiments the officers took a pride in their band, which, if it were entirely removed from their control, they would not be so likely to feel. There was an allowance made for bands. He was not prepared to say whether the precise amount the officers contributed was exactly what they would care to give, but there was no general complaint on the subject in the Army; and, at a time when the Government was desirous not to increase the Estimates more than was necessary, it was not an item which he felt it very desirable to enlarge.

Mr. PARNELL asked whether it would not be possible in next year's Estimates, to distribute the items for levy money and recruiting under different heads? The Accounts would then show what was spent in levy money, in medical fees, and in grants to volunteers for an extension of service, of which he had just spoken. It would be very convenient to the Committee if the right hon. and gallant Gentleman would do so, for it would enable them to judge of the policy in regard to each of those items, which were entirely different. Then he would also ask whether any of these sums for levy money or for recruiting, and, if so, how much, were included in the recruiting expenses of the Guards? These recruiting expenses of the Guards were supposed to be borne by the Stock Purse Fund; but, in reality, none of the Stock Purse Fund bore them. The Brigade of Guards got more from other sources—such as fines and purchases from discharge—than was paid out of the Stock Purse Fund for recruiting services; and he was, therefore, anxious to know whether the recruiting money of the Guards was paid out of this Vote? If not, he would ask what Vote it was paid out of? Also, before he opened the question of the Stock Purse Fund—which would take him some little time—he would like to ask the right hon. and gallant Gentleman whether he was prepared to abolish the Stock Purse Fund altogether, and to place the Guards on the same footing as other regiments?

Colonel STANLEY said, the Stock Purse Fund, as he had before remarked, was a subject of extreme complication, and the desire of the Department had been gradually to consume it, and leave the charges upon the ordinary Estimates. With regard to the distribution of levy money, the Returns did not show how it was distributed under the different sub-heads.

Mr. PARNELL said, what he wanted to know was how the levy money, mentioned in the Return, was divided? The Vote at present was only divided thus—Extra pay, £6,900; band expenses, £700; extra duty pay, £400; additional, £3,079—making altogether the amount of the Stock Purse Fund. But there was nothing about levy money for recruiting purposes in that Vote; and he wanted to know whether any money for recruiting for the Guards was paid out of this sub-head J? He could not find from what source it was paid, if it were not paid out of this sub-head; and if it were from this, he wanted to know how much it was?

COLONEL STANLEY said, that he could not answer at that moment whether these expenses were paid out of the Stock Purse Fund; but if the hon. Gentleman would be kind enough to ask the question later on, he would be ready to answer with accuracy on the point.

MR. BIGGAR said, he wished to ask a question in regard to the amount charged for instruction in musketry and gunnery. It was only £300 per annum for the Artillery, while it was £4,300 for the Line. Now, it seemed to him of obvious importance that the Artillery should be taught gunnery; because, if they were not, how were they to use their guns? He did not see the use of going to great expense for enormous arms and the latest improvements, if they did not take the trouble to teach the Artillery men how to use those large guns. According to this Account, as much was given to the Foot Guards alone for instruction in musketry as was spent on the whole of the Artillery.

MR. O'DONNELL said, in reference to this question of the bands, that he thought he had placed his argument on an undeniable basis. It was no answer to him to say that the officers took pride in their military bands, because the soldiers did that. Why should the officers be mulcted in eight days' pay any more than the soldiers? In the old system, when a regiment was a proprietorial concern, owned by the commanding officer, and officered by his relatives, there was some good reason for the band, like other portions of the equipment, being supplied at the commander's expense; but now-a-days the Army was a National Army, and the soldier was simply below the officers in point of rank. In fact, a soldier might become an officer, and even rise out of the regiment altogether. The band, just like the muskets, ought to be supplied out of the Public Exchequer; and to tell him that the officers took pride in the band was no answer at all. It seemed the rule with Ministers in charge of Departments, when they brought on their Estimates, to give the least possible amount of satisfaction. The present occupant of the War Office certainly discharged his duty most courteously; but he gave the Committee just as little satisfaction upon points raised as was at all consistent with the courtesy of his character. He had often heard complaints from poor officers as to this charge, and it was one which ought not to be made at this stage of Army organization.

MAJOR O'BEIRNE said, the way in which officers' pay was entered in the Estimates was a deception to the public. An officer was put down as receiving 7*s.* or 11*s.*, or more, a-day; but the public were not aware that these were subject to deductions for band and for mess, which was really most unfair. ["Oh, oh!"] Well, it was unfair. Another point not mentioned was that the subalterns were not subject to this deduction; whereas they certainly should be, just like any other officer in a regiment.

MR. PARNELL thought he had better go at once into the question of the Stock Purse Fund. He was sorry the right hon. and gallant Gentleman had not made up his mind to get rid of this great scandal. He had said that he desired to make it an annual charge in the ordinary Estimates; but that was just precisely what it was now. The Vote of the Stock Purse Fund appeared in the Army Estimates every year; and he thought it was an annual charge which should now cease to exist, being an allowance which had long ago fallen out of date. Before he went into the general subject, he wished to direct attention to the criticisms of the Controller and Auditor General on this subject, at page 9. He said—

> "Certain charges included in the pay lists of the several regiments of Foot Guards appear to call for some remark. The Royal Warrant of 1846, regulating the pay and allowances of these regiments, authorizes as follows:—To captains of companies collectively, an allowance in lieu of the pay of non-effective men, formerly borne upon the establishment—namely, to the Grenadier regiment, £3,393 15*s.* 2*d.*; to the Coldstream and Fusilier regiments, each £2,088 9*s.* 4*d.* per annum. The amounts at present drawn by the regiments in respect of this allowance are as follows:—Grenadier Guards, £3,915 17*s.* 6*d.* per annum; the Coldstream and Fusilier, £2,610 11*s.* 8*d.* each per annum. In answer to inquiries as to the authority for the increased amounts, I have been informed by the accounting officer that these allowances have been treated as company allowances of

£130 10*s*. 7*d*. per annum, and that the increase is consequent upon the addition in the year 1854 of four companies to each of the regiments in question."

Then the Auditor General went on to say—

"The wording of the Royal Warrant would hardly seem to justify the allowances being considered to be of an elastic character. They are granted to 'captains of companies collectively,' not to each captain, and would appear to be more in the nature of a regimental than a personal allowance."

That was the observation of the Controller and Auditor-General on an allowance in lieu of non-effective men. He went on to say, with reference to the Stock Purse Fund—

"Previous to the year 1834 a non-effective allowance of 1*s*. 1*d*. per day for eight men per company was drawn by each of the regiments of Foot Guards; but in that year a commuted allowance of £158 5*s*. 6*d*. per company was fixed in lieu. This was subsequently confirmed by the Royal Warrant of 1846 as an allowance for recruiting and hospital expenses."

Now, he wished to point out that here was an allowance for recruiting and hospital expenses of £158 5*s*. 6*d*. per company, first allowed in the year 1854, and yet none of the current expenses of the Guards were paid out of this Fund. The hospital expenses were paid out of it; but a considerable part went into the pockets of the commanding officers and field officers. The amount in the present Estimates was £6,000 odd, and by that amount he proposed to reduce this Vote. The Controller General went on to observe—

"This allowance, together with the hospital stoppages retained by the regiments, formed a fund from which was defrayed not only the recruiting and hospital expenditure, but also extra pay to Staff and other non-commissioned officers, allowance in aid of band expenses, &c. After these expenses had been defrayed there always remained a considerable balance, which was equally divided amongst the Guards' officers as their own emoluments. In 1855, owing to the heavy calls made upon this fund caused by the Crimean losses, it was found insufficient to meet the demands made upon it, and Lord Panmure, then Secretary of State for War, decided that the Guards should henceforth render an account of these expenses as compared with the allowance to defray them, and that the balance upon each account should be paid by or to the public as the case might be. I may add that since the year 1855, with the exception of the years 1857, 1858, 1859, 1862, 1863, and 1864, the Votes of Parliament have each year been called upon to make good a considerable deficiency. It was also decided that the profits which the officers had been in the habit of dividing should still be secured to them on an average of the sum they had drawn during the preceding three years, such amount to form a charge against the annual allowance of £158 5*s*. 6*d*. per company. These allowances were as follows:—"

It was not necessary for him to repeat what they were. Then he goes on again to say—

"I have requested to be informed whether these allowances have ever received the sanction of the Treasury; but as yet I have received no information on the point. With regard to the Stock Purse Fund, I may also observe that until the present year the various charges against it have not been shown in detail in the War Office Accounts. The practice was to charge the public with the annual allowance of £158 5*s*. 6*d*. per company, and in addition any balance which might be required to enable the fund to pay the officers their annual allowances, both being charged to Vote, the 'Regimental Allowances.' In the present year, however, the £158 5*s*. 6*d*. is not charged against the Vote; but the various payments on account of hospital expenses, levy money, band expenses, and extra pay to non-commissioned officers, are classified to the Votes to which they properly belong. The rates of extra pay to non-commissioned officers differ in the several regiments of Guards, and in no case do they appear to be sanctioned by any Royal Warrant. I have applied for information upon the point, but have not yet received an answer."

Some years ago his hon. Friend the Member for Clonmel (Mr. A. Moore) asked a Question in reference to this Vote, and Mr. Gathorne Hardy, who was then Secretary of State for War, said it was an allowance for recruiting, hospital, and miscellaneous expenses, and agreed to give a Return of the amounts which made up the lump sum of £13,190 in the Army Estimates. The Return, No. 168, he had now got, and it purported to be a Return of all special allowances, besides an allowance for band expenses. It was a most remarkable document, for it purported to give a great deal of information, and it practically gave none at all. It purported to explain the items and details of the expenditure of this large sum of £13,190, and this was all the explanation that was given:—Three depôts, £77 12*s*. 6*d*.; quartermasters, additional, three regiments, £140; apportionment to first major of each regiment, £100; field duty, three regiments, £166 18*s*. 4*d*.; recording the proceedings of courts martial, £18 7*s*. 6*d*.; the total being £502 18*s*.; and that was all the explanation they had of the details of this Vote of £13,190, the rest being left entirely unaccounted for under the head of Stock Purse Fund, at £158 5*s*. 6*d*. per company—£11,070 15*s*. His hon.

Friend, when he got his Return, found he was not much wiser than he was before, and moved for another Return to explain the Stock Purse Fund. That second Return was of a still more extraordinary character than the first. Indeed, everything about this Stock Purse Fund seemed to be wrapped in some wonderful mystery; even when the right hon. and gallant Gentleman spoke about it, and professed his good intentions, he seemed to be as much in the dark as everybody else; and it was for this reason that he was now going into the matter in detail, in the hopeless attempt to make the subject clear to the Committee. This second Return purported to be a balance-sheet of the disbursements and receipts of this Fund. On the one hand, they had the hospital expenditure—£8,939—levy money, or recruitment money—the point to which he directed the attention of the Secretary of State a few minutes ago—£145. Thus, out of all this money, which was originally granted for hospital and recruiting expenses, only £145 was spent in recruiting expenses. He would show, by-and-bye, that not even that small sum of £145 was spent in the recruiting service of the Guards, because they obtained £713 levy money to replace the £145. Under the head of disbursements, they found bounty expenses £1,360; Staff allowances and non-commissioned officers, £905; and then average profits of field officers and captains, £6,278 odd. Then, on the other side—on the Receipt side—they found the Stock Purse Fund £158 5*s.* 6*d.* per company, amounting to £11,079 5*s.* voted in the Estimates, Leaving money charged, £713; hospital stoppages, £2,669; the three together amounting to £14,461 5*s.* The total disbursements under the head of allowances to non-commissioned officers and band expenses, amounted to £17,960 5*s.* 6*d.*; and if from that sum was deducted the total receipts, there would remain a balance of £3,000, which was not in any way accounted for; while, in the Estimates, no information was given as to the source from which it was derived. He called the attention of the Committee to this extraordinary omission from the Return, which, although it purported to be a regular balance-sheet, only added to the mystery that surrounded the Stock Purse Fund, and which he was determined to penetrate. The disbursements exceeded the receipts; and hon. Members were told that, in order to make up the deficiency, a sum of money had been voted annually since the Crimean War. He found that by a previous Return some money had been voted by Parliament to make up the deficiency of one year—namely, £1,607; whereas the actual deficiency amounted to £3,158, from which it was quite clear that, as he had said before, the Return was highly untrustworthy. It came to this—that they were voting every year a sum of money amounting to £11,079 5*s.* for the Stock Purse Fund of the Guards, distributed amongst the Votes under the following heads:—Vote 1, Sub-head D, £6,900; Sub-head E, £700; Sub-head F, £400; Vote 10, £3,079. The amount of the Stock Purse Fund voted in this way, per company, was £158 5*s.* 6*d.* But what he desired to know was, where the balance was charged in the Estimates, which the Controller General spoke of as being the only balance made up by a Vote of Parliament? Under what Vote was it to be found? He (Mr. Parnell) was not actuated by any hostility towards the present officers who were enjoying the money, but certainly thought it quite right to raise that important question; and he was of opinion that a charge of such an exceedingly doubtful character, which involved the necessity of presenting to the House of Commons Returns that could not be relied upon, should be put a stop to, without loss of time, and that the hospital and recruiting expenses of the Guards should be put on the same footing as those of the rest of the Army. The recruiting expenses of the Guards were at present provided for out of other moneys than the Stock Purse Fund; and, consequently, the Fund, which was originated in order to meet those two expenses of hospital and recruiting, now only met a portion of those expenses, and was assisted by an annual Vote of Parliament to make up the annual deficiency. He repeated, that both the hospital and recruiting expenses of the Guards should be placed on the same footing as those of the rest of the Army. Therefore, let an actuarial estimate be made of the interests of the Guards who enjoyed those allowances. And let that interest be calculated upon the number of years that the captains of companies might be supposed to remain at their present ranks; because they would, in course of time, be promoted, and cease to have any interest; but let their rights be respected and calculated upon the basis indicated. By this means a very great scandal, that year by year was attracting increased attention, and which no Minister had ever been able to justify, would be removed. He begged to move the reduction of the Vote by the sum of £6,278.

Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That a sum, not exceeding £4,591,722, be granted to Her Majesty, to defray the Charge of the Pay, Allowances, and other Charges of Her Majesty's Land Forces at Home and Abroad (exclusive of India), which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1880."—(*Mr. Parnell.*)

Colonel STANLEY said, he was not one of those who stood up to defend the Stock Purse Fund, which was an arrangement that in itself was objectionable, and ought to be put an end to. In that respect he entirely agreed with the hon. Member for Meath. The hon. Gentleman had said that the charges for hospitals and recruiting should be brought under their proper heads, and that it should be ascertained, by an actuarial calculation, to what sum each particular officer was entitled under the Stock Purse arrangement. That was precisely what was being done. And he believed that at that very moment an actuary on the War Office list was employed in ascertaining what sums represented the interests of each of the officers who had a proprietary right in the allowance. He hoped that before another year had passed the subject would be made quite plain to the Committee, and that they would be able to determine what steps should be taken.

Mr. PARNELL considered that until they were in possession of the details for the basis of the actuarial calculations, it would be difficult to decide how far they were satisfactory. After the answer of the right hon. and gallant Gentleman, he did not wish to press his Amendment.

Mr. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN inquired if he was correct in supposing that the right hon. and gallant Gentleman (Colonel Stanley) admitted a proprietary right to exist in the officers with regard to the Stock Purse Fund, and the Hospital, and other buildings of the Guards? Because that appeared to him to be a matter about which there might be two opinions. He did not wish to express any final opinion upon the subject, but hoped it would not be assumed, without investigation, that there was an absolute proprietary right on the part of the officers. The whole arrangement, as it then stood, was anomalous and indefensible, and should be put an end to. It was not clear, however, that the pecuniary result was disadvantageous to the public purse. It must be observed that that the Guards' officers were not provided with quarters, and it was doubtful whether a good bargain would be made by the country if new barracks were built, or an equivalent lodging allowance at London rates given to them, in lieu of these Stock Purse allowances. It appeared to him right to say a word on that occasion against accepting without any demur the idea that buildings erected by officers partly out of the public funds were proprietary in those officers.

Colonel STANLEY admitted that the right must be properly proved; but that the opinion of the Law Courts had, at any rate, established what seemed to be a *primâ facie* right.

Mr. PARNELL thought it very fair and reasonable on the part of the right hon. and gallant Gentleman that he should propose to ascertain, by actuarial calculation, the proprietary interest which the present officers enjoyed in that amount of £6,278. The money had been voted for many years; and, undoubtedly, some kind of vested interest existed.

Mr. O'DONNELL wished to say a few words before the Motion was withdrawn, and to point out that the Guards had a very considerable reason to be dissatisfied with the manner in which the Controller and Auditor General had dealt with that subject. His Report said—

"Previous to the year 1834 a non-effective of 1*s.* 1*d.* a-day for eight men per company was drawn by each of the regiments of Foot Guards; but in that year a commuted allowance of £158 5*s.* 6*d.* per company was fixed in lieu. This was subsequently confirmed by the Royal Warrant of 1846 as an allowance for recruiting and hospital expenditure. This allowance, together with the hospital stoppages retained by the regiments, formed a fund from which was not only the recruiting and hospital expenditure,

> but also extra pay to Staff and non-commissioned officers, allowance in aid of band expenses, &c."

Then, continued the Controller and Auditor General—

> "After these expenses had been defrayed there always remained a considerable balance, which was equally divided amongst the Guards' officers as their own emoluments."

That was a very curious circumstance; but a more remarkable fact still was that in 1855 the hospital expenses were so large as to swallow up the company allowances altogether. The Controller and Auditor General proceeded—

> "In 1855, owing to the heavy calls made upon this fund, caused by the Crimean losses, it was found insufficient to meet the demands made upon it, and Lord Panmure, then Secretary of State for War, decided that the Guards should henceforth render an account of these expenses as compared with the allowance to defray them, and that the balance upon each account should be paid by or to the public as the case might be."

Thus it would be seen that from 1855 any existing balance was to be paid to the public; but, strange to say, from the very time when the Guards' officers were required to pay over a balance, it was quite impossible for them to find any balance to pay into the Exchequer. The Report continued—

> "I may add that since the year 1855, with the exception of the years 1857, 1858, 1859, 1862, 1863, and 1864, the Votes of Parliament have each year been called upon to make good a considerable deficiency. It was also decided that the profits which the officers had been in the habit of dividing should still be secured to them, on an average of the sum they had drawn during the preceding three years, such amount to form a charge against the annual allowance of £158 5*s.* 6*d.* per company."

The result of that arrangement was that the officers of the Grenadier Guards received each per annum £92 6*s.* 1*d.*; Coldstreams, £78 4*s.* 2*d.*; Fusiliers, £80 2*s.* 6*d.*, as representing their share of a fund originally established for hospital and recruiting purposes. He (Mr. O'Donnell), of course, did not pin his faith to the statements of the Controller and Auditor General; but he was obliged to remark that they were not at all flattering to the officers of the Guards.

Mr. PARNELL desired to know whether the sum of £1,506 included the amount accruing from deserters from the Guards; and, if not, why this was not so, and what became of the deserters' effects? Again, who were the legal authorities that exempted the Guards from the operation of the provisions of an Act of Parliament which was intended to apply to the whole Army? The other question which he had asked before the introduction of that relating to the Stock Purse Fund, referred to in the Report of the Controller and Auditor General, was whether the notice of the right hon. and gallant Gentleman had been called to the Report of the same officer on page 10, where he said, with regard to the allowance in lieu of pay to non-effective men of the Guards—

> "The wording of the Royal Warrant would hardly seem to justify the allowances being considered to be of an elastic character, but that they appeared to be more in the nature of a regimental than of a personal allowance."

Colonel STANLEY said, that as the Controller and Auditor General was perfectly competent to deal with the points which had been brought under his notice, he was doubtful whether any nearer approach would be made to a practical issue by pursuing the subject at that moment. But he would mention that the payments in question had been made from a date long antecedent to that of the Royal Warrant of 1846; and, further, that there was no special Warrant for such allowances. The War Office had always acted upon the instructions contained in the Official Letter of Lord Panmure, which ran as follows:—

> "In consequence of the heavy casualties which have taken place in the present war, and with a view to the interests and exigencies of the Service, I have thought fit to require from the officers of the Guards a yearly account, in which shall be credited the sum of £158 5*s.* 6*d.* per company."

Of course, when the number of companies was increased, it was thought right to add the amount for each new company to the original total. He thought that the Controller and Auditor General might be left to deal with the remaining small point that, up to the issuing of the Report, that officer had received no reply to his inquiry as to whether the allowances in question had ever received the sanction of the Treasury. About the deserters' effects, he had not any special information at the moment; but he concluded they were included in the General Accounts, When he ascertained definitely, he would take care to make the facts known.

Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Original Question again proposed.

MAJOR O'BEIRNE moved that the Vote be reduced by a sum of £6,300, allowances to officers of brigade-depôts. He had no doubt that these positions were complete sinecures, as was shown by the fact that Cavalry officers were generally appointed to them, the fact being that there was nothing to do. It was a waste of £6,300.

Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That a sum, not exceeding £4,591,700, be granted to Her Majesty, to defray the Charge of the Pay, Allowances, and other Charges of Her Majesty's Land Forces at Home and Abroad (exclusive of India), which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1880."—(*Major O'Beirne.*)

MR. PARNELL thought the Motion was entitled to some consideration, although, of course, he knew it was very disagreeable to hon. Members to sit and listen to arguments, and to the right hon. and gallant Gentleman. But he must recollect that he did not sit there every night, but only once a-year. The Chancellor of the Exchequer had taken away from them the opportunity of discussing the question at other times; and if they could get no replies from the Chancellor of the Exchequer, the duty became very hard upon the right hon. and gallant Gentleman.

COLONEL STANLEY said, he was not aware that he had directly or indirectly complained of the duties he endeavoured to perform. He had given all the information in his power, and by taking steps to endeavour to place the facts before hon. Members at once. The reasons why officers in charge of brigade depôts received a larger allowance was not guided by the number of men under their command, but had reference to the general duties they were required to perform. He had always understood that the amount of 5*s.* a-day was given rather in respect of the expenses which such an officer had to incur, and which were similar to the expenses of an officer in command of a regiment. Such an officer was in a *quasi*-Staff position, and it was in consequence of his holding that position that the allowance was granted. He saw no reason for disturbing the present arrangement.

MAJOR O'BEIRNE said, the right hon. and gallant Gentleman was under some misapprehension as to the officers of brigade depôts. Their duties were to inspect the Volunteers and Militia twice a-year; and the fact that Cavalry officers were appointed to these duties was, in his opinion, sufficient proof that they were incapable of doing their duty.

MR. H. SAMUELSON said, he thought the hon. Member who had last spoken was himself labouring under a misapprehension. He had belonged to a regiment of Militia for 10 years; and his regiment had been inspected every year very efficiently by the commanding officer of the brigade depôt, for the time being.

Question put.

The Committee *divided:*—Ayes 7; Noes 148: Majority 141.—(Div. List, No. 46.)

MR. BIGGAR pointed out that, in his opinion, there was an unreasonable discrepancy in the payments for musketry and gunnery instruction.

MAJOR NOLAN said, there used to be a gunnery instructor at each brigade depôt; but they were now dropping these. The question was, whether the instructor should not be maintained? Unless there was an able teacher of musketry the men got into the habit of applying themselves to some other employment. This was the case with the Artillery, where gunnery instructors were being allowed to die out.

COLONEL STANLEY said, he was not fully aware of the present position of this question; but he believed that now all officers attended the course at Shoeburyness, and that, in course of time, they might be able to teach gunnery.

MR. BIGGAR said, that as the right hon. and gallant Gentleman had given the best explanation in his power, he did not wish to press the question.

Original Question put, and *agreed to.*

Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That a sum not exceeding £50,600, be granted to Her Majesty, to defray the Charge for Divine Service, which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1880."

MR. PARNELL moved to report Progress. He had a number of details to bring forward which he did not wish to go into at that hour. One point was with reference to the attendance of Catholic chaplains with the Forces at the Cape. He was informed, on the best authority, that a great many of the men at the Cape were Catholics—he was answered that the number was one-half—and as this was a very important question, he asked the right hon. and gallant Gentleman to let them report Progress, so that they might have full time to discuss it.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Chairman do report Progress, and ask leave to sit again."—(*Mr. Parnell.*)

Colonel STANLEY said, he did not wish to press this Vote.

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER: I wish to call the attention of the Committee to the position in which we stand. I do not wish to make any remark upon the way in which hon. Members think it right to conduct discussions in this House as a general rule; but I must point out that if we spend as much time in the discussion of every Vote in these Estimates as we have spent to-night over the first Vote, it seems impossible that we can get through the Business of dealing with Supply in the course, I may say, of this Session. My right hon. and gallant Friend has been ready and anxious to give information on every point on which he has been questioned; and I must say, so far as I have been able to observe, there has been very great consideration shown to my right hon. and gallant Friend by a good many Gentlemen who usually take a great interest in the Army Estimates, and whose views we often hear with very great advantage. But there has been a very extraordinary amount of conversation—I hardly like to call it discussion—upon parts of this Vote, which has been carried on very much from one particular quarter of the House. Now, I am far from saying that many things that have been brought forward by the hon. Member for Meath (Mr. Parnell), and others, have not been worthy of consideration. Everyone who perceives the way in which the hon. Member for Meath devotes himself to the study of every question he takes up must be aware that he has often matters to bring forward that are worthy of attention; but, on the other hand, I must say it has struck me that there has been a very great waste of time—a frequent repetition of the same arguments.

Mr. PARNELL: By me?

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER: I am not speaking specially of the hon. Member for Meath.

Mr. PARNELL: I rise. ["Order!"] I rise to Order——

The CHAIRMAN: The right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer is in possession of the House.

Mr. PARNELL: I rise to a point of Order. Last Session, during the proceedings of the Committee on Public Business, it was distinctly given in evidence that a deliberate waste of time by the repetition of the same argument was a contempt of the House of Commons. The Chancellor of the Exchequer has not exactly charged me individually with a deliberate waste of time, but he has said there has been a waste of time. I do not think the Chancellor of the Exchequer should make such a charge against Members of this House; and I submit, as a point of Order, that when he charges Members of this House with a deliberate waste of time, he should charge the individual Member with it. I challenge him to substantiate the charge against me.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member rises to a point of Order, and says that the Chancellor of the Exchequer has used expressions with regard to the Business of the House of Commons; but he has not shown that he has committed a breach of Order against the hon. Member. It appears to me that no question of Order has been raised.

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER: I was very far from imputing to the hon. Member, or to anybody else, that he had been guilty of a waste of time; but I hold that the course followed this evening has led to a waste of time, [Mr. Parnell: On your own side.] And if that course, or any similar one, is pursued during our discussions, a great deal of time will be wasted, and it will be impossible for this House to get through the Business which the country wishes it to get through. I do not desire now to pursue the subject, but only to call attention to it; and I hope, in so doing, I shall be understood as only endeavouring to fulfil my duty in the position in which I now stand, and in order to clear the Government from the idea that they are wasting time, and that they are not endeavouring to get forward the Business with which they are intrusted. It is our duty to bring forward the Estimates, and my right hon. and gallant Friend has been the whole evening in the House, and has done his best to explain and answer every question that has been put to him. I do not think he could possibly have done more; if we have not made any progress, it is not our fault. The Question immediately before us is, whether we shall proceed to any more Votes to-night? I quite admit, as my right hon. and gallant Friend has done, that it would not be convenient now to enter into Votes which would lead to serious discussion or controversy. We have got through the first Vote, and my right hon. and gallant Friend will be prepared to withdraw Vote 2, and postpone any other Vote likely to lead to any discuscussion; but we do hope the Committee will allow us to pass other Votes which give rise to no question, in order that we may get through a certain amount of Business.

Mr. SULLIVAN said, he had been absent from an early hour in the evening until a few minutes ago, and was not aware exactly of what had passed during the whole course of the evening; but, so far as he understood, the Committee had voted something like £4,000,000. He thought that was a considerable Vote to take in the time. With regard to what had been said as to waste of time, it should be remembered that it was the business of the Government to propose these Estimates; but it was likewise the business; of hon. Members to criticize them. There was as much obligation upon Members to criticize these Votes as there was upon the Ministry to propose them; and, so long as the criticism had been conducted in good faith, he saw no reason to think that anyone had done anything but discharge his duty. As for the Secretary of State for War, he had acted, no doubt, as he always did, with the greatest courtesy and readiness to answer, and good temper. Of that, he had the utmost testimony from hon. Gentlemen round about him. No discussion that had taken place had been raised on the part of his hon. Friends but with a desire of discussing the Estimates. It was exactly the sort of discussion that ought to take place in that House. Henceforth, there were going to be genuine debates on the Estimates in that House; and there was not a page or an item in them that would not be discussed. Numbers of hon. Members intended to qualify themselves for fully discussing these Estimates; and would, if necessary, give their whole time, not only during the Session of Parliament, but during the Recess, to this study, in order that, when brought forward, the Estimates might be thoroughly and genuinely discussed.

Colonel STANLEY said, that if the Government prolonged the discussion at that hour of the night, they would be likely to lay themselves open to the charge which hon. Members opposite had resented, he thought somewhat unduly, as coming from the Chancellor of the Exchequer. He did not think that it would be useful to continue this discussion that night; but he hoped the Committee would consent to the proposal which he would make. They had been two nights discussing one Vote; and he did not think it too much to ask the hon. Member to withdraw his Motion to report Progress, on condition that the remaining effective Votes were omitted, and they should proceed to take Vote 17 for the non-effective Services. That Vote provided for matters regulated long ago by Warrant, upon which no question could fairly arise. Thus, all questions of policy, which might be open to discussion upon the Votes for the active Services, would be put aside for that night, if the hon. Member would consent to withdraw his Motion.

Mr. PARNELL thought the proposition of the right hon. and gallant Gentleman was fair. He had taken a great deal of pains in making himself acquainted with these Estimates, and there was scarcely a single Vote upon which he had not found a good deal of matter for inquiry and discussion. It was not his intention to waste time; and he might say that he had taken the trouble to write down almost every word he had said to the Committee, and the notes that he had prepared were open to the inspection of any impartial person if he chose to look over them, in order that he might say whether he had uttered that evening a single unnecessary word. He must confess that he felt aggrieved by the language of the Chancellor of the Exchequer, and by his saying that the time of the Committee had been wasted;

but so far as the proposition of the right hon. and gallant Gentleman the Secretary of State for War went, he thought the proposal to take Vote 17 was very fair.

MR. BIGGAR observed, that before the Amendment was withdrawn, he thought he might be justified in saying that neither himself nor any of his Colleagues had found fault with anything the Secretary of State for War had done. He must say that the right hon. and gallant Gentleman had acted with great courtesy throughout the debate; but he did think they had cause to complain in not being furnished with a copy of the Appropriation Account until last Saturday morning, when the Votes were to be taken on that night. From not having the Appropriation Account until so late, they had been compelled to occupy more time than they would otherwise have done, by reason of the Accounts being new to them. The manner in which those things were managed had given rise to a great deal of opposition; and if the authorities at the War Office would keep their Accounts in a more business-like way, there could be no question that the Business of the country would be much facilitated. Moreover, it would prevent discussions on the Estimates extending to the length which they had done that night. But he should contend most strongly that the course which had been adopted was simply in discharge of the duty of the hon. Members to criticize the Estimates.

Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Original Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

(2.) £33,100, Rewards for Distinguished Service, &c.

MR. PARNELL said, that this subject was alluded to by the Controller and Auditor General, in paragraphs 34 and 35 of his Report of 1876, as follows:—

"Appended to this Account will be shown an Explanatory Paper (No.11), showing the receipts and disbursements passed to the general account of Fines for Drunkenness. This fund is appropriated to the granting of gratuities to well-conducted soldiers on their discharge, a sum being annually transferred from it as an Appropriation in Aid of Vote 17, under which the gratuities are estimated for. It is the rule that the amount of gratuities paid must not exceed the available balance of the Fines Fund. The history of the Fund is briefly as follows:—In accordance with the recommendation of the Commission on Courts Martial, appointed by Royal Warrant of 10th March, 1868, power was given by the 77th Article of War, 1869, to commissioned officers to inflict summary fines for drunkenness, which fines it was decided should be formed into a General Fund, and applied, under the direction of the Secretary of State for War, to objects tending to the benefit of the soldiers of the Army generally. The proposed scheme was not immediately carried out; and in the years 1867-8, 1868-9, and 1869-70, the amounts received was paid over to the Exchequer as Extra Receipts. In 1870, however, a Committee was appointed to devise a plan for carrying out the original intentions, and its recommendations being approved by the Treasury, were embodied in Army Circular, 197, of 1870. The Fund having accumulated in 1872 to £45,000, it was thought desirable to extend the system of gratuities, and fresh Regulations for the future having been drawn up, received the approval of the Treasury in January, 1874. Both the original and revised Regulations seem clearly to have referred to the fines received from non-commissioned officers and men of the Regular Army; and the Accounts of the Fund, laid before the House of Commons in the Explanatory Paper referred to, show that up to the financial year under consideration, the Militia fines had been in no way dealt with.

"35. Owing to the large claims upon the Fund under the extended system of gratuities, the balance of the Army fines, on 31st March, 1877, was found to be insufficient to recoup the Vote the amount which had been expended from it; and to meet the deficiency a sum of £2,135 3*s.* 2*d.* has been transferred from the fines received from the Militia. In answer to my inquiries as to whether the approval of the Lords of the Treasury had been obtained for the course adopted, I have been informed that such approval has not been applied for. As I think it is open to considerable doubt whether the War Office were justified in appropriating the Militia fines to the payment of gratuities to the Regular Army, I have brought the subject under notice."

He also would bring the subject under the notice of the House.

COLONEL STANLEY said, that no doubt there was a good deal of inconvenience in the arrangements of last year, the fact being that gratuities had been given originally upon this Vote. The gratuities had been very much greater than was anticipated; and, instead of being given only to a certain proportion of well-conducted men in the Army, they were given to every soldier who had completed 21 years' service. Therefore, the matter turned out much more expensively than was estimated. It would be seen that the charge was one beyond their control. As the subject was one giving rise to considerable difficulty, a Committee was appointed at a time when he did not occupy his present position. Certain recommendations were made by that Committee, which were brought to the notice of the Treasury; and the Committee reported on the 31st of March last year. The Committee stated that they had communicated with the Lords Commissioners of the Treasury about the 9th of August in the previous year; that the Treasury had no objection to offer with reference to the recommendations of the Committee on the subject. They also said that they were not prepared then to advise any alteration in the Regimental Debts Act, and that the Treasury would require further advice before interfering with that Statute. He believed that was substantially the answer which the hon. Member required.

Vote *agreed to.*

(3.) £98,000, Pay of General Officers.

MR. BIGGAR observed, that the number of General Officers seemed this year to have increased from 248 to 292. He could not see on what account that could be defended, and should like to know whether these extra officers were really required, otherwise he did not think the Secretary of State for War would be doing his duty unless he reduced the number? It was a scandal that gentlemen who were doing no duty should get their pay and be supplied with money by the public.

COLONEL STANLEY said, with regard to the question of the hon. Member for Cavan, that he could only tell him that the number of General Officers stated in the Estimates was correct. It was hardly wise or right for the country to expect to receive good service from men, and when they had grown too old to discharge active duty to put them aside. Some of those General Officers received full pay, some half-pay, and some unattached pay; and the number of them had been fixed by the Warrants arising out of the recommendations of the Royal Commission.

Vote *agreed to.*

(4.) £918,100, Retired Full Pay, Half Pay Pensions, and Gratuities, &c.

MAJOR NOLAN drew the attention of the Secretary of State for War to a matter which arose in connection with the retirement scheme. He had always disapproved of the retirement scheme, and an instance of the inequality with which it worked had recently been brought to his knowledge in connection with the Royal Artillery. The object of the scheme seemed to be to retire lieutenant-colonels as fast as possible, in order not to check promotion. But, as it now worked, it allowed officers, after a certain amount of service—that was to say, lieutenant-colonels—if they had been promoted since the 1st of October, 1877, to retire; but in the case of officers who had been promoted before that date, they were not allowed to retire, even if they wished it. The answer given by the military authorities to that anomaly was that the officer was better off if he did not retire, inasmuch as he had his chance of becoming a full colonel of Artillery, a rank very rarely given. If the object of the scheme were to retire lieutenant-colonels, he did not see why officers promoted before the 1st of October, 1877, should not be retired as well as those promoted after. It was surely a curious system which compulsorily retired junior officers, and did not allow the senior officers to retire even voluntarily. This was a matter which, he thought, the Secretary of State for War might fairly be asked to look into, and see whether he could not remedy it.

COLONEL STANLEY observed, that if the hon. and gallant Member had been in his place on Friday, he would have heard a good deal of discussion on this point, and on others connected with the same subject. The result of the discussion was that the House had adopted an Address to Her Majesty, praying for a Royal Commission to inquire into the whole question of pay, promotion, and condition of the Royal Artillery. He conceived that the matter which the hon. and gallant Member had brought forward would be a very proper subject for that Commission to inquire into.

Vote *agreed to.*

(5.) £121,500, Widows' Pensions, &c.

(6.) £16,800, Pensions for Wounds.

Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That a sum, not exceeding £35,000, be granted to Her Majesty, to defray the Charge for Chelsea and Kilmainham Hospitals (In-Pensions), which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1880."

MR. PARNELL observed, that there were some points in connection with this Vote which would require discussion, and also in the next Vote—that for Out-Pensions; and the following Vote for the Militia, Yeomanry, Cavalry, and Volunteers. He should, therefore, move to report Progress.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Chairman do report Progress, and ask leave to sit again."—(*Mr. Parnell.*)

COLONEL STANLEY trusted the hon. Gentleman would withdraw his Motion; and, if there were any questions which he could not then answer, he would be willing to postpone the Vote.

MR. PARNELL said, there were points in this Vote, and in the subsequent Votes, on which he must raise some discussion.

COLONEL STANLEY thought it both inconvenient to the Government, and everyone else, not to proceed with those Votes at that time. There could be no possible objection to taking these Votes, which the State was bound to provide for. He was willing to pass over the Hospital Vote, and to take those for Out-Pensions, Superannuation, Militia, Yeomanry, Cavalry, and Volunteers.

MR. PARNELL said, he must oppose the Vote.

COLONEL STANLEY said, there was no Notice on the Paper, and he was not aware of any question which could arise on this Vote. It had been passed, year after year, without comment; and the money was spent under a Royal Warrant, administered by the Chelsea Hospital Commissioners, in accordance with the regular custom of the Service. He was not aware of any question which would arise on this Vote; and in asking the Committee to pass it, he was only asking them to do what they had done year after year.

MR. PARNELL said, he must press his Motion to report Progress. There were points with regard to this Vote which would need a good deal of discussion, and on which he intended to take a Division, as he had told the Secretary of State for War several times. He had shown no disposition that night to prevent the right hon. and gallant Gentleman from getting his money Votes; but where they had points for discussion it was not fair to require them to proceed with their arguments at that period of the morning. A very important question was involved in this Vote; and although, as the right hon. and gallant Gentleman said, there was no Notice of it on the Paper, he also knew that no one anticipated that this Vote would be reached, for everyone thought that Vote 23 would not be taken until the previous Votes had been disposed of. This point had been made for the convenience of the Government, in order that, they might get through some of their less important Votes without discussing the more important ones. It always had been a rule never to take money Votes after half-past 12; and the present Government, and notoriously the present Chief Secretary for Ireland, always refused money after that hour. When in Opposition, they used all the Forms of the House to prevent Votes from being passed after half-past 12. He thought the Government was acting most unreasonably to press them in this way; and he did not know what they wanted in doing it, or whether their object was to drive him and his Friends into a corner or not.

MR. BIGGAR said, this Vote, which they were asked to pass, was for £1,000,000, and it was truly preposterous to pass such a Vote at that hour. The great object in debating these questions was that what they said should, through the reporters in the Gallery, be reported in the morning papers. They knew very well that nothing stated after half-past 12 was reported to the country; and, therefore, the nation remained entirely ignorant of what was done after that hour. He did not raise these questions on the Vote for the General Officers; but he did think it was preposterous, unjustifiable, and utterly unreasonable for the Government to proceed in this claim.

Question put.

The Committee *divided*:—Ayes 14; Noes 96: Majority 82.—(Div. List, No. 47.)

Original Question again proposed.

MAJOR NOLAN said, he found the Government had obtained £5,700,000 that night, and he was astonished at their attempt to take such a Vote at such an hour. There had certainly been a long debate that evening, although he had scarcely joined in it more than five minutes altogether; but then he had always objected to the way in which this sum of nearly £4,600,000 was rushed through Committee. It was a Vote which affected all the great questions of the Army, including pay, and many others, and it ought to take a long time in discussion. This Vote 23 was a great deal over £1,500,000. It was £1,576,000. He was quite aware that only £1,186,000 was charged to this country; but on that Vote they had to discuss their policy as regarded India, and so they must take the whole sum at £1,500,000. He was not going into the subject himself that night; but he would only point out that it would be perfectly right on this Vote to discuss the policy of long service and short service, of pensions, and other matters affecting our Indian Army. He mentioned these points to show the Committee on what they were embarking at 20 minutes past 1; and he thought the Government ought to be contented with the large sum and the very considerable number of Votes they had already got. He begged to move that the Chairman do now leave the Chair.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Chairman do now leave the Chair."—(*Major Nolan.*)

Colonel STANLEY said, technically, there was one Vote—22—for Chelsea and Kilmainham, and that he had offered to postpone. He knew that was a very fair subject for discussion, and that there were a good many matters open to criticism. He hoped nothing he had said would be considered as a complaint of any fair or reasonable criticism as regarded the different Votes; but he did hope the Committee would allow him to take Vote 23, which was for Pensions that would have to be paid as under Warrant very shortly. That was not a Vote which raised any question of policy; and although the Vote was unquestionably large, so were the claims made under it. It was as a matter of convenience that he asked the House to dispose of this Vote.

Mr. O'DONNELL said, there was no present urgency for this £1,500,000, for there was nothing of any consequence to be paid until the beginning of the next quarter; and if they got the money before the 1st of April, they would be quite in time for meeting their quarterly engagements. The Government had already got over £5,000,000, which was quite enough; and, after the lecture they had received from the Chancellor of the Exchequer, they were not disposed to give any more money. As a general rule, the more they were lectured, the less disposed they would be to submit to it. They stood upon their Constitutional right, and protested against the encroachments of the Executive upon the legislative functions of the House. It was the set policy of the prime mover and central genius of Her Majesty's Government to turn the House into a mere recording office of the Resolutions of the Ministry; but though he might have educated his Party up to that position, the country was not to be so educated, and if the Motion was brought to a Division, he should certainly support it.

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER said, his right hon. and gallant Friend had already shown, by the readiness with which he postponed any Votes upon which there was any prospect of discussion, that he was not anxious to stifle the full examination of the Estimates. In proposing, however, to pass the Vote now asked for, he was simply asking for what it would be impossible to raise a discussion upon. If he did not get it, it would be impossible for him to meet the engagements into which the country had entered. The hon. Gentleman said that the money would not be wanted before the 1st of April; but he forgot that engagements had been made for discussions of interest to the House generally, and certainly to the country, for which the Government had been obliged to make provision; and he must remember, also, that there were other Services which also had to be provided for, while the Government were subjected to very severe and not unnatural comments if they took money for one purpose and applied it to another. Yet such a course was almost rendered necessary, if Votes were refused when there was no reason for refusing. If he were to take the comments of the hon. Member for Dungarvan (Mr. O'Donnell) as throwing light upon the conduct of hon. Members opposite, he should have to modify very materially the remarks he made a little while ago. He did not then attribute any deliberate intention to obstruct the Business by the length of time spent in the conversation of that evening, because there were a great many subjects fairly for discussion. He did think, however, that that discussion was somewhat prolonged; while the last remarks of the hon. Member for Dungarvan threw a somewhat different light on these proceedings.

MR. O'DONNELL said, if the Government forced the Committee to transact Business at improper hours, lectures directed to a considerable portion of the House were, at any rate, not calculated to facilitate Business. The Government had no more right to lecture him, a humble Member of the House, than he had to lecture the Government. The Chancellor of the Exchequer had great powers, and, therefore, great responsibilities; and sometimes he was obliged to remind the right hon. Gentleman of his responsibilities, when he seemed a little inclined to forget them. The only argument brought forward by the Chancellor of the Exchequer was that so many nights were promised beforehand for important discussions; but there was at least another night for the Army Estimates, and that would give plenty of time to discuss these Votes. When the Army Estimates were brought in again, he supposed they would finish these Estimates. He did protest against this frequent reference to the long time spent over a Vote of £4,500,000. That was a heavy Vote, and it must necessarily raise a great number of questions; but he and his Friends had not introduced very many Amendments, and the Government had got their money after all. He hoped the Chancellor of the Exchequer would not persist in their references as to throwing light upon motives, and so on. That in no way shook the resolution of hon. Gentlemen on that side of the House to make a fair and free use of their Parliamentary rights.

MR. PARNELL said, after the way in which the Chancellor of the Exchequer had treated him that evening, he should deal very differently with the Government in future. He should take Divisions upon points on which he was entitled to take Divisions, and he should not again exercise the forbearance he had exercised that evening. He should use his full rights, and show no forbearance whatever towards the Government.

MR. BIGGAR said, the Chancellor of the Exchequer could not have listened to the speech of the hon. and gallant Gentleman the Member for Galway (Major Nolan), because he explained exactly on what grounds this Vote would be discussed, and ought to be discussed. The hon. and gallant Gentleman was acknowledged to be a first-class authority on Army subjects, and it was a very bad course for the right hon. Gentleman to ignore any argument from such a quarter. The right hon. Gentleman was also thoroughly unreasonable in his charges against the Members on that side of the House; and it was perfectly preposterous to say, as he did, that the same argument was urged over and over again. He thought the right hon. Gentleman ought to get up and make an apology to the different hon. Members who spoke on the Motions that were before the Committee. If the object of the critics of the Votes had been to waste time, they could have wasted an enormous deal of time by taking Divisions. That, however, was not done, and the proposition to report Progress was not made until after 12.30.

COLONEL STANLEY said, that at that hour of the night he did not think he could press the question further, and ask hon. Gentlemen who had supported him so far to sit up any later. Therefore, he would postpone the Vote.

MR. BIGGAR said, there was no objection to Vote 24. That was the only Vote upon which there was no controversy. [Mr. PARNELL: Do not give them a Vote.] His hon. Friend was unreasonable.

COLONEL STANLEY said, he would withdraw this Vote in order to take Vote 24, and then he would report Progress afterwards.

MR. PARNELL said, he objected to taking any more money at half-past 1 in the morning, and if the Motions were withdrawn he should move to report Progress.

COLONEL STANLEY said, he would consent to report Progress at once.

Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Original Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

House *resumed.*

Resolutions to be reported *To-morrow ;*

Committee to sit again upon *Wednesday.*

MOTIONS.

EMPLOYERS' LIABILITY BILL.

LEAVE. FIRST READING.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Sir JOHN HOLKER): I am about to ask leave of the House to introduce a Bill to amend the Law relating to the Liability of Employers for Injuries sustained by their Servants. I am aware it is somewhat late in the evening to address the House at any length on this matter; but as the Bill is a very important one, I must ask the House to give me their attention for a few minutes, while I explain the measure we propose. The liability of employers for negligence occasioned by their servants in the course of their employment is a question which has recently led to a very considerable amount of discussion. It has been said that the law on this subject is a hard law—a law which is exceptionally unjust; that there is an urgent necessity for this Bill; and that the present law is unfair, unequal, and unjust. In order that the House may appreciate and decide whether the existing law is unfair, unequal, and unjust, let me explain, in a very few words, what the law is as it stands to-day. Any master, in regard to those who are not in his employment, and the outside public, if I may use the expression, is liable for his own personal negligence, and for the injuries occasioned by the negligence of his servants, if such negligence is caused in the course of their employment as such servants. With respect to persons in the employ of the master, although masters are liable for any personal negligence of their own, or for personal default of their own, the law does not provide sufficient materials, or sufficient machinery, for punishing the negligence or default of their servants. Although the masters are liable to the persons in their employ, they are not liable for injuries which are occasioned to servants in their employ in consequence of the negligence of those who are their fellow servants. Now, this distinction, so far as I can make out, has this foundation—that when servants enter into the employ of the master they impliedly take upon themselves the risk which arises from negligence of which their fellow-servants may be guilty. It may be said that although this may be the doctrine of Courts of Law, it is not a doctrine which can be justified really and truly, and that no such position in law should be allowed. I must admit that the question is one of very considerable difficulty—I may say, of enormous difficulty. Different minds may take different views on this subject. On the one hand, it is said by the workmen, and by those who direct workmen, and whose counsel workmen follow, that there should be no difference in the law, and that masters should remain liable for injuries occasioned by those in their employ, just in the same way and extent as they are liable to the outside public, or those not in their employ. It is said, in effect, that they should be liable to the utmost extent of their fortune to their servants for any negligence incurred by their negligence, although it might have been committed without their consent and without any authority from them, and may, in fact, have been committed by the servants doing that which the master had expressly and distinctly forbidden. Of course, there is this merit in it—that is to say, that it is a simple proposition, and if carried into effect, it would make the law perfectly equal, and it would remove every possibility of complaint. But it involves a proposition of a very serious nature. Is it just to subject an employer to such a vast additional liability? Let us take a simple illustration. The owner of a mine, or the worker of a mine, who lays down the best rules he can for all who work for him, and takes every precaution which science and ingenuity and skill can suggest to prevent accidents; nevertheless, one of his workmen, in defiance of orders not to go to a part where there may be a dangerous gas with a naked light, does go there—there is an explosion, and it may be that hundreds of men in that miner's employ are either killed or seriously injured. If the mine worker is to be rendered liable to the servants who are injured by this negligence, the consequence would be that he would be utterly ruined, although he is not himself in any way to blame for the explosion. If the law subjects a man to such an enormous responsibility, the result would be to stop mining altogether. Let me put a humbler illustration. A greengrocer has a cart, and has taken care to engage the best servant he can get. This servant takes out goods and goes to a place where they are to be delivered, and in the course of his round is guilty of some negligence by not looking around him, or so on, and drives over some lawyer who is making thousands a-year, or over a Bishop, or somebody else equally important. Is this greengrocer, for no default of his own, to pay such compensation as he may be called upon to pay for such an injury? It is difficult to say that such a liability as this should be placed upon the master. In dealing with such matters we have to consider the consequences, and they would in such a case be that every master would have thrown upon him such an enormous additional liability that he would be unable to compete in the race of life, and the ultimate consequences must be the ruin of the masters, and with the ruin of the masters would be involved the ruin of the workmen, for whose benefit we are now called upon to legislate. Other people take a different view. They say, although the exception to which I have drawn attention renders the master not liable for the negligent acts of the fellow-servant —although the law may not be justifiable on any logical ground; yet to subject the master to liability for the negligent acts of his servant, if done against his will and without his authority, would be essentially unjust. Those who take this view say—"You can easily remedy this, and you can remove the injustice by making the masters only liable for their own negligence and not for the negligence of their servants, and so putting everybody upon the same footing." Each of these different views have prevailed, one Party advocating one alteration of the law, and the other advocating another alteration in an entirely opposite direction. These conflicting views, after being constantly brought before the House and the country, were in June, 1877, referred to a Committee appointed by this House, and to that Committee the Bill introduced by the hon. Member for Stafford (Mr. Macdonald) was referred. The Committee took a good deal of evidence, and discussed the matter with a great deal of care, and there was a considerable difference of opinion amongst the Members of that Committee. Ultimately, however, they drew up a Report, which was not acquiesced in by the whole Committee, or by anything like the whole of the Committee; but it was the Report of the majority of the Committee. That most able and learned Report was drawn by my hon. and learned Friend the Member for Coventry (Sir Henry Jackson). That Report has been under the consideration of the Government, who have also considered the subject, both before and since the appointment of the Committee, and they certainly do not agree in the extremest views of either side. They do not think it wise to subject masters to the enormous additional liability which many of the workmen of the country, and those who advised them, ask that they should be subjected to. But, at the same time, the Government cannot take the view that the law should be altered to the extent that some of the masters say it should be altered. The Government do not consider it would be wise to free masters from all liability for the negligence of their servants; and they have come, indeed, to very much the same conclusion as that which has been come to by the Committee in their Report. There are certain cases of incorporated companies where no one, from the very nature of the society or Corporation, can be made liable or responsible for the acts of his fellow-servant. By the very nature of the case the Corporation cannot be made liable. In this case it is thought right, where there is a Corporation of this sort, that those who are in truth the managers of the business of the Corporation, or a distinct department of the business of the Corporation, should be placed in the position of masters and outside the category of fellow-servants. And if any accident or injury should be occasioned by the negligence of one of these persons, those placed outside the category of fellow-servants, and who was in the position of manager or partner in the business, then the Corporation or Company should be liable for that person's negligence, although he may be a fellow-servant. So that, in the case of private concerns, where they are placed under the management of managers, or where part of the business, or important departments of a private concern are placed under a manager, it is fair to consider that the master has delegated to the manager the control and management of that part of the business; and it is fair to consider, as we do, that in such a case the manager shall be considered in regard to the master as his *alter ego*, and the manager cannot be treated as a fellow-servant. These are the views which the Government entertain, and they accordingly propose to enact that there shall be in some employments specified in the Bill—such as railways—persons intrusted by the Company with the management of the railway or of the traffic-way, or with any particular part of the railway, traffic-way, or any station of the railway, or any work connected with the railway—that the person so intrusted shall be considered servants in authority. Again, persons in charge of or managing any great concern—such as a particular pit or colliery, whether above ground or under ground—shall be considered servants in authority with regard to manufactories and works. A servant in authority is to be one who is appointed by the master as a manager of a factory, or works, or otherwise, or of any distinct branch, or portion thereof. Then the Bill, in a very simple enactment, declares that in regard to those persons, if they are guilty of negligence in the course of their employment, and that negligence occasions injury to any fellow-servants, the master of the Railway Company or the Mining Company shall be liable. That is the proposition which I have to submit to the House. I do not know whether it is a proposal which will satisfy what, perhaps, I may call, without speaking disrespectfully, a popular clamour. I cannot tell whether it will do so; but I cannot help thinking that the thoughtful part of the community will accept this Bill as imposing upon masters and employers of labour who, after all, are the main source of the prosperity of this country, as great a liability as they ought to be made to bear. The hon. and learned Gentleman concluded by moving for leave to bring in the Bill.

Mr. MACDONALD said, there were one or two errors in some of the remarks of the hon. and learned Attorney General to which he must call attention. The illustration he gave of the humble greengrocer was exactly the law now. If the greengrocer's man upset a Bishop, who, he learned for the first time, was an important individual — he always thought Bishops were exceedingly humble individuals, following in the footsteps of their Master—the greengrocer was liable for the injury done. Again, the hon. and learned Attorney General said that if a heavy responsibility were thrown upon the masters, they would be handicapped in the race of competition; but he was informed that the principle of the Bill, which he himself introduced on behalf of the great bulk of the working people of the country, was exactly the law of France at the present time. The law of Germany, again, was very largely in the same direction. In Belgium, again, as he had ascertained by a personal visit, the law laid down was very much the same as that which he had ventured to suggest as desirable to pass for the benefit of the workmen of this country. Yet those countries were now crying out for protection against British manufactures, and from British industries. Therefore, he had a perfect right to say that the masters could very easily assent to the law asked for. Again, the hon. and learned Attorney General had said that it was the workmen, and those who acted for them, who held these views; but he must remind the House that a very distinguished Judge, who was by no means one of those who agitated the working people of the country — Lord Justice Brett—gave it as his opinion that the law, as it now stood, could not be supported. Several other legal gentlemen came before the Committee, and gave an opinion equally strong in regard to the matter. The hon. and learned Baronet the Member for Coventry (Sir Henry Jackson) said, quoting a case that had happened in Massachusetts, that the workmen entered upon these risks knowing, as well as anybody else, what they were. He could only say that the illustration used was one of the most feeble, and, if he might say so, one of the most foolish, that possibly could be uttered by any man. The hon. and learned Attorney General said that such a law as he advocated would throw a terrible responsibility upon the employers; but he must know well that this was the law of Scotland up to the year 1857; and yet that was the period when Scotch manufactures increased more largely than at any other period. He thanked the hon. and learned Gentleman the Attorney General for having presented this modicum of what was wanted, because he knew full well that by-and-bye they were bound to have more. In the case of the Factory Acts, after dealing with the question in a general way, the Home Secretary at last took them well in hand, and settled them in a manner which thoroughly met the wants of the people of the country. He felt perfectly satisfied that the question between capital and labour would also be finally settled in a similarly satisfactory way. He would strongly recommend the hon. and learned Gentleman to take a little more thought on the subject, and to bring in a Bill with the strong hand which characterized the Secretary of State for the Home Department in dealing with the Factory Acts. He asked him to do this, because he felt convinced the present Bill would only disturb the question, and would not settle it; and, therefore, he wanted to see the question grappled and finally dealt with at once and done with. He should like to ask the hon. and learned Gentleman when the Bill would be printed and brought in for the second reading, because he might rest assured that it would not pass in its present form.

Mr. COURTNEY wished to ask two questions by way of explanation. In the first place, was it proposed to make the responsibility of the superior master for the act of a servant in authority unlimited? And next, did the responsibility of the person placed in authority extend to all persons in the same employ, or only to the particular class under him? For example a stationmaster might be guilty of negligence which would expose not only the persons in the station to accident, but guards, or even a director or secretary travelling along the line. Was the responsibility of the Railway Company to extend upwards and laterally as well as downwards?

Mr. SHAW -LEFEVRE, said, although the hon. and learned Attorney General spoke in so hesitating a tone in the early part of his speech, when he came to describe the details of his Bill, it appeared to him to go somewhat beyond the recommendations of the Committee. If it were so, he was glad to find the Government were moving in the right direction. However, this was a matter which required very careful consideration, and only with the Bill before them could they understand perfectly the details of the explanation which they had just heard. He hoped the hon. and learned Gentleman would explain the points raised by his hon. Friend behind him (Mr. Courtney), because it was a matter which came under the consideration of the Committee; but the Committee did not, in that case, think the Corporation ought to be liable for the acts of the stationmaster. If, however, the hon. and learned Attorney General contemplated including such a case, he would include also many other similar cases, and go much further towards settling the question than his speech at the commencement would have led them to suppose. He believed also that the hon. and learned Gentleman was not quite accurate in his explanation of the law. He was, of course, scarcely prepared to dispute such a question with him; but he certainly thought that in the circumstances stated, the greengrocer would under the present law be responsible.

Sir HENRY JACKSON said, he had hoped that the question would have been considered from another point of view, and that was, whether the law affecting the liability of masters not only to servants but to the general public did not require amendment. The great difficulty the Select Committee felt, and the difficulty which he suspected the Government and the House would feel, was that which resulted from the apparent anomaly which at present existed. They had a master responsible to third persons, and yet not responsible to his own servant; therefore, the servant who said this was a hardship upon him had a *primâ facia* case; but the question to be determined was whether the general law was right—whether the exception was to be advocated or the law condemned? He had always entertained a very strong opinion that the true juridical principle was to make everybody responsible for what he himself was actually to blame for, and for nothing else. He wished the Government had boldly grappled with the law, and put it, as it affected everybody, on a firm and satisfactory footing. Had it been on such a footing the question as to common employment and the relation of master and servant would never have arisen. As, however, they had shrunk from doing that, he saw little to complain of in the Bill as announced. It went somewhat further than the recommendations of the Committee, which simply were that no workman should ever be without a master for whose negligence he could obtain redress. At present, there were many workmen who served Corporations and persons who took no personal part in their work, and that was a state of things which the Committee thought ought not to continue and were willing to see redressed. His hon. Friend the Member for Stafford (Mr. Macdonald) looked upon the Bill as a modicum, and as a concession to the principle which he (Sir Henry Jackson) himself had never seen any basis for. If the principle of taking everybody out of the category of common employment was found in the Bill when they came to discuss it, he should certainly oppose the second reading, because it was a principle which he conscientiously believed to be a very bad one.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Sir JOHN HOLKER) said, in using the illustration of the greengrocer, his simple object was to show how heavy the present law was in some cases. With respect to the question of the hon. Member for Liskeard (Mr. Courtney) whether the liability for the neglectful act of a servant in authority was unlimited, the Government did propose that it should be unlimited, and it would be extended to any servants of the master. In the case of a railway, supposing some servant to be guilty of negligence and some other servant of the railway, belonging to no matter what branch of the employment, and no matter what his rank, were injured, the Company would be liable. The Bill would be printed at once. It was impossible to say when the second reading would be taken, but it should be taken without delay.

Motion *agreed to.*

Bill to amend the Law relating to the Liability of Employers for injuries sustained by their Servants, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. ATTORNEY GENERAL, Mr. SOLICITOR GENERAL, The LORD ADVOCATE, and Mr. ATTORNEY GENERAL for IRELAND.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 103.]

LAND DRAINAGE PROVISIONAL ORDER (BISPHAM, &C.) BILL.

On Motion of Sir MATTHEW RIDLEY, Bill to confirm a Provisional Order under "The Land Drainage Act, 1861," relating to Bispham, Carleton, and Thornton Improvements, situated in the parishes of Bispham and Poulton, in the county of Lancaster, *ordered* to be brought in by Sir MATTHEW RIDLEY and Mr. Secretary CROSS.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 104.]

House adjourned at a quarter after Two o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Tuesday, 18*th March*, 1879.

MINUTES.]—PUBLIC BILLS—*First Reading*—Oyster and Mussel Fisheries Order (Blackwater, Essex) * [29].

Second Reading — *Committee negatived* — Marine Mutiny Act (Temporary) Continuance *.

Committee—*Report*—Mutiny Act (Temporary) Continuance) *.

SOUTH AFRICA—THE ZULU WAR—THE QUEEN'S MESSAGE.

QUESTION. OBSERVATIONS.

LORD TRURO rose to ask Her Majesty's Government, Whether it is true that a Message has been transmitted by the Secretary of State for War expressing Her Majesty's sympathy with Her troops in South Africa and Her entire confidence in the Commander-in-Chief, when a Court of Inquiry was still pending; and, whether this Message was duly considered by, and met with the entire concurrence of, Her Majesty's Government? The Question, he said, had been asked in somewhat similar terms in "another place," and had been replied to with an alacrity and an acceptance of responsibility not usual with a Cabinet Minister. It would not be supposed that any subject of Her Majesty would feel otherwise than grateful for the expression of sympathy which was at all times accorded towards the subjects of the Sovereign when cases of distress or suffering occurred. Therefore, it was not to the first part of the Message that his Question was specially directed—it was directed rather to that expression of entire confidence in the Commander-in-Chief, and at a time when a Court of Inquiry was still pending. He could not but question whether that expression of entire confidence could have been made without the direct sanction of Her Majesty's Ministers, who were responsible for all the acts of the authority to whom the Message was addressed. He would therefore inquire whether that Message ever had been sent, and, if it had been, whether it had been sent without the knowledge of Her Majesty's Ministers? It might have been sent, he presumed, by order of the Commander-in-Chief through the Minister for War; but it would be new to him to learn that such a Message—affecting, he might say, the command of Her Majesty's Forces—had been sent without being submitted for the approval of the Cabinet, or without having met with its sanction. The object, he presumed, of the Court of Inquiry was to obtain such an account of the circumstances attending the disaster as might furnish a light to guide Her Majesty's Government in the steps which should be taken. When an expression of entire confidence was accorded by one man to another it was founded universally on success, and it was new to him to find it accorded in a state of danger. If, as he was led to believe, it had been sent without any direct sanction on the part of Her Majesty's Government, then such a step was certainly unusual; but the knowledge which they all had that no Sovereign who had ever sat on the Throne of this Realm had a more profound acquaintance with Constitutional usages than was possessed by Her Majesty induced him to think that there could not have been in this instance such a departure from what was usual. He wished to ask Her Majesty's Government, Whether it was true that a Message was transmitted by the Secretary of State for War expressing Her Majesty's sympathy with Her troops in South Africa and Her entire confidence in the Commander-in-Chief, when a Court of Inquiry was still pending; and, whether this Message was duly considered by, and met with the entire concurrence of, Her Majesty's Government? He would be the last man to say anything whatever to reflect on the professional capacity of an absent man, or on the capacity of a distinguished officer who had been always regarded by his compeers as a man remarkable for his military talents and as being singularly prudent in all military measures; but he believed he was not wrong in saying that the great mass of military opinion in this country did not lead to the belief that in this unhappy disaster every means had been taken to prevent the unfortunate massacre which had occurred. On the contrary, it inclined to the belief that there were certain omissions, if not commissions, which military men did not approve. He was not for a moment complaining that any other course had not been pursued; but he said that this expression of entire confidence where there had not been complete success was a departure—in his judgment, an unhappy and unfortunate departure—from the ordinary rule, and would not give satisfaction to military minds in the country. He would have been perfectly satisfied if the matter had been allowed to rest without any such expression of confidence. He hoped to receive a full and candid reply to his inquiry.

THE EARL OF BEACONSFIELD: My Lords, I need not assure your Lordships, who are acquainted with the Constitution of this Realm, that no public act on the part of the Sovereign is ever done except on the responsibility of Her Ministers. Therefore, I shall not dwell on that point, except to make the remark that I think the manner in which the noble Lord has made his inquiry is not one consistent with the Constitutional usages which are generally observed. At the same time, I would observe that there is one great peculiarity in the Question. The noble Lord makes an inquiry respecting a certain Message, the purport of which he criticizes in general language, but totally avoids placing before your Lordships what that Message, which is the subject of his controversy, really is. If the noble Lord had only alluded to it, I might, perhaps, have passed it over slightly, or even unnoticed; but the noble Lord, in asking his Question, has entirely misrepresented the question. The noble Lord referred to a Message which was sent by Her Majesty, on the responsibility of Her Government, to the Commander-in-Chief and the troops in South Africa. Now, my Lords, what was that Message? Her Majesty, on learning what had occurred, unhappily, in that part of the world, immediately expressed her sympathy with Her Army in the great disaster and loss which they had incurred and suffered, and, at the same time—to use, I believe, the exact language—expressed still Her confidence in the Commander-in-Chief and Her troops to maintain the honour of Her name. Now, my Lords, such a Message was most becoming in one occupying the exalted station of Sovereign of this Realm, and that Message was transmitted under the responsibility of Her Advisers. The custom thus adhered to was one which has been pursued in innumerable instances; and to hold that such an expression of feeling on the part of the Sovereign, thus constitutionally expressed, should be submitted to the Cabinet, and even to the discussion of Parliament before it is transmitted to the troops, in whose sufferings it sympathizes, and in whose future exploits it expresses confidence, would be to destroy all that spontaneous grace of consolation which such Messages to our brave troops, in circumstances of disaster, are so eminently calculated to convey. My Lords, there is nothing in what has occurred but what is regular and Constitutional, and the interpretation which the noble Lord—of course, unintentionally—has placed on this Message—the language of which, I may repeat, he never quoted—conveys to my mind, and I should think to the minds of your Lordships, a completely erroneous impression of the meaning which it was intended to express. In the circumstances which existed, an expression of confidence by Her Majesty, after an expression of sympathy with their misfortunes and disasters, in the Commander-in-Chief and Her troops to maintain the honour of Her name was, to my mind, most becoming and proper, and is not to be tortured into a formal expression of unlimited confidence in the Commander-in-Chief, in the manner which it has been by the noble Lord. The noble Lord says that no expression of this kind on the part of the Sovereign, even with the approbation of Her Ministers, should have been made in consequence of the Court of Inquiry at that time sitting. My Lords, that Court was not holding an Inquiry into the conduct of the Commander-in-Chief. It was a Court of Inquiry instituted by the Commander-in-Chief himself, in order to obtain facts which might enable him to form an accurate opinion as to the causes of the disaster, and which he might transmit to Her Majesty's Government. Was it to be supposed that in such circumstances an expression of the feeling of the highest Personage in the Realm, calculated to sustain our troops in trials of no common character—an expression of feeling which is looked forward to by Her Majesty's troops either in triumph or discomfiture with the greatest interest—was it to be supposed that it should be delayed till the Court of Inquiry had come to some conclusion as to facts, in order that the Commander-in-Chief should convey an accurate report to the Government? I am sure your Lordships would never tolerate or sanction such a course as that. Nothing occurred but what was regular and Constitutional. It has been in accordance with regal custom, and it has been done on the full responsibility of the Ministry, as is every public act of the Sovereign. My Lords, I therefore think that the inquiry of the noble Lord might have been avoided on this occasion.

Lord TRURO said, he had been completely answered. He was satisfied, because he had succeeded in eliciting a clear and full explanation.

House adjourned at half past Five o'clock, to Thursday next, half past Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Tuesday, 18*th March*, 1879.

MINUTES.]—Supply—*considered in Committee —Resolutions* [March 17] *reported.*

Private Bill (*by Order*)—*Select Committee—* Thames River (Prevention of Floods), Sir Trevor Lawrence, Mr. M. Brooks *added*, Lord Robert Montagu *discharged.*

Public Bills — *Ordered* — *First Reading* — County Boards [105].

Second Reading—Referred to Select Committee— Wormwood Scrubs Regulation* [96].

Select Committee—Summary Jurisdiction* [69], *nominated;* Coroners* [67], *nominated.*

PRIVATE BUSINESS.

THAMES RIVER (PREVENTION OF FLOODS) BILL.

Committee on the Thames River (Prevention of Floods) Bill to consist of Twelve Members; Sir Trevor Lawrence and Mr. Maurice Brooks added to the Committee; Lord Robert Montagu discharged from attendance; Five to be the quorum.—(*The Chairman of Ways and Means.*)

QUESTIONS.

CRIMINAL LAW—CASE OF MICHAEL GILMORE.—QUESTION.

Mr. MITCHELL HENRY asked the Chief Secretary for Ireland, Whether it is true that Michael Gilmore, a young man twenty-four years of age, and in the last stage of illness from consumption, was, on the 6th of January last, taken out of his bed and marched through the town of Tuam, in deep snow, by six armed policemen and lodged in the prison there on the suspicion that he had written a threatening letter; whether all his papers were seized and sent to Dublin to be examined by an expert; whether bail was refused and he was not allowed to return home until the medical man certified that his death might take place at any moment; and, whether it is true that nothing was discovered to justify his arrest, and that he has since actually died; and what course under these circumstances the Government propose to take in reference to this case?

Mr. J. LOWTHER: Sir, the facts of the case I find are as follows:—Michael Gilmore was arrested in Tuam on the 5th of January of the present year on a charge of having written a threatening letter. The arrest was made under a magistrate's warrant, duly obtained, and took place at half-past 3 in the afternoon, the prisoner not being confined to bed at the time. It is the case that there was snow on the ground that day. On the 2nd of December, a month or more previous to the arrest, Gilmore's residence was searched under a warrant, and certain documents were seized and made the subject of examination by an expert, as indicated by the hon. Gentleman. Bail was, in the first instance, refused, but was accepted the day following the arrest, in accordance with the recommendation of the medical authorities. Meanwhile, during the few hours he was in confinement, every attention was paid to him, and especial care taken to avoid his being exposed to any risk from cold or other causes. On the 11th of January he was committed for trial at Galway Assizes, bail being again accepted, and on the 17th of February, previous to the Assizes being held, he died, the cause of death being consumption. The documents seized, and other evidence, fully justified the arrest in the opinion of those whose duty it was to investigate the case, and I am unable to find that any blame is attributable to any of the persons connected with it.

PATENTS FOR INVENTIONS (No 2) BILL.—QUESTION.

Mr. SAMUELSON asked Mr. Attorney General, Whether he will, before the Second Reading of the Patents for Inventions (No. 2) Bill, lay upon the Table a Statement showing, in respect of each year from 1870 to 1878 inclusive, the number of Patents then in their fourteenth year, the number of applications to the Privy Council for prolongation, and the number of prolongations actually granted?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL (Sir John Holker), in reply, said, that he would lay on the Table, as soon as he obtained it, the statement referred to in the hon. Member's Question. He should not like to promise, however, that if he had an opportunity of taking the second reading of the Patents for Inventions (No. 2) Bill he would forego the advantage, merely because the statement was not ready.

ARMY — THE INDIAN CONTINGENT— COST OF TRANSPORT.—QUESTION.

Mr. MUNDELLA asked Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, If he will cause to be laid upon the Table of the House a full detailed Statement of the cost of the transport of the Indian troops from and to India, together with the pay and allowances, cost of provisions, and all other expenses incidental thereto?

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER, in reply, said, that if the hon. Gentleman would move for it, he would cause the Statement in question to be laid upon the Table.

PARLIAMENT—THE VACANT SEATS— DISSOLUTION OF PARLIAMENT.

QUESTION.

Mr. HIBBERT asked Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Whether it is the intention of the Government to take any steps, in anticipation of the ensuing dissolution of Parliament, to provide for the filling up of the six vacancies created by the disfranchisement of Beverley, Bridgwater, Cashel, and Sligo, so as to complete the full number of the House of Commons?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: Yes, Sir, the Government think it will be right that the filling up of these vacancies should be provided for before the time comes for a Dissolution of Parliament. But there is no hurry, as the necessity is not likely to occur immediately.

LAW AND JUSTICE—CASE OF "MARTIN v. MACKONOCHIE."—QUESTION.

SIR UGHTRED KAY-SHUTTLEWORTH asked Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Whether it is the fact that, in the case of Martin *v.* Mackonochie, the judge against whose decision the appeal is made, but who has no personal interest in the action, has been permitted to appear by Counsel as a party in the suit; whether the Treasury has instructed the Solicitor General to appear accordingly; whether it is proposed to pay the costs out of the public purse; and, whether there is any precedent for such a course or for such an applicatton of the public funds?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER, in reply, said, it was true that the Judge in question (Lord Penzance) had been permitted to appear by counsel as a party in the suit. The permission, he presumed, was granted by the Court before which the proceedings took place; but, of course, that was a matter over which the Government had no control. The Treasury had instructed him (the Attorney General) to appear on Lord Penzance's behalf in accordance with the directions of the Lord Chancellor and the Home Secretary. It was proposed that the costs should be paid out of the public purse. He believed it was in accordance with usual practice that when there arose any question as to the jurisdiction of one Court over another, although the Judge, who had no personal interest in the matter, was expected to appear, the charge was borne by the Government. There was, of course, no direct precedent in the present case, because Lord Penzance's Court was of very recent creation.

THE WAR OFFICE LOCKS.

QUESTION.

MR. MACDONALD asked the Secretary of State for War, If his attention has been directed to a Correspondence in respect to a contract for locks furnished to the War Office, in which it is stated that a person furnished locks at a very large per centage above purchase price; if he has taken any steps to find if these allegations are correct; whether there was any particular reason why that tradesman was selected to supply the locks; and, whether it be correct that cast-iron locks were not used in the Department till the contract was in the hands of the contractor in question?

COLONEL LOYD LINDSAY, in reply, said, the attention of his right hon. and gallant Friend (Colonel Stanley) had been called to the matter referred to. The locks, however, as a matter of fact, were purchased at the printed price, which was not in excess of the ordinary retail price. It had not been the practice to furnish locks of cast-iron; but English manufacturers were of opinion that if they were of good workmanship they were as good as others.

MR. MACDONALD gave Notice that he would take the first opportunity of calling attention to this matter of locks. He could show that there had been great extravagance.

THE KING OF BURMAH—REPORTED ULTIMATUM.—QUESTION.

MR. RICHARD asked Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Whether it is true, as reported in the public journals, that an ultimatum has been sent to the King of Burmah; what is the nature of that ultimatum; and, whether it was sent with the knowledge and sanction of Her Majesty's Government?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: Sir, I have communicated with my noble Friend the Secretary of State for India (Viscount Cranbrook), and he informs me that he has no information, and we have no information of any ultimatum of any kind having been sent. I have also to say, that, so far as is known, the Viceroy has no intention of sending one.

PUBLIC HEALTH—DEATH-RATE OF THE METROPOLIS.—QUESTION.

Sir UGHTRED KAY - SHUTTLEWORTH asked the President of the Local Government Board, Whether it is true that the Registrar General has reported that the death-rate of the Metropolis, which was 22·3 in every thousand in 1876, and 21·9 in 1877, has risen in 1878 to 23·5 in every thousand; whether this increase was almost entirely due to zymotic diseases; whether the death-rate has risen to a still higher figure in recent weeks (29·2 in that ending March 8th); whether Dr. Frankland has reported that during the past year the quality of water delivered by the Companies who derive their supply from the Thames was inferior even to the unsatisfactory water supply of recent years; and, whether the Local Government Board have taken any action in consequence of these reports?

Mr. SCLATER-BOOTH: It is true, Sir, as stated in the hon. Gentleman's Question, that the annual death-rate in London, which was 23·8, 22·3, and 21·9 per 1,000 in 1875, 1876, and 1877, rose again to 23·5 in 1878. It is also true that during the first 10 weeks of this year, influenced by the severe winter, the death-rate has averaged 26·3 per 1,000. The average annual death-rate in London, however, during the eight past years of the current decade—1871-78—has averaged but 22·8 per 1,000, against 23·6 and 24·3 in the two preceding decades—1861-70 and 1851-60 respectively—showing an actual recent decline. As to the increase in 1878, compared with the exceptionally low rate in 1877, less than one-third of it was due to the increased fatality of the principal zymotic diseases — namely, whooping cough and diarrhœa. The marked excess of mortality in the first 10 weeks of this year is in no way due to zymotic diseases. The annual zymotic death-rate in London in the eight years 1871-8 has averaged 4·0 per 1,000, against 4·5 and 4·9 in the two preceding decades, 1861-70 and 1851-60 respectively. In reply to the second part of the Question, Dr. Frankland has reported that with one exception—namely, 1872—the Thames water was last year more polluted than during recent years by organic matter, and that owing to the frequent heavy floods the water was extremely difficult to filter. The efficiency of filtration, however, during 1878, as ascertained by the monthly analysis of the Local Government Board's examiner, shows that out of 60 samples of the water of the five Thames companies in that year, 48 were clear and transparent, whereas it appears that during the six preceding years the average result was that out of the 60 samples 42 only were clear and transparent. The Local Government Board have no power to enforce a supply of water from any fresh source, their powers being chiefly limited to seeing, through their officer, the water examiner, whether the water is, as far as practicable, properly filtered. They have not failed to impress upon the companies the necessity of adopting all necessary improvements, and during the last two years the five Thames companies have expended upwards of £400,000 in constructing improved reservoirs and filtering beds. Many of these new works are completed, or on the verge of completion.

INDIA—THE EXCHANGES.

QUESTIONS.

Mr. J. K. CROSS asked Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Whether his attention had been called to a paragraph which appeared in the "Times" telegraphic summary of the Indian Budget, dated Calcutta the 13th of March, and which states that—

> "No increase of taxation is proposed, because the change in the relative value of Gold and Silver, which alone has disturbed the satisfactory financial condition of India, is under the consideration of the Home Government upon the motion of the Indian Government;"

and, whether Her Majesty's Government have at present under consideration any plan by which they hope to establish a monetary standard of value which shall be common alike to India and England?

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER: Sir, the Government have received a despatch from India containing proposals bearing upon the condition of the exchange, which so seriously affects Indian finance, and, as the question does not affect India alone, have referred it to a small Departmental Committee. The time necessary for a careful examination of so large a subject precluded the possibility of any action prior to the Indian Budget. Should any change of importance be proposed, the House has been informed before that it will have an opportunity of discussing it.

Mr. CHILDERS wished to know, with reference to the statement of the Chancellor of the Exchequer, on the subject, Whether, if any proposal was made by the Departmental Committee, there would be an opportunity of discussing it before it came into operation?

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER: Yes. I hope, if any proposal is made, it will be long before the end of the Session; but, undoubtedly, the House will have an opportunity of considering any change that may be proposed before it comes into effect.

Mr. FAWCETT said, he wished to ask a Question on the same subject. Last April, when the subject was before the House, the right hon. Gentleman then said that Parliament should have the opportunity of considering any proposed change if it was introduced when Parliament was sitting; but he did not give any promise as to what should be done if Parliament was not sitting. He wished to know, If the answer now given by the Chancellor of the Exchequer would apply to a proposal made when Parliament was not sitting?

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER: I gave that answer deliberately, and it is not my intention to alter it now. What would be done if a proposal was made when Parliament was not sitting would have to be considered; but I hope that, if any proposal is made, it will be made before the end of the Session; and, in that case, it will undoubtedly be brought before the House in time for due consideration to be given to so important a matter before anything final is done.

DISTRICT AUDITORS BILL.

QUESTION.

Sir CHARLES W. DILKE asked the President of the Local Government Board, with reference to the District Auditors Bill, Whether he can state, for the information of the House, what local authorities in the Metropolis are intended to be included in the provisions of the Bill?

Mr. SCLATER-BOOTH: Sir, the District Auditors Bill does not affect any local authorities, whose accounts are not now required by law to be audited by an auditor of the Local Government Board. It makes no alteration whatever in the existing law in this respect, and in the Metropolis the accounts of the Vestries and District Boards will continue to be audited, as before, under the provisions of the Metropolis Management Act. The only authorities in the Metropolis whose accounts are audited under the provisions of the Bill are the several Boards of Guardians, the managers of the school and asylum districts, the London School Board, and the exceptional case of the Woolwich Local Board, which was constituted under the Public Health Act, 1848, and has consequently been always under the audit of the Poor Law auditor.

CYPRUS—THE GREEK LANGUAGE.

QUESTIONS.

Mr. H. SAMUELSON asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether Petitions in Greek are received and dealt with by the Government of Cyprus upon equal terms with those in English and Turkish; whether the Greek language is officially recognized and used in the law courts; and, whether Greek is the language of the majority of the islanders?

Mr. BOURKE, in reply, said, the Government were not aware of any restrictions having been placed upon the language used in Petitions to the Government of Cyprus. As to the official recognition of the Greek language, their information upon the subject was not very recent; but they were aware that shortly after Sir Garnet Wolseley arrived in the Island, he expressed himself averse to any change in the official language—it was the Turkish. With regard to the last part of the Question, he did not think there could be any doubt that Greek was the language of the great majority of the inhabitants.

Mr. H. SAMUELSON wished to know, Whether the Government would ascertain whether Petitions in Greek were officially recognized?

Mr. BOURKE said, now the subject had been mentioned, the Government would do so.

ARMY—THE CONSOLIDATED RATION—ERBSWURST.—QUESTION.

SIR HENRY HAVELOCK asked the Secretary of State of War, Whether his attention has been drawn to the great independence of transport, and consequent facilities for rapid movement, stated to be given to troops in the field by their being supplied with the portable and consolidated ration called "Erbswürst;" how many days' supply of this ration, calculated for the whole force now on the way to Lord Chelmsford and that already with him, has been sent to the Cape; and, whether the supply so sent has been re-packed in boxes suitable for conveyance in the field?

COLONEL STANLEY: Sir, my attention has been drawn to the subject. There are many kinds of consolidated rations, this "erbswürst" being only one of them. The subject was investigated by a Committee last spring, and they recommended that a preparation of pea-soup, which, I believe, is what is meant by the term employed by the hon. and gallant Member, should be issued to the troops on active service when they are carrying their own supplies for a day or more, being cut off from their supply waggons. It is not a substitute for the ordinary rations, but only for groceries and other articles of which they would be unavoidably deprived. There have been nine days' supplies sent out for the whole Force, and I believe there is more to be sent, or is on its way. The whole supply has been re-packed in field-services cases.

QUARANTINE ACT—CARGO OF RAGS FROM RUSSIA.—QUESTION.

MR. J. COWEN asked the Vice President of the Council, If a Swedish vessel that arrived in the River Tyne on Saturday last from Libau with a cargo of rags, has been, by instructions from the Privy Council, ordered to undergo quarantine; and, if he is aware that the vessel left Libau in January last with a clean bill of health; that she has been stopped in the Baltic by ice over a month; that she has also clean bills of health from two Danish ports at which she called; and that there is no trace of disease or sickness amongst the crew?

LORD GEORGE HAMILTON: Notice was received at the Privy Council Office on Saturday that the *Prima*, a small Swedish vessel, laden with a cargo of rags from Russia, had been repelled from a Swedish port "on account of the dangerous nature of the cargo in respect to the propagation of the pest," and was, therefore, proceeding to an English port. Setting aside the possible risk of admitting such a cargo, which is absolutely prohibited by the other European nations, it is evident that if we were to allow free pratique to a vessel under such circumstances, foreign Governments would be likely, in order to carry out their own regulations, to levy quarantine against English vessels, at a loss to our trade which would be intolerable. The Lords of the Council, therefore, acting under the powers conferred on them by the Quarantine Act, have detained the vessel until the cargo and all on board have been fumigated and disinfected. There has been no sickness on board the *Prima;* but the danger, if any, arises from the cargo, and not from the persons on board. An Order of Council has been passed authorizing the release of the vessel as soon as she has been disinfected.

SOUTH AFRICA—THE ZULU WAR—THE DEFEAT AT ISANDULA.—QUESTION.

SIR ROBERT PEEL asked Her Majesty's Government, Whether it is true, as reported in the "Times" newspaper, that a message was transmitted by the Secretary of State for War, on the receipt in this country of the telegraphic intelligence of the grave military disaster at Isandula, and before Lord Chelmsford's Despatch upon that unfortunate affair had been received, and while the Court of Inquiry was still pending, expressing entire confidence in Lord Chelmsford as Commander-in-Chief of the British Forces in South Africa; and, whether that message of confidence received the sanction of Her Majesty's Government and of the Field Marshal Commanding in Chief, His Royal Highness the Duke of Cambridge?

COLONEL STANLEY: Sir, I did not see the report to which the hon. Baronet refers in *The Times* newspaper; but, as I have already stated, it is true that a message was transmitted by me on the receipt in this country of the telegraphic intelligence of the great disaster at

Isandula. That message was transmitted on the very day or the day following my receipt of Lord Chelmsford's telegraphic message; therefore, of course, it was before his Despatch was received and before the Court of Inquiry had framed their Report. That message was one, as I have already stated, of personal sympathy and of confidence, and I am not aware that it contained any reference to Lord Chelmsford in his capacity as Commander-in-Chief of the British Forces. I repeat that that message of confidence was forwarded by me. I did not think it necessary to consult my Colleagues on the matter, and I am responsible for having thought it consistent with my duty to transmit that message.

INDIA—THE AFGHAN WAR—NEWSPAPER CORRESPONDENTS.

QUESTION.

Mr. ANDERSON asked the Under Secretary of State for India, If he is aware that General Roberts has sent the correspondent of the "Standard" away from the Kurum Force, and that the only newspaper correspondents left are members of General Roberts' own staff; whether it is in accordance with regulation that Staff Officers should be so employed; and, whether it is by order, or with the consent of the Indian Government, that General Roberts prevents any account of his proceedings coming to the public through independent channels?

Mr. E. STANHOPE: Sir, our only information on this subject is what has appeared in the newspapers, and we have no reason to doubt the accuracy of their statements; but we have heard nothing whatever from the Government of India on the subject.

Mr. ANDERSON: With reference to the answer of the hon. Gentleman, and his entire ignorance of everything I ask him, I wish to know if he will take steps to ascertain whether the Indian Government have consented to General Roberts's muzzling the Press?

SOUTH AFRICA—THE ZULU WAR—DEPATCH OF SEPTEMBER 14, 1878.

QUESTION.

Mr. SHAW LEFEVRE asked the Secretary of State for the Colonies, Why the Despatch of Lord Chelmsford, dated December 14th, 1878, including a Memorandum on the force required in the event of the invasion of Zululand being decided on, which was promised to the House on the first night of the Session, has not yet been laid upon the Table of the House?

Colonel STANLEY replied to the Question, saying, that so far as the Correspondence connected with the War Office was concerned, the documents were in print and might be placed on the Table almost at any time, and he hoped they might be circulated in the course of to-morrow or the next day. But most of those which were of any importance had already appeared in the other series of Papers. The greater portion of the Documents were rather of a departmental, than of a public, character.

DOMINION OF CANADA—THE NEW TARIFF.—NOTICE OF QUESTION.

Mr. JOHN BRIGHT gave Notice that, on Thursday next, he would ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies, If he can lay upon the Table of the House a Copy of the new Tariff now before the Canadian Parliament; if any communication has taken place between Her Majesty's Government and the Governor General, or Government of Canada, on the subject of the proposed increased Customs and Protective Duties in Canada; whether it is intended to represent to the Canadian Government the impolicy of a war of Tariffs between different portions of the Empire; and, whether it is true that the "instructions" to Lord Lorne omitted, for the first time, the Clause requiring that Bills imposing differential Duties should be reserved for Her Majesty's approval?

CENTRAL ASIA—REPORTED RUSSIAN OPERATIONS AGAINST MERV.

QUESTION.

Lord ROBERT MONTAGU asked Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Whether the Government had any knowledge as to the truth of a statement in the "Standard" of that day to the effect that a Russian Force of nearly 20,000 men was being conveyed across the Caspian, with the view of operating against Merv?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: Perhaps the noble Lord will be kind enough to give Notice of his Question.

PUBLIC PEACE (IRELAND)—RIOTS AT BELFAST AND OUTRAGE AT DERRY.

QUESTIONS.

THE O'DONOGHUE: Sir, I beg to ask the Chief Secretary for Ireland, Whether there is any truth in the statements which appear in the papers to-day, that in Belfast there has been a collision between the police and some persons who took part in a procession yesterday?

MR. SULLIVAN: At the same time, I may be allowed to ask the right hon. Gentleman, If there is any truth in a telegram posted up in the Library, to the effect that last night, at a *soirée* of Catholic inhabitants of Derry, there was thrown down through the glass skylight a cartridge box loaded with powder and fired with a fuse, which exploded among the persons assembled below?

MR. J. LOWTHER, in reply, said, that with respect to the Question of the hon. Member for Tralee (the O'Donoghue), he was sorry to say that a collision had occurred in Belfast between persons engaged in riotous conduct and the constabulary. He had not heard the full particulars, but he was in hopes the collision was only slight. With regard to the other matter referred to by the hon. and learned Member for Louth (Mr. Sullivan), he had heard nothing of it. He did not know whether the statement was true or not.

EGYPT—THE BRITISH CONSUL GENERAL.—QUESTION.

SIR GEORGE CAMPBELL asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, If he could say whether the approaching departure of Mr. Vivian, the British Consul General in Egypt, at the present time of the Egyptian crisis, was merely for the purpose of consulting him, and not for the purpose of withdrawing him from his post, and so strengthening the hands of another Englishman in the service of the Egyptian Government.

MR. BOURKE: That subject is still under discussion, and I cannot, therefore, according to usual practice, undertake to make any statement of the views of the Government with reference to it.

MOTIONS.

WINE DUTIES.—RESOLUTION.

MR. W. CARTWRIGHT, in rising to call attention to the Report from Her Majesty's Representatives Abroad respecting the various modes and rates under which Duties are paid on Wines introduced into Foreign Countries, as also to the Correspondence respecting commercial relations between Great Britain and Spain; and to move—

> "That, in the opinion of this House, it is desirable that a Select Committee be appointed to inquire into the system under which Customs Duties are now levied in this country on Wine, and into its results, fiscal and commercial,"

said, he had already twice called the attention of the House to the subject, and he had framed the Resolution with which he would conclude so as to meet some of the objections which had formerly been urged against it. When he first presented his Motion to the House, which he might say was an indictment of the system under which the Wine Duties were levied in this country, his object was that a Committee be appointed to investigate the mode of levying Duties. He then was obliged to go into many matters to make himself intelligible—matters which were technical details; but he was glad to be able to say that he should not now have to trouble the House with them. The question now had made some progress, in proof of which he could quote official testimony. When last he had the honour of submitting the question to the opinion of the House, they had the Despatch of Lord Derby in 1876 in relation to the Wine Duties as the last word of the Government on the subject. The Correspondence that had been going on for some time with the Portuguese Government terminated in this Despatch, which closed the door upon any further consideration of the question. In that Despatch, Lord Derby took up firmly his position upon the old lines of the official tradition, for he said he could not admit that any arguments that were drawn from the tariff system prevalent in other countries with reference to Wine Duties could have bearing on the system in force in this country. He said that the system of other countries bore no relation to the system of this country; and he did more than that—he referred especially to the *data* furnished by experts in 1861, which he affirmed had subsequently been confirmed by other investigations, and which he declared to give sufficient warrant for saying that this country could not entertain the objections raised against the present system as being well-founded. That position, he was happy to say, the Government had now receded from. Since the last occasion when he (Mr. Cartwright) addressed the House on this subject, a Blue Book had been published, containing the Correspondence between this country and Spain as to existing commercial relations, and there was a closing Despatch in it, written by Lord Salisbury, which, although it ended the Correspondence, did not close the door upon inquiry and investigation, inasmuch as Lord Salisbury, though maintaining the principle of the alcoholic test, did not disavow a willingness for inquiry and investigation on the first opportunity with a view to a revision of the Wine Duties in detail. That was a new point of departure, which implied that the Government were prepared, on the first opportunity, to entertain the question of a revision of the Wine Duties. This Motion, accordingly, offered the Government the opportunity of which Lord Salisbury held out the hope that they might avail themselves when it occurred. There were Reports on the duties on wine in other States from our Representatives in foreign countries presented since last Session, and they showed the great and striking anomaly of the system adopted by this country. In six of the 15 States named in the Reports, there existed no alcoholic test whatever, and the Duty was levied at a uniform rate. Five of the six—namely, Italy, Greece, Austria, (including Hungary), Germany, and Switzerland, were wine-producing countries, which might be supposed to have an interest in protecting themselves against the importation of foreign wines; yet in these countries there was no alcoholic test. The duties on wine were lower than here, while there were high Excise Duties upon spirits. Again, not one of the countries that had an alcoholic test had fixed the standard so low as 26 degrees. Five of them admitted wine as a merchantable article up to a strength of 37 degrees, and one of them as high as 42 degrees. This last was the United States, which might be considered to some extent a wine-producing country, and which certainly was not distinguished for a liberal tariff. That was not the only anomaly. England was singular in the amount of Duty levied. No other country levied as much as 2*s.* 6*d.* a-gallon. The highest Duty in any other country was in Russia, where it was four-fifths of ours—that was 2*s.*, while the Excise Duty on spirits amounted to as much as 12*s.* 4*d.* All countries, except England, had a uniform Duty, and the difference between our Duty and the lowest Duty abroad on wine was the enormous difference between 2*s.* 6*d.* and 1½*d.* per gallon. Such facts, at all events, afforded strong *primâ facie* grounds for his Motion in favour of inquiry. From the facts, the inference was deducible that our system differed from the system of any other country, and, therefore, might be regarded as an anomalous one. He was bound to touch upon some other points which he thought were essential. The present system dated from 1860, the time of the Anglo-French Commercial Treaty, and was framed with one particular object—to facilitate the introduction, at a low rate and to the greatest possible extent, of wines which were considered to be "natural" wines—that was, wines defined as containing only that admixture of brandy which was necessary to make them a merchantable article. The intention of the framers of the system was practically frustrated, through errors arising out of the want of knowledge in this country as to the nature of the article "wine," which the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Greenwich (Mr. Gladstone) referred to in his speech on the occasion, and which he ascribed as due to the peculiar condition of the wine trade in this country under the system as it existed before 1860. So great was the ignorance regarding wine that the negotiators of the Treaty, when discussing the provisions concerning this article, used terms which bore different constructions in the two countries, so that, when the instrument they had sanctioned was put in force, it was found to be understood in a different sense by each party. The standard used by the French was not the same as used by us, so that the strength of wine which the French believed themselves entitled to introduce at the lower rate was in excess of the strength the Customs would pass. Accordingly, a Supplemental Convention was agreed to, in which 26 degrees of alcohol was fixed upon as the standard, not upon any scientific principle, but as a half-way figure between the divergent standards of the original arrangement. That settlement, however, had given rise to a great deal of remonstrance, and a controversy arose in which the Inland Revenue and the Customs and the Board of Trade fully discussed the matter. The evidence was to be found in the Parliamentary Papers. In the first place, it was alleged by the Excise, or Board of Inland Revenue, that by admitting wines of a higher alcoholic strength than 26 degrees, they would be acting in a manner highly prejudicial to the Revenue, as it held out an inducement to illicit distillation. In fact, illicit distillation was the head and front of the objection which the Excise urged against any change in the arrangement. The Customs, on the other hand, maintained that if the Duty was not put upon the wines in the present manner, they would be unable, at the ports of entry, to determine which were fictitious and which were natural wines. These views, however, had been utterly demolished by the result of the experiments made by the Board of Trade, which proved to demonstration that the protection of the Revenue from spirit was not in any way dependent on the present system, and that it was desirable to modify the existing method. The proof that the balance of argument was deemed by the Government of the day to lie with the Board of Trade was that a proposal was made for a modification of the Duty. He was perfectly aware that that offer had not been accepted; but he contended that the fact of its having been made afforded absolute demonstration that, on review of the subject, the system arrived at under this hap-hazard arrangement was not one which the Government deemed essential for safeguarding the Revenue. There was only one other fact to which he wished to refer in respect to this point, and that was that, although there were plenty of materials at hand from which it was possible to obtain illicit spirits with greater ease than from wines of high alcoholic strength, yet they were not employed to the prejudice of the Revenue; and here he could refer to the experience of France, where the Customs Duty on wines was only 3*d.* per gallon, and on spirits 6*s.* 8*d.* per gallon; yet he was informed, on the best authority, that illicit distillation in France practically did not exist, notwithstanding the apparent temptation offered by the difference in Duty. He had no wish whatever to examine at length the official Reports on the nature of wines presented to the Government by its staff of experts, as they were of a purely technical character; but he would repeat what he had said on a former occasion, that he did not attach very much value to them, for, as as had been once remarked by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Greenwich, there was in this country a remarkable absence of knowledge in respect to the nature of wines, and the fact was beyond doubt that these gentlemen operated in many cases on wines not yet fully fermented. In 1869 a certain quantity of Portuguese wine was imported into this country, and was judged by the Customs to be just under 26 degrees of strength; but after being some time in bond, it was examined and found to be of 30 degrees of strength by the same authorities. One great evil of the present system was that it was practically prejudicial to the production of wines with a low alcoholic strength. This charge of 2*s.* 6*d.* per gallon upon all wines over 26 degrees gave no incentive to the wine grower to develop the manufacture and improvement of his highly-bodied wines; because, whatever expense and trouble he might be at to bring his wines down in strength, he would still have to pay the same duty as if they had been fortified up to 42 degrees. The manufacture of such strongly fortified wines was coarser, and was attended with less trouble and risk, and the large addition of spirits insured conservation; so that the present system held out no inducement for wine growers to make efforts for the production of a less fortified wine. The subject of the Wine Duties had an intimate bearing upon our commercial relations with Spain. He was not about to defend the fiscal system of Spain, and would allude only to facts which were well established. The facts to which he referred were recorded in the Blue Book, and showed that British goods entering Spain were subject to differential duties, in comparison with similar goods of other countries, amounting to from 13 to 58 per cent against British goods. He did not exaggerate when he said that, because of that fact, several branches of industry in this country were very materially affected. Hon. Members would find the reasons for and against the placing of our trade at that disadvantage stated in the Blue Book by the Spanish Minister and also by the British Agent, the reason stated in support of it being that Spanish wine exported to this country was so heavily handicapped that the trade could not be developed. Spain had frequently knocked at our doors in the hope of having this state of things altered, but was always met with a stern "*Non possumus.*" He hoped, however, that that line of policy would for the future be abandoned, and that the country and the House would be told by the Chancellor of the Exchequer that the promise contained in Lord Salisbury's despatch would be speedily carried out, with a view that the Spanish Government might be moved to relieve our trade with Spain from the disadvantages under which it now laboured. The Resolution he was about to submit to the House would give Her Majesty's Government an opportunity of saying that the promise or declaration contained in the despatch of Lord Salisbury would be acted upon, and that on the first favourable opportunity that offered they did take into consideration the Duties at present assessed, with a view to their revision. Unless the matter were taken in hand in that spirit, they were not likely soon to arrive at a satisfactory revision of the Duties complained of. Meantime, he trusted that the Chancellor of the Exchequer would not reply as he did last time, when he objected, not that the matter was unworthy of inquiry, but that inquiry would be inconvenient and have a disturbing effect. To the deputation which waited on him the other day about our commercial relations with Spain, the Chancellor of the Exchequer said, with reference to the present Motion, that personally he was not disposed to grant an inquiry; but that he should be glad to hear from the Mover whether there was any special reason for it. Now, he (Mr. Cartwright) held that the case was precisely one which did demand inquiry; and in saying that, he did not ask for a one-sided inquiry, but for a full investigation of the subject, with a view especially to its bearing upon the general fiscal system of this country. There were many grounds for investigation, and the system at present existing was a hap-hazard and illogical one. To refuse the appointment of a Committee would be hardly to act up to the declaration made in Lord Salisbury's despatch. He asked whether it would not be right and fair to submit the question, which largely affected our trading relations with other countries, to an investigation which should not be a Departmental investigation? If the question were submitted, it should not be inquired into by men who, however competent, however conversant with what the public interest demanded, yet were still necessarily biassed with what he might call official superstition, but should be submitted to the fair and sifting inquiry of a Committee of the House of Commons. The hon. Member concluded by moving the Resolution of which he had given Notice.

MR. COBBOLD, in seconding the Resolution, admitted that the greatest divergence of opinion had existed in the various Departments of the State, yet the question ought not to be neglected because different views were held by the Foreign Office, the Customs, the Board of Trade, and the Treasury. The Motion embodied a request which had been asked for not by those whose views might naturally be thought to be interested, but by foreign countries with whom it must be our object, and, he trusted, our desire, to be on the most friendly footing in all commercial matters. In *The Times* of Saturday there had appeared a leading article on the subject before the House, which the severest critic would allow was written very properly and carefully. He should be sorry if the House were led to believe that in the "battle of the tariffs" we were at the outset to be met by an unfriendly spirit on the part of other countries. No greater proof that this would not be the case could be given than by a speech delivered 10 days ago in the Chamber of Deputies at Lisbon by a supporter of the Government, and which was to the effect that they should not suspect the good intentions of England in respect of their African Colonies, but should co-operate with her in extending civilization. Parliament had not, but ought, to make some inquiry into this subject. All that the Motion really asked was that the experience gained since the passing of the French Treaty, 20 years ago, might be brought to bear, with a view to a settlement of the points complained of. The inhabitants of the Peninsula certainly cherished the belief that by that Treaty they had been left out in the cold. It should not be forgotten that as iron ore, coal, and lead, formed the staple of the products of this country, so was the vine the staple property of the Peninsula and the Southern countries of Europe. In conclusion, he hoped he had adduced sufficient reasons to induce the House to assent to the Motion. The appointment of a Committee could not fail to have an important influence on our commercial relations with other lands. A war of tariffs was impending in Europe. That being admitted, it would be a mistake for this country to enter into negotiations with any other country which had even a semblance of a grievance against us.

Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That, in the opinion of this House, it is desirable that a Select Committee be appointed to inquire into the system under which Customs Duties are now levied in this Country on Wine, and into its results, fiscal and commercial."—(*Mr. Cartwright.*)

MR. BOURKE thought it would be convenient if he stated at that early stage of the debate what was the opinion of the Government on the Motion submitted to the House by the hon. Member for Oxfordshire (Mr. Cartwright). The question, though interesting, was not a very novel one, and had received the attention of various Governments and Parliaments; but he was willing to admit that there were circumstances connected with foreign tariffs existing at the present time which rendered the subject well worthy of renewed consideration. The question of the Wine Duties was, no doubt, a complicated, and, at the same time, in some aspects a technical, one, and before giving an opinion upon it, one should have a clear idea of the principles upon which the duties were at present imposed. It should be, in the first place, recollected that an Excise Duty of 10*s.* per gallon was levied upon spirits, and that a similar Import Duty was also levied. The revenue derived from these Duties amounted to £20,000,000, so that our fiscal system depended in a great measure upon their maintenance. When dealing with the Wine Duties, it ought to be borne in mind that, in justice to the home distiller, it would be both unfair and unjust to impose a much less duty on spirit when mixed in wine than when mixed with water. Moreover, it was to be remembered that the existing system could not very well be tampered with without disturbing the whole of that system. The hon. Member for Oxfordshire had not indicated any substitute for that system. To his (Mr. Bourke's) mind, there were only three ways in which Wine Duties could be levied. The first was by a specific duty; the second was by an *ad valorem* duty; and the third was by an alcoholic scale. Of the first, nothing need be said, as a high duty would be unfair upon cheap wine, and a low duty would inflict a great loss on the revenue, and be unfair to the Spirit Duties. Respecting *ad valorem* duties, he was aware that many commercial authorities, both within that House and out-of-doors, were enamoured of their attractions; but they had not been found to answer in the particular case under discussion. No doubt, in many branches of trade, where there was no difficulty in ascertaining the precise value of the goods on which a duty was to be raised, those duties worked excellently; but that was not the case in others, where the value of goods was governed by the fluctuations in trade, in the cost of production of the raw material, of labour, by supply and demand, by fashion, and by taste. In the latter cases, to attempt to impose *ad valorem* duties would lead to great inconvenience and injustice. It had been found, in fact, that *ad valorem* duties, as applied to wine, were unjust as well as inconvenient to the trade. Consequently, as far as this country was concerned, such duties had been practically abandoned. This difficulty of applying an *ad valorem* duty to wine chiefly arose from the difficulties of classification. The qualities were so various as to raise great trouble, and the distinct valuation was often not easy to be obtained. In many cases, no information could be obtained likely to lead to the real value of the wine imported. Whatever might be the opinion expressed by one tester, his judgment might be overthrown by another. Thus the price of claret ranged from £6 to £65, of port from £20 to £90, and of sherry from £14 to £180 per hogshead. In these circumstances, whatever value might be fixed upon a particular kind of wine by the Government officer, it would probably be immediately challenged by the trade. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Greenwich (Mr. Gladstone), before bringing in his Bill dealing with Wines and Spirits, in 1860, had been in favour of applying the principle of *ad valorem* duties to the former; but he found, from the evidence which was taken by the Committee which had sat to consider the subject, that it would be impracticable to apply it to them. But, apart from that, in looking at the subject, it must not be forgotten that these duties were to be imposed for Revenue purposes only; that one thing was certain—namely, that goods of the same kind, whether coming from the Colonies or from foreign nations, were to be subject to the same duties; that where an Excise Tax was levied at home, it was permitted by common consent to levy a corresponding duty upon similar goods coming from abroad; and it was further to be borne in mind that for many years we had adhered to the principle of taxing the necessaries of life on a low scale. It was in accordance with those principles that the right hon. Member for Greenwich had laid a high tax upon spirits, and had adopted a low one, measured by an alcoholic scale, with regard to wines, for the double purpose of maintaining the Revenue and of giving encouragement to the introduction of cheap wines. He (Mr. Bourke) could not concur with the hon. Member for Oxfordshire that the right hon. Member for Greenwich had acted without proper advice, or that he had adopted the principle of an alcoholic scale on the result of hap-hazard experiments, because experiments had been most carefully made at the Custom House in London, according to the same system of measurement, and, therefore, there was no reason to believe that they were untrustworthy. He was quite prepared to admit that the system based on four degrees of scale, fixed by the right hon. Gentleman, was altered two years afterwards to one based on two degrees of scale, which was found to be more convenient, although the experiments fixing it were made by the most trustworthy and skilful persons obtainable. From those experiments, which were conducted all over Europe, it had been ascertained that in the great majority of cases 26 degrees represented the natural alcoholic strength of the wine. Some 488 samples of wine were tested in all in 1874. Of these, 282 were found to have an alcoholic strength of under 24 degrees, while that of the remaining 206 fortified wines was over 22 degrees; and of 500 samples of Catalonian wines, it was found that the majority could be introduced into this country with an alcoholic strength of 26 degrees. It was upon that scale that the Wine Duties had been fixed. The hon. Member for Oxfordshire had asserted — and laid great stress upon the point—that other countries had not followed our example in this matter; but he did not proceed to show that the principle they adopted was the right one, or that they were wiser. Even if foreign countries were correct in the principle they had adopted, he (Mr. Bourke) contended that no analogy could be drawn between the principle that should govern the Wine Duties in this country, and that which governed those duties in other countries. The hon. Gentleman had mentioned certain countries where the alcoholic scale was totally disregarded; but he could not quite understand what deduction he drew from this. There could be no doubt that if they compared the Wine Duties of foreign countries relatively to the Spirit Duties of foreign countries, they would find that the Wine Duties in foreign countries were much higher than the Duties in this country. For instance, in Denmark the duty per gallon upon wine was 1*s.*, and upon spirits 1*s.* 6*d.*; whereas our highest duty upon wine was 2*s.* 6*d.*, and our duty upon spirit was 10*s.* The country which, in this respect, most nearly nearly resembled our own was the United States, and there the duty upon wine was 1*s.* 8*d.*, and upon spirit 9*s.* 6*d.* But in France the duty upon wine was 5*d.*, and upon spirits 6*s.* 8*d.* This showed a very great difference as compared with England. He doubted the statement that the consumption would be increased by lowering the tariff. With regard to the low-priced wines this was no doubt true, for experience showed that since the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Greenwich had altered the scale, low-priced wines had come into this country in great quantities, and there had also been a great increase in the consumption of natural wines from Spain. But it was not clear that an alteration in the Duty of the highly-alcoholized wines would have the same effect, for these strong wines were not drunk as a beverage. He believed that even if the Duty were very much lowered, their consumption would not be greatly increased. Spain had put forward her case on many occasions with very great persistency; but she had been told again and again that it was wrong of her to say that we laid any differential duty on her wines as compared with other wines, and especially with those of France. What we said to her was this—"If you choose to send your natural wines into England, they are received exactly on the same scale as French wines." But if she chose to mix her wine with spirit, no reason he had ever seen would persuade him that he ought to tax the natural wine on the same scale as a mixture of wine and spirit. The import into this country of the natural wines of Spain had been increased very much within the last two months, and the increased quantity imported for the year had been 36,994 gallons under the degree of 26. This gave us ground to believe that if Spain made an effort to introduce natural wines into this country their consumption would largely increase. It was, no doubt, true that the export of certain commodities from England to Spain had fallen off; but it must be borne in mind that the exports to all foreign countries from this country had fallen off very much. There was no proof whatever that in the case of Spain the falling-off was altogether due to the unfair treatment we had received in the matter of the tariffs. Our exports to France had fallen off this year about £2,000,000; our exports to Germany about £500,000; to Italy about £1,000,000; and to Spain about £800,000. If we considered the condition of Spain in regard to the Wine Duties, we could not say that she had fared badly under the alteration made in 1860. Since that date, the amount of wine imported from Spain had been increased more than 80 per cent; and instead of paying £2,000,000 of Import Duty to this country, as she did in 1859, she now only paid about £800,000, for the amount of imports into this country. Besides, if any alteration in the Wine Duties were to be made the basis for future Commercial Treaties, it ought to be clearly understood that other countries as well as Spain had to be considered. France had claims upon this country, and those persons who would reduce the Duty upon French wines from 1*s.* a-gallon to 6*d.*, should bear in mind what Spain would say to that. He did not think that those gentleman who would reduce the Duty on French wines would say that Spanish wines should be introduced at the same rate; and, therefore, what Spain called the differential rate would have to remain the same. Although we should lose a large amount of Revenue, he thought certain modifications in the Wine Duties might be made which would prove advantageous to British commerce; but it ought to be well understood that these should lead not only to a modification of foreign tariffs, but also to the removal of many other impediments to British commerce, such as delays and defective administration, which existed in foreign countries. Of these impediments they were hearing every day. If we looked favourably upon any change with respect to our Wine Duties, he thought we had a right to demand of Spain or other countries a great deal more than to be put upon the "most-favoured-nation" footing, for we had a claim to that already. We must remind them, at any rate, that our Revenue had to be considered, and that it would be very much endangered by any disturbance in the spirit trade. The House would naturally desire to know what the Government proposed to do with regard to the Resolution which was before it. He regretted that the hon. Gentleman had not told them what was the opinion of the trade upon this subject. But they had reason to believe that the granting of a Committee to consider the whole subject would have a good effect upon foreign Governments, as showing the general opinion of the House. In these circumstances, the Government were disposed to grant the Committee proposed by the hon. Member for Oxfordshire. With regard to the Motion, it would be more convenient if the hon. Member would withdraw it, and confer with his right hon. Friend the Chancellor of the Exchequer, in order to settle what the Order of Reference should be.

Mr. BAXTER expressed his gratification that the Government had consented to grant the Committee asked for by the Motion, seeing that last year the opinion of the House had shown itself to be entirely in favour of an investigation of the subject. The evidence offered on behalf of his proposal by the hon. Gentleman the Member for Oxfordshire (Mr. Cartwright) was, in fact, simply overwhelming. If it were worth while, there were some points in the speech of the hon. Gentleman opposite (Mr. Bourke) on which he (Mr. Baxter) should like to touch; but as the Government had granted the Committee, he would not do so now, and would merely say that the hon. Gentleman would find some of his arguments would be very easily refuted by the evidence given before the Committee.

Mr. B. SAMUELSON said that, by the act of the French Government, in denouncing the Treaty of Commerce, we had for the first time since 19 years been placed in a position to deal with the Wine Duties in any mode that our financial and commercial policy might lead us to adopt. This was not the time nor the place for entering into a full discussion of that policy; but the Committee which the Government had decided on granting would be at liberty to consider whether an alteration of the scale might not be effected as well by levelling up as by levelling down. He hoped such a course as the former might not be necessary; but it should be borne in mind that the quantities of our exports of textile fabrics to France had within the last five years fallen off from 10 per cent in some cases to 25 per cent in others; and that the diminution was even greater, if values and not quantities were compared. In iron and manufactures of iron our exports, with the exception of pig-iron, were absolutely insignificant. They amounted to less than 8,000 tons per annum, as against 38,000 in the year before the Treaty of 1860. This was not surprising, inasmuch as the Duty, instead of the 15 per cent which was understood to be the basis of the French Treaty tariff, amounted to from 25 to over 60 per cent on the average prices of iron of the last four or five years; and now we were threatened with an increase of the imposts on our manufactures of all descriptions. Whether the Wine Duties were admitted or not to be differential duties, it could not be denied that the new wine tariff was introduced for the first time as part of the arrangements of the French Treaty, and that they had the same effect on the wine trade with Spain as if they had been specially intended to act as differential duties. It was not surprising, then, that the people of Spain should regard them in the light of differential duties. If irritation had arisen on this account, it was no doubt greatly aggravated by our allowing the Rock of Gibraltar to be used as a basis of smuggling operations into the Spanish Mediterranean ports. That grievance it was our duty, as a neighbouring and friendly people, to remove without delay. Nor did it lie with us to allege that Spain, by her fiscal system, held out a temptation to smuggling. In conclusion, he hoped that the words of the September Despatch of Lord Salisbury to our Minister at Madrid would not be allowed to remain mere empty words; but that, whatever might be the result of the proposed Committee, an effort would really be made, by a joint English and Spanish Commission, or in some other way, to remove the difficulties which at present stood in the way of mutually advantageous commercial relations between this country and Spain.

Mr. RITCHIE commended the Government for assenting to the Motion, as the question was one that had for a long time demanded a settlement. The appointment of a Committee would be beneficial, though he was not sure that it was the simplest or most practical arrangement that might be arrived at. The hon. Gentleman the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs had said that it was not necessary for Spain to export her natural wine at 26 per cent of spirit; but that was the very point the Spaniards denied, and they said distinctly that they could not export any large quantity below that strength. If further facilities were given for the export of the natural wines of Spain, he did not believe that their own distillers would be prejudiced. It was not necessary to make any arrangement by which wines of great alcoholic strength should come in at the low duty. There might be a sliding scale, so that wine might come in at a Duty somewhere between 1*s.* and 2*s.* 6*d.*, according to its strength. The hon. Gentleman had said that Spain had no cause of complaint, because she received the same treatment as other countries; but, as a matter of fact, if she could not send her natural wines at a strength below 26 per cent, while other countries could do so, she was nominally on an equality but actually at a disadvantage. The hon. Gentleman who had introduced the Motion had argued that Spain, in putting on English goods a differential duty, had done an unjustifiable thing; but, for his own part, he thought that the course taken by the Spanish Government might be defended on many grounds. Spain saw that she was placed at a great disadvantage as compared with other wine-growing countries, and she therefore felt justified in imposing heavier duties on English commodities. He trusted the inquiry would result in placing the importation of Spanish wines on a more satisfactory footing than it was at present, and he hoped the Government would take a leaf out of Spain's book; and if they modified the Duties on Spanish wines, that they would insist upon Spain, as an equivalent, taking off the differential Duties she had placed upon English goods. If Spain would not do that, then he hoped that England would double the Duties upon the wines coming here from Spain, rather than take anything off.

SIR JOSEPH M'KENNA suggested that the Reference to the Committee should be made sufficiently wide to enable them to take into consideration the whole question of the relative Duties upon all alcoholic beverages whether manufactured at home or coming from other countries. He thought that the Chancellor of the Exchequer was fully alive to the great importance of this question. It was not so much a question between one wine-producing country and another, as a question between the producers of alcoholic beverages in this country and the producers of other countries.

MR. MAC IVER thought that, as regarded the Reference to the Committee, one of two courses should be adopted. The inquiry should either be of the narrowest description, limited to the Wine Duties, and to that alone, or else it ought to be some such inquiry as he (Mr. Mac Iver) had already indicated in the Notice of Motion standing in his name. He felt very strongly that, if the Committee travelled at all beyond technical matters affecting the wine trade, the inquiry should take a wide scope, and embrace the whole of the questions affecting our commercial interests generally, our trade system with foreign nations, as well as the fiscal relations between the Mother Country and other portions of the Empire. The Reference should either be restrained to the narrowest possible limits, or else it should be a complete inquiry into the causes and the remedies for the existing commercial depression. There could be no more delightful *reductio ad absurdum* in regard to what some people called Free Trade principles than the debate which was now taking place. Here was poor Spain—poor benighted Spain, as the free-trading gentlemen would call her—and a country certainly where the manifest abuses of a protective system existed in their worst form—a country whose fiscal policy he (Mr. Mac Iver) would not for a moment defend—and yet, Spain, with all her faults, was likely to get what she wanted, while we could not. What could be more contemptible in regard to the results of the fiscal system in which some of our British political economists delighted, than that we should really require to take "a leaf out of the book of Spain," not because Spain was right, but because we were further wrong even than she. The abuses of our system of Free Trade, without reciprocity, had landed us in disasters worse than Protection could ever have done. Our present commercial relations with France were costing us £20,000,000 annually—for in our free-trading innocence Mr. Cobden had been allowed to make a Treaty, under which the French were able to sent us goods of the value of £45,000,000 annually, while they would only take our goods to the extent of £25,000,000 in return. Worse than that, they sent us, duty free, about £25,000,000 worth of things that we could equally well make for ourselves; and, owing to their restrictive tariffs, £8,000,000, or thereabouts, was all we could send them in return. They had also put on a *surtaxe d'entrepôt* specially against British shipping, and what had been the result? The vessels now required to go to France direct, which was precisely what our French friends intended. They had thus improved the valuable foreign trade of their great ports, like Havre and Marseilles, which was all to our disadvantage; and had, as nearly as possible, killed the former trade in raw materials from Great Britain to France. The French encouraged manufactures in their own country, and introduced direct those raw materials of which they stood in need. He had heard with great satisfaction the speech of the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Mr. Bourke). It seemed to him to show that they were about to reverse the policy of the last 33 years; and that, in negotiating future Commercial Treaties, we would again come back to the business-like view of "What can we get? What shall we give?"

MR. W. E. FORSTER was very glad that the Committee was about to be granted, but could not regard the concession as meaning a reversal of the commercial policy which we had of late years pursued. As to the terms of Reference, he hoped they would be sufficiently wide to include all questions which could be fairly raised in connection with the Wine Duties; but they ought not, in his opinion, to embrace any other subject, for he could not suppose that the Government would listen to the suggestion of turning this into a Committee to inquire into the general question of the commercial arrangements of the country. Such an inquiry he looked upon as being entirely consistent with Free Trade measures, and not at all in accordance with those principles which were in some quarters advocated under the name of reciprocity. The claim of the Spanish Government practically was that we had set up a differential duty as against them, and it would be for the Committee to examine into the grounds on which that statement was made. For his own part, although he did not mean to enter into the question on the present occasion, there was, he thought, much ground for it; and if we established a differential duty against Spain, or any other country, we adopted that course in opposition to our avowed policy. The hon. Gentleman opposite (Mr. Mac Iver) had said that nothing would have been done if Spain had not levied these heavy duties on English goods. He (Mr. W. E. Forster) was very sorry that was the opinion of the hon. Gentleman of the action of his own Government. He thought the Government, if convinced of the wrong done, would have granted the inquiry in just the same way, even though these duties were not exacted; although, no doubt, the inconvenience the country had suffered had had its effect in forcing forward this question. With regard to the remarks about France, he certainly most ardently wished that she would lower her tariffs; but he did not believe that the same charge would be made against France that Spain made against England—and that England made, with perfect justice, against Spain—that she levied a differential duty.

MR. MAC IVER said, there was a differential duty at present levied by France against England, for the *surtaxe d'entrepôt* was practically a tax of 24*s*. per ton against everything landed from shipping that had touched at an English port.

MR. W. E. FORSTER said, no doubt, if the hon. Gentleman could show that that was so, and would bring a Notice on the subject before the House, hon. Members on both sides, and the Government, would give the matter their fullest consideration. He was not surprised that the Government would not pledge themselves to the exact terms of the Reference; but when they came to look at the terms of the Motion, he thought the Government would not be able to improve upon that moved by his hon. Friend the Member for Oxfordshire (Mr. Cartwright). He was very anxious that the last few words especially should be included, and that a Select Committee should not only inquire into the system under which Customs Duties were now levied in this country on wine, but into its results, fiscal and commercial, so that the point raised by his hon. Friend the Member for Youghal (Sir Joseph M'Kenna) might be covered, and they might ascertain the effect of any changes on the spirit revenue and the spirit trade, and also ascertain their effects on our commercial relations with Spain and other countries.

MR. WHITWELL submitted that the rates levied upon Spanish wines were of a most anomalous character, as they were not uniform in any particular whatever. They affected the wines of other countries beside Spain. It was well known that Spanish wines came to this country through France, in the form of Bordeaux; but, of course, we got them at an increased price, and, consequently, while we thought we were drinking French wines we were drinking Spanish. He was glad that the Government had granted the appointment of a Select Committee to inquire into the subject, in the hope that any injustice which existed would be swept away. He believed that the results of the inquiry would not prove prejudical to the Revenue, but would, on the other hand, be a benefit to trade.

MR. NORWOOD said, he would not have taken any part in this discussion but for the observations of the hon. Member for Birkenhead (Mr. Mac Iver), whose taunt as to the protectional tendency of some of the speeches was not without justification. He would be sorry if the investigation took the form of an inquiry into our trading relations with Spain and other countries, and their respective tariffs. Though Spain had not acted fairly in levying differential duties upon our goods, he trusted that there would be nothing in the shape of bartering with Spain about the duties she imposed upon us. One of them—that levied on export of coals by the Spanish consular authorities at our ports—was monstrous; but still he hoped the whole matter would be dealt with in a straightforward and equitable manner, and not give rise to the belief that we were forced into concessions contrary to the spirit of our Free Trade policy. The only ground on which a Committee should be appointed was to investigate whether the mode in which we had assessed the Wine Duties was fair to all countries, irrespective of any country that might propose alterations in them for their special purposes.

MR. SAMPSON LLOYD expressed his satisfaction that the Government had granted the inquiry. In reference to the doubt expressed by the right hon. Member for Bradford, as to the levying of differential duties against this country, he begged to remind him that the French Government levied a differential duty on shipping in the form of a *surtaxe d'entrepôt,* which was exceedingly injurious to the interests of the port which he represented. That was a proceeding inconsistent with the spirit which ought to exist between France and England; and he hoped that it would receive the attention of the Government when they negotiated the next Treaty of Commerce with our neighbours across the Channel.

MR. JACOB BRIGHT said, the only drawback to the satisfaction with the proposal of the Government was the speech in which it was made. The hon. Gentleman the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Mr. Bourke) made an elaborate speech to show that that should not be done which the hon. Member for Oxfordshire (Mr. Cartwright) wished should be done; but he (Mr. Jacob Bright) hoped that that speech did not represent the feeling of the Government in the question; and he was quite sure that the Government had it in its power to promote much larger intercourse between England and various Continental countries. He desired to point out that if we could establish a lower rate of duty upon French wines, we should obtain them from more Departments than we did at present. There were some 60 Departments in France that produced wines, but we obtained them from only three or four, and the reason was that a very large proportion of those wines—some 90 per cent of the whole—were of too poor a quality to allow of the duty of 1*s.* per gallon to be paid. They were, indeed, usually sold at 1*s.* a-gallon. If they were introduced at 4*d.* a-gallon there might be a considerable trade in them. This question should be considered broadly and in reference to all wines, and it might have an influence upon France in regard to her tariff. At any rate, every means should be taken to bring about a better state of things, in the hope of improving the trade of this country, which the Government had done nothing to assist during the time they had been in Office. On the contrary, they had added to taxation, and had thereby embarrassed the trade and commerce of the country. He hoped, however, they would now take up the question in earnest.

MR. YEAMAN pointed out that the question had been agitated in all the Chambers of Commerce in the country for a number of years, and he was glad that the Government had assented to the appointment of a Select Committee to consider it more fully. After the Committee had completed its inquiry, it would really devolve upon the Government to settle the question with the

Governments interested. This country could not expect the relaxation of foreign tariffs on their manufacturers, if an unequal duty on their wines was adhered to.

Mr. BIGGAR thought that the hon. Gentleman the Mover of the Resolution, had made out a wonderfully weak case, for, in his (Mr. Biggar's) opinion, the result of the inquiry would be to raise the Duty. There ought to be only two principles on which they should go—either take the alcoholic test, or the test of value; and, in his opinion, the former was the best test that could be applied in the circumstances.

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER said, he was gratified to find that the course which the Government had taken, in assenting to the appointment of the Committee, had commanded such general assent on the part of the House. He wished, at the same time, to say that, agreeing with the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Bradford (Mr. W. E. Forster), he entirely repudiated any idea that they were about, in taking this step, to initiate anything in the nature of a reversal of the established commercial policy of the country. It was said just now that they were going to take a leaf out of the book of Spain. If they were, he hoped it was only for the purpose of tearing that leaf up, because there could be nothing more unwise or disadvantageous than for this country to undertake a reversal of that policy. But he thought there were some reasons, both fiscal and commercial, why they might expect benefit from an inquiry of this kind; and he wished to say, specially with regard to the commercial reasons, that while he disclaimed the purpose of using the Wine Duties as retaliatory duties on Spain or any other country, he thought it was desirable that they should get rid of the difficulties which they found in their way when attempts were made to enter into commercial negotiations with any of those countries. We go to Spain, Portugal, and other countries, and we begin to discuss commercial questions and preach Free Trade, and we meet with this argument—"Oh, you have established a differential rate of duty against us in the matter of wine." He denied that, and we proved in a conclusive manner that this Duty was not put on for differential purposes, and could not fairly be so described. However well that doctrine might be put forward, there could be no doubt that practically it was the impression in many countries that the scale of duty was of a differential character; and not only was that the impression in some foreign countries, but it was an impression which derived strength from its being entertained by a great many persons at home. But they must search the whole question to the bottom and have it, not only on the authority of the Revenue Department, who were supposed to be always more or less prejudiced in the matter, but after fair discussion by a Committee, before which persons holding different views might be able to put forward the views they held, and let the House see what amount of truth there was in this allegation. One thing was perfectly clear, the Duty was not originally introduced with any such purpose—the quarter from which it came (Mr. Gladstone) was sufficient proof of that. He did not say it might not be proved in its working to have had an effect not contemplated at the time it was framed. There was another point adverted to in the course of that discussion—with regard to French wines and the Duties upon them. It had been truly said, and suggestions had been made in the course of communications between the persons who had taken an interest in extending our commercial relations with France, that there were large quantities of French wines which could not come in at the 1*s*. Duty. He did not express any opinion on the merits of the proposals made with reference to that point; but they were utterly precluded from considering the question as long as there was this grievance on the part of Spain and Portugal, which would, of course, be greatly increased by anything of that sort. It was said, on the part of Spain and Portugal, that wines of much less value coming from the Peninsula were charged a higher duty than wines coming from certain districts of France because they were of different alcoholic strength. All these points were matters which it was desirable to clear up. Then there was another class of questions which it was also useful to consider. If any change was to be made in details, they might usefully consider whether any alterations of rates could be made without interfering with the principle of the alcoholic test, or the rates applied to prevent the introduction of raw spirit, without excluding the wines which had generated a natural spirit by fermentation. He only instanced that as a sort of question which might possibly come before the Committee. He should be glad to consult with the hon. Gentleman, and have the advantage of the views of one or two persons outside who took very great interest in all these questions, before absolutely settling the terms of Reference; but he was not disposed to quarrel very much with the terms the hon. Gentleman had suggested. He quite agreed they ought to be terms which should involve the questions which might fairly be brought up by the Wine Duties, but not questions of a wider character—such as their commercial relations in general.

Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

SPECIE AND PAPER CURRENCY.

RESOLUTION.

MR. DELAHUNTY rose to move—

> "That, in the opinion of this House, a free circulation of specie currency, together with a full and adequate circulation of paper currency, convertible into specie on demand, is essential and necessary for the promotion and development of manufactures, commerce, and trade."

Notice taken, that 40 Members were not present; House counted, and 40 Members being found present,

MR. DELAHUNTY, resuming, said, he wished to determine the lines upon which the circulation of paper currency should exist throughout the country. In his opinion, trading operations would be impossible without a free exchange of money, and that exchange, to have the desired effect, should be an exchange based upon a metallic and not upon a paper currency. If they looked into history, they would see that all great statesmen and Parties that had given the matter consideration had come to the conclusion that it was essential and necessary that there should be a stated standard by which exchanges between man and man should be regulated. Let the House go through the whole list of political economists—from Adam Smith down to John Stuart Mill, or others later—and they would find that there was a unanimous opinion upon the question. Indeed, one went the length of expressing the opinion that with a free circulation of specie a country might have a paper circulation mountains high. This view was probably somewhat of an exaggeration; but it contained in it a great deal of truth. In order to have paper money they must have gold. He did not want to enter into the question as to how a free currency of gold could be obtained—that was a question of detail, to be discussed hereafter; but what he wished the House to affirm was the true principle that specie currency should be allowed to flow free, without any restriction whatever. He argued that the contraction and expansion of the currency frequently led to panics, and that to this cause was attributable the distress which at present existed throughout the different manufacturing and commercial centres of the Kingdom. It did more to destroy trade and commerce than almost any other thing of which he could think. It had the effect, too, of depreciating property to an enormous extent. For instance, it was recorded by a correspondent in *The Globe* newspaper that, owing to the contraction of the circulation, four railways in the State of Pennsylvania, which in the spring of 1876 were worth $112,000,000, had been reduced in value to something like half that amount in 1877. That contraction was still going on in America, because she had sought to resume cash payments without allowing the gold to circulate; and he said emphatically that this would be the destruction of America. From 1874 to the 1st of January last, the currency of America had been reduced to the extent of over $100,000,000 in trying to resume cash payments. It was being further reduced, and the effect of that reduction would be not only to injure America, but to re-act most injuriously upon Ireland. If, owing to this cause, manufactures, trade, and commerce were injured, and even destroyed, in America, the result would be that the whole labour of the country would be thrown upon the land, which there was limitless, with a view to the production of food to be sent to this country and sold for whatever price could be obtained. Under such a condition of things, it would be impossible for the small farmers in Ireland to exist. Unless, therefore, the Americans acted on some such principles as those embodied in the Resolution which he was now asking the House to affirm, they must go down themselves and bring down Ireland with them. Already they had sent down the price of cereals very low in England, and they were sending meat here also, to compete with the home producer. What was wanted at the present crisis was not reciprocity, but Free Trade. A great many people who professed Free Trade were not entitled to the designation at all unless they were for free money. He maintained that wherever there was a free, sound, honest circulation, trade, manufactures, and commerce were developed, and the people always prospered. That was illustrated by the case of Ireland itself 100 years ago, when Arthur Young, in describing the industrial progress of England, Ireland, and France, placed Ireland before England and immeasurably before France, which everyone now said was so prosperous, while Ireland was in a hole. No country was in a sound financial condition unless it had a specie circulation. England, France, and Germany had no notes under £5, and their credit was undoubted; but in those countries where small paper existed—such as Spain, Italy, Austria, and Russia—the public credit was not good. There ought to be a specie circulation, with plenty of paper to supplement and economize it. His object in bringing forward his Resolution was to obtain the assent of the House to a proposition which no one could gainsay, and to lay the foundation for future legislation by which the interests of every part of the United Kingdom would be promoted. In conclusion, the hon. Gentleman moved the Resolution of which he had given Notice.

MR. HOPWOOD seconded the Motion.

Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That, in the opinion of this House, a free circulation of specie currency, together with a full and adequate circulation of paper currency, convertible into specie on demand, is essential and necessary for the promotion and development of manufactures, commerce, and trade."—(*Mr. Delahunty.*)

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER said, the hon. Member for Waterford (Mr. Delahunty), as the House knew, had now for a great number of years turned his attention very particularly to the subject of currency and other questions connected with it, and he thought the respect they all felt for the hon. Gentleman would render it incumbent on the Government to take some notice of the proposition which he had now asked the House to affirm. Therefore, he gladly rose in order to say that, as far as the terms of the Motion were concerned, he was prepared entirely to accept and to agree with the expression of the opinion of the hon. Gentleman. The only difficulty he felt was that in some parts of his speech the hon. Gentleman intimated very plainly that he was now asking the House to affirm a general principle from which he intended at some future time to deduce consequences, and upon which he intended to found propositions for legislation. But the hon. Gentleman did not tell them at all distinctly—in fact, did not tell them at all—what the nature of those proposals might be; and, therefore, while he (the Chancellor of the Exchequer) was prepared entirely to assent to the proposition the hon. Gentleman now asked them to affirm, he must guard himself and his Colleagues, and the House also, from being supposed, by any assent they now gave to the proposition, to assent to propositions which the hon. Gentleman might hereafter make. The hon. Gentleman was, in fact, issuing a note which was to be convertible at some future time. And they did not know what was the specie in which the note was to be paid. There were in the hon. Gentleman's speech one or two passages which would lead him to infer that the hon. Member had in his mind a proposition he had made on former occasions for the curtailment, if not the absolute suppression, of small notes. Now, whether small notes were a convenient medium of circulation or not, he did not see that they, any more than large notes, would be excluded by the principle which the House was now asked to affirm. They were asked to affirm that there should be "a free circulation of specie currency" — that, everybody, he should think, in England entirely agreed with—"together with a full and adequate circulation of paper currency." Well, that was now so convenient that it had become a necessary, he might say; from having been at one time convenient, it had become a necessary; and that you should have it considerable, full, and adequate, but not excessive, because the word adequate implied that it was not to be more than adequate. It was not to be an inflated paper currency, but an adequate paper currency, and that the currency should be secure by being convertible into specie on demand. That, as the hon. Gentleman truly said, and as all the great authorities whom he had quoted, and whom they all honoured for their teaching on these subjects, they always had regarded as the keystone to a proper system of currency—that if you had a paper currency, it should be convertible into specie on demand. They all entirely agreed with that; but they might have small notes as well as large notes, which would be convertible into specie on demand, and he thought they wanted some other principle than that stated for rejecting small ones. In fact, they would have by small notes a larger currency than if they excluded them. There could be no doubt that in any country which used small notes there would be naturally the larger amount of paper currency in proportion than in the country which excluded them, because small notes were a great convenience, and they were used in those parts of the country where they were legal, and they were used very freely, and were found to be exceedingly convenient. He should be exceedingly sorry to say anything to prejudice the country against the use of small notes if they were properly secured and properly convertible. At the same time, he perceived the danger of an abuse of the system, and that was a matter which ought to be carefully guarded. It was quite possible that unless proper regulations were made for securing the convertibility of the notes there might be a great inflation. He took the key of the hon. Gentleman's argument to be this—the hon. Gentleman wished to guard us against the consequences of inflation and contraction, as a large inflation followed by contraction must necessarily bring about confusion, suffering, and a great deal of mischief. The hon. Gentleman instanced the case of America, in which there was a large inflation of currency owing to the extensive circulation of greenbacks; and when these were called in, the effect of the contraction of that inflated circulation was that a great deal of trouble was occasioned. The hon. Gentleman also mentioned the case of a large circulation of Bank of England notes, and when circumstances caused them to be called in confusion was the result. He quite agreed with the hon. Gentleman that anything which led to unnatural inflation was sure to be followed by contraction, which formed a set-off to it, for nature would assert itself. In this country in 1819, because of the inflation which existed before, there was much suffering. But where the inflation and contraction arose from natural causes the case was different; and any attempt, by artificial means, to prevent the contraction which must, in the course of trade, follow inflation, or to keep the circulation at a uniform level, would fail, and fail disastrously. Having said so much, he could only express what he was sure was the feeling of all who had listened to the hon. Gentleman, or had seen the pains he had bestowed on this subject, that they held in respect the principles which he had enunciated. At the same time, they must guard themselves carefully against the consequences which might be some day deduced from the Resolution until they knew what those consequences were.

SIR JOSEPH M'KENNA expressed satisfaction that the hon. Member for Waterford had introduced his proposition in terms in which they could all agree. He wished, however, to guard himself against being supposed inferentially to favour any theory for the suppression of £1 notes. Since the Acts of Sir Robert Peel, in 1844 and 1845, £1 notes stood on precisely the same basis, with regard to circulation and specie, that £5 notes and £1,000 notes did. No doubt before those Acts were passed there were grave objections to small notes, and they were suppressed in this country, but not in Ireland. As Cobbett said, £1 notes were the legs on which the £5 notes walked. Sir Robert Peel, in 1844 and 1845, removed the objection which might be urged against the circulation of small notes. His Acts laid down this principle—that the Irish banks might issue as many notes for the future as the public would take, provided that anything issued in excess of the previous average circulation of the banks in Ireland should be represented by specie. The special objection to £1 notes in Ireland and Scotland had therefore been removed. He guarded himself, however, against being supposed to agree to a scheme of the hon. Member for Waterford which was foreshadowed, but was not now before the House. At the same time, he cordially welcomed the Resolution in its present form.

Mr. BIGGAR also approved the proposition of the hon. Member—in fact, he took it very much to represent the present system of circulation, consisting of bank notes based on specie. At the same time, he did not see that the adoption of the Resolution would effect any improvement in the present state of things. He was also at a loss to know what sort of legislation, that would extend the principle already recognized, the hon. Member for Waterford proposed to found upon the proposal. What had happened in America lately went entirely in favour of the views he (Mr. Biggar) held on the subject.

Mr. DELAHUNTY, in reply, said, he was satisfied with the result of the discussion, but not with the speech of the hon. Member for Cavan (Mr. Biggar), who had been up in the moon with regard to America, where contraction had been produced by the passing of the Act to provide for specie payments.

Motion *agreed to.*

POST OFFICE (WEST INDIA MAIL CONTRACT).—RESOLUTION.

Sir HENRY SELWIN-IBBETSON, in rising to move—

> "That the Contract entered into with the Royal Steam Packet Company for the conveyance of Mails to and from the West Indies be approved,"

said, that the existing contract would terminate in 1880. In the middle of last year the Government invited applications for new tenders for that particular service. Six tenders only were received, of which four were for a portion of the route only, while two were for the whole service. One of the latter was made by the Atlas Company, which proposed to convey mails from Queenstown to New York by the ordinary mail steamers, and from New York, for delivery at the different ports, by the steamers of the Atlas Company; and the Company offered to do this for £59,500 a-year. The second tender for the whole route was sent in by the Royal Mail Steam Packet Company, which had the present unexpired contract, which was for £86,750 a-year. For the same sum the Company offered to continue the service, with the option to the Post Office of an addition of one knot to the speed. Besides comparing the proposed subsidies, the Government had to consider the routes and the methods of delivery, and these involved, not only the times of delivery, but also the Imperial question of direct or indirect communication with our own Colonies. The Secretary of State for the Colonies was strongly in favour of direct communication, both on commercial and on political grounds, which greatly influenced the decision of the Treasury. As to times of delivery, while the figures before the House showed a certain gain on the part of the Atlas Company in delivering the mails at Jamaica, there was a loss in respect of almost every other Colony as compared with the times named by the Royal Mail Company, whose tender he asked the House to accept. The delay varied from a certain number of hours to six and seven days at some of the more distant ports; and it was felt, both by the Treasury and the Colonial Office, that this was a most important consideration in deciding which of the two contracts should be accepted. Moreover, it was stated by one of the Governors of the Colonies that the service of the Atlas Company was "anything but satisfactory." It was further found, from evidence of the Board of Trade, that not one of the six vessels of the Atlas Company carried a Board of Trade certificate. They were very good vessels for the purposes for which they were employed; but they could not compare, in speed or in accommodation, with the vessels belonging to the Royal Mail Steam Packet Company. The hon. Member for Birkenhead (Mr. Mac Iver) had proposed to ask the House to postpone the consideration of this contract for a month, and thereby he would keep in suspense the operations of the Company, which, so far as he (Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson) understood, that hon. Gentleman considered was a good Company, and one perfectly qualified for this particular service. It had been said it was unfair that the contract should have been re-submitted to the Royal Mail Company for re-consideration, seeing that another Company had made its offer. There had really been no unfairness. The Royal Mail Company had not been compelled to reduce their original contract in consequence of any offer submitted by any other Company. The contract was simply reduced on a representation made by the Treasury and Colonial Office that it was too high. He did not wish to detain the House upon other points of detail; and, having endeavoured to state the reasons which he thought justified the Government in what they had done, he would now ask the House to confirm the contract which they had entered into with the Royal Mail Steam Packet Company for the conveyance of mails to and from the West Indies.

Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That the Contract entered into with the Royal Mail Steam Packet Company for the conveyance of Mails to and from the West Indies be approved."—(*Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson.*)

MR. MAC IVER said, this was, to some extent, a question between the Royal Mail Company, of Southampton, and the Atlas Steamship Company, of Liverpool, and there was no doubt whatever that the Atlas Company had been somewhat hardly dealt with. The West India Postal service was not one for which there had been any rush of competitors, nor was there any reasonable ground for supposing that the Southampton Company had, in the first instance, demanded any excessive remuneration for the work that was expected of them. That Company was one which, during many long years, had done excellent service, and although thoroughly well managed, it was a Company that did not yield any very large return to the shareholders; and it was no secret that, at the present moment, the stock was quoted at a considerable discount. The Atlas Company, conducted by Messrs. Leech, Harrison, and Forwood, of Liverpool, was also a well-managed concern, but not too remunerative, trading between the United States and the West Indies. They had never, so far as he knew, done any work for the Government; and the fact of their trading between America and the West Indies was the simple explanation of why their steamers did not carry Board of Trade certificates. It was not fair to the Royal Mail Company, and it certainly was not fair to the Atlas Company, merely to use their tender as a means of bringing down the price of those to whom the work had been given. The Royal Mail Company had an opportunity of amending their tender; and by having the Atlas Company played off against them had been, as he thought, squeezed down to an unremunerative figure, while the Atlas Company, who were still the cheapest, were left out in the cold. The Post Office had, perhaps, done a sharp thing; but he thought it could not permanently be for the national advantage to have contracts undertaken on terms which did not afford a reasonable remuneration. In the present case, if the question before the Government had simply been in regard to carrying letters, then he thought the Southampton offer should have been put aside and the Atlas Company's offer should have been accepted. The question, at all events, was partially one of letter-carrying; and he urged now that the Post Office should, even in the face of the revenue that might be lost thereby, avail themselves of the proposal of the Atlas Company, in addition to that of the Royal Mail Company. What he (Mr. Mac Iver) wanted was the double service. The facilities to British and Colonial trade, which would be afforded by doubling the existing number of mails, and sending some portion of the correspondence *viâ* the United States at the cost of the ocean postage, would be worth all the money. He did not ask the House to reject the Southampton contract, but only to postpone its approval, in order that the Post Office might have an opportunity, in the meantime, of making arrangements with the Atlas Company to afford additional postal facilities. It was in order to allow time for the consideration of this question that he had placed on the Paper the Amendment which stood in his name. As regarded the mere conveyance of the mails, he insisted that the Atlas Company's route was the best, especially with respect to the interests of the Islands which were the furthest from England. He could not conclude what he desired to say without pointing out that this contract with the Royal Mail Company of Southampton, which the House was asked to sanction, and which he (Mr.

Mac Iver), notwithstanding the Amendment which appeared in his name, was really desirous of supporting, was altogether contrary to the principles of what was called free trade. It was not unworthy of remark that the right hon. Gentleman opposite (Mr. Childers), the Chairman of the Royal Mail Company, who was a very ardent free-trader, ceased to become so the instant a practical application of what were called free trade principles was brought home to himself and his friends. If it was to the interests of the nation that everybody should always go to the cheapest market for everything, then surely the House of Commons ought not to ratify this contract with the Royal Mail Company. It was neither the best nor the cheapest way of carrying the letters; but, on the other hand, the principle involved in this contract had his (Mr. Mac Iver's) complete and hearty approval; and, notwithstanding the inconsistency of free-trading Gentlemen opposite, he hoped that not merely this contract in itself, but also the principle involved, would be equally acceptable to the House of Commons. The service proposed was, in one sense, not a mercantile service at all. The question involved was, whether in years to come our West India Colonies were to remain part of the British Empire or to be handed over to their neighbours across the Atlantic. The ties between the Mother Country and the Colonies generally were worth preserving, and no question could possibly be of more importance than this one at the present time. This, however, was not free trade in the sense in which the right hon. Gentleman on the other side of the House understood it. Free trade—or that which some hon. Gentlemen opposite called free trade—would, if continued long enough, lose us our Colonies. Look at Canada. How long would their loyalty be proof against a fiscal union with the United States, unless we at home could find some means of putting our Canadian fellow-subjects on a more favourable footing as regarded their exports to Great Britain than their competitors in the United States of America? The trade of some of the West India Islands with the United States was already larger than with Great Britain; and so much was that the case that, in the Petition which his hon. Friend the Member for Liverpool (Mr. Rathbone) had presented, it was urged as a reason why we should contract with the Atlas Company rather than with the Royal Mail Company. But if it ever came to be a question as between these two Companies, it would, he believed, be to the interest both of Great Britain and of her Colonies to maintain the communication direct. For the reasons he had stated, he believed that the contract with the Royal Mail Company, which the Secretary to the Treasury asked the House of Commons to approve, was, so far as the policy and principle of it was concerned, a wise one, and ought to receive their sanction. It could not, however, be denied that our West Indian Colonists deserved more consideration in the way of postal facilities than they had received; and he hoped his noble Friend the Postmaster General would be able to see his way to making arrangements with the Atlas Company in addition to those for which approval was now asked in respect of the Royal Mail Company.

Mr. RATHBONE did not think that his right hon. Friend (Mr. Childers) was open to the charge of deviating from his free trade principles, when, as Chairman, he made the best bargain he could for his Company. The policy of the Government, however, he could not help thinking, was wasteful and unwise. The parties immediately concerned—the Treasury and the Post Office—were the representatives of the taxpayers of the country, and they had accepted a tender which, in the first instance, was £26,000, and even when reduced was £20,000 in excess of the offer made by another Company. Who was benefited thereby except the Royal Mail Steamship Company? The service required was the carriage of certain mails sent by the inhabitants of this country, and to facilitate the postal communication was the object of the subsidy; yet six-sevenths of the whole amount of the mails would have been carried more rapidly by the Company making the lower offer, because there were not only the Jamaica mails, there were the New Grenada and other islands mails, and not only this, but the cheaper tender included 26 instead of 24 mails during the year, so that by two mails in the year would the convenience of the senders of letters be diminished. Certain Colonies, it had been said, would gain by more rapid communication; but even these Colonies would have gained had the other route been chosen, because there was a large and increasing trade with the United States, and until recently they had paid a considerable subsidy to have letters carried that way. Here, then, those Colonies would gain. If time had been given the Company they could have arranged to amend this contract, and secure that very direct service which had been made the reason for withholding the contract from them. What could be the real reason why the Government had taken the dear contract? The Reports on the subject, which were before the House, showed that the Post Office at once, on the grounds of pecuniary advantage, were prepared to take the Atlas Company's offer; but before accepting it communications were made to the Colonial Office, and then arose the objections, and finally the other offer was accepted on the ground that more direct communication would tend to increase social intercourse with the Colonies. He could not help saying that the Government seemed to have acted upon information as antique as were their commercial principles. They had acted in the spirit of Protection; and they seemed to suppose that if they had given the contract to the Atlas Company instead of to the Royal Mail Company there would have been no direct communication with the West India Islands. They did not seem to be aware that certain Companies had monthly communication with the West Indies, and the mail question, one way or the other, would not prevent there being this direct communication. They seemed to think they lived in a period when there was no steam communication except when subsidized by the Post Office, instead of, as now, having Companies who carried on a large regular trade, independent of the Post Office service. He could not understand how the Government policy could be defended as being in the interests of the Colonies, or even of the idea of keeping up social intercourse between them and this country; and certainly it was no advantage to make a payment out of the not too rich Exchequer of £20,000 more than was necessary. The policy pursued was unwise on another point. If, although they invited tenders, the Post Office practically gave the preference to a certain Company at a higher rate than they could get the work done elsewhere, the end would be that no other Companies would tender at all, and the Post Office would be left bound hand and foot in the hands of this large Company. This was the inevitable consequence of the course the Post Office was adopting in the matter, and of a policy neither economical or wise.

MR. YEAMAN pointed out that the steamers of the Royal Mail Company were more rapid and powerful than those of any rival Company, and that the speed of vessels was a matter of the greatest consequence. As had been stated, to some of the more distant ports of call a saving of seven days was effected by the most powerful boats. This, where large amounts of commercial bills of exchange were carried, was of great advantage to commerce.

LORD JOHN MANNERS said, he did not hesitate to say that the Government, in deciding upon the rival tenders, were mainly actuated by Colonial and Imperial considerations, and not by the mere questions of expense. The present contract was for a less sum, by £6,500 a-year, than the last. Anyone who read the official Papers would see that the Post Office had simply sent on the tenders to the Treasury, with the suggestion that the Treasury should take the opinion of the Secretary of State for the Colonies before they came to a decision. The Treasury naturally adopted that course; and the Colonial Office authorities, after a careful consideration of the whole question, had, in the interest of the Colonies, come to a conclusion favourable to the Royal Mail Company, and the Government then accepted that tender. He thought the Government were more than justified in taking the opinion of the Colonial Office, which was a course suggested in the Report of a Committee presided over, in the first instance, by Mr. Cobden, and, secondly, by Mr. Dunlop.

MR. ANDERSON said, the complaint was that the tender of one Company was used as a lever to pull down that of another Company, without giving that other Company a similar chance of lowering its tender. The result of the policy of the Government would be, he thought, to prevent independent Companies from tendering in future, as they would not submit to having their tenders treated in that unfair way.

Mr. SAMPSON LLOYD said, that the Government had exercised a wise discretion in accepting this contract, because the work would be done better by the Royal Mail Company than by any other; and, as it was, the sum of £6,700 a-year was saved by the present contract. As they had saved this sum, he hoped they would favourably consider the propriety of embarking the outward mails at Plymouth, which the Company would undertake for £2,000 extra. Replies to letters arriving from the West Indies could thus be despatched one day later; and that often meant the saving of 14 days or more as compared with present facilities.

Motion *agreed to.*

COUNTY BOARDS BILL.

LEAVE. FIRST READING.

Mr. SCLATER-BOOTH, in moving for leave to bring in a Bill to establish County Boards in England, said, that though, as a general rule, remarks upon a proposed measure which was familiar to the House might be dispensed with, yet there were occasions when it was convenient for some observations to be made. He would, therefore, take the opportunity of stating very shortly the reasons which had actuated the Government in framing the measure on somewhat different lines from those of last year. His hon. Friend the Member for South Norfolk (Mr. Clare Read), not many days ago, inquired upon what day it was proposed to bring forward the Bill, and stated that he would move the postponement of the next stage of the Valuation Bill, on the ground that a certain clause in that Bill was inconsistent with pledges already given by the Government in reference to a County Bill. There was a relation between the two Bills, and it was, of course, necessary to provide for the contingency of one or the other of them not receiving the sanction of Parliament; but there was not—and there never had been—on the part of the Government, any intention that one Bill should pass, and that the other should not. The Government had only this to say, as between one Bill and the other—that they had always laid down the principle, to which he himself adhered, that the Valuation Bill was a measure which lay at the very root of all attempts of reform in local government. He was obliged to detain the House for a few moments by referring to some features of the measure of last year. That measure proceeded upon the principle of a complete fusion between the existing Courts of Quarter Sessions and the County Boards, which were to administer the county business for the future. There were some advantages—many obvious advantages—in the unity which would be arrived at by grafting the County Boards on the Courts of Quarter Sessions. But, with these advantages, there were certain disadvantages, to which he would presently draw attention. Proceeding, however, upon the principle of this complete fusion, it was obvious that the Government could not disregard the claims which the Justices, who had for so many years—he might say centuries—administered county government, might not unreasonably put forward. Accordingly, it was considered necessary that the Justices should have one-half of the representation on the County Board, and that the elective members should constitute the other half of the representation. The great extent to which the Justices were required by the Bill to abdicate their functions made this concession a reasonable one. But what happened in the conduct of that measure before Parliament? The Bill was read a second time by a very considerable majority. Hon. Gentlemen on both sides of the House were in favour of the principle of the Bill, and the second reading was carried by a large majority. On going into Committee, a two nights' debate ensued; and he, on the part of the Government, replied to the speeches which had been delivered. At the last moment, an hon. Gentleman below the Gangway on the other side of the House proposed that Progress should be reported, in order that a similar measure with regard to Ireland might be considered at the same time. The House acquiesced in that adjournment, and no time was found for the resumption of the debate before the Easter Recess. After the holidays, it was ascertained that those hon. Gentlemen who were supposed to be the most eager for the passing of a measure of this kind were strongly in favour of proceeding with another measure—the Cattle Diseases

Prevention Act—in which they took a greater interest; and it could not be said that the county Members generally, who were supposed to represent the magistrates on this subject, showed any particular desire to accept the proposed fusion of the two bodies, which was the main feature of the measure of last year. Since the end of last Session, he had received communications from Courts of Quarter Sessions, and also informal communications from magistrates, which led him to suppose that the magistrates, as a body, were not disposed to accept this fusion, and that, on the whole, they would desire to continue to discharge separately their duties connected with the police and the administration of justice. Again, hon. Members on both sides of the House, who had been consistent supporters of a plan of county government, showed a considerable indisposition to accept the plan of equal numbers of Justices, and of representative members. There was, likewise, evinced a considerable jealousy of the magisterial divisions on which the electoral machinery of the County Board was based. Although a very mild form of election was set out in the Bill, there was evinced in debate, and still more in the opinions which reached him, a feeling that the proposed open meeting for the purpose of the election to the Boards would have been unpopular, and that it was not desired by the ratepayers or by the Guardians to whom the election was assigned. All these points had been carefully considered during the Recess; and the measure which he now sought to introduce, though entirely consistent with the plan of last year, had been constructed with regard to the considerations he had just described. The Government had given up the proposal to identify the existing Courts of Quarter Sessions with the new County Boards. It was proposed that the magistrates should continue to exercise separately their functions under the Police Acts, and also those connected with the administration of justice; and that for the purpose of obtaining money for the payment of officers and the other things they were required to do as Justices of the Peace, they should become what was technically called a "precept authority," and should issue their precept to the County Board, which would have the exclusive privilege of levying, administrating, and accounting for the county rate. In making this change, the Government gave up the advantage of having one central County Board for all purposes. On the other hand, they gained in simplicity, in the workable character of the measure, and also, according to his judgment, in having proposed a plan which would be more readily passed into law. When they considered the great future that might be in store for a representative and independent county authority, he felt the plan on which they now proposed to construct it would effectually secure the accession to it of all new business of great importance. Having premised this much, he would now say a few words on the functions to be assigned to the new County Board. Among the functions they proposed to assign to the county governing body last year was one relating to river conservancy; but he might remind hon. Members that a measure already introduced into the House of Lords by his noble Friend the President of the Council took over that subject, and dealt with it in a complete and comprehensive manner. The election of coroners was also dealt with in the measure of last year; but this year he had left it untouched, because there was a Committee of the House already dealing with that question. There was also in the Bill of last year a provision with regard to the power of the county authority to make recommendations as to the local areas of the county. This provision he had not thought it necessary to repeat. The attention of the County Boards would, of necessity, be so directed to the subject of the local areas, that they might safely be trusted to represent to Parliament, or the Government, or the Local Government Board, the changes required in regard to the local areas of the county. It would scarcely be candid if he held out the expectation that any very rapid or important changes could reasonably be expected through the agency of such a Board, or, indeed, by any other means. The main features of this year's measure were the following:—In the first place, they proposed to transfer to the County Board the administration of the Highway Act of last year. Secondly, they proposed to hand over, likewise, the management of the bridges and approaches, which had, from time immemorial, been vested in the magistrates of the different counties. In the third place, the County Boards would have the very important power of reviewing the workhouse accommodation of each county, and of providing accommodation in the workhouses for imbecile and idiot paupers, whether children or adults, who were not fit inmates for lunatic asylums. He regretted that such a provision had not been made for this class long ago. He did not provide in the Bill for direct control of the lunatic asylums; but the Boards would be empowered to inquire into the lunatic asylums, and to exercise such influence as would keep their future enlargement in check. It was proposed last year to give the County Boards a considerable share of the management of the lunatic asylums; and he had no doubt that before long some plan would be devised by which a large share in their management would be given to the County Boards. But long familiarity with the Pauper Lunatic Acts had convinced him of the very great difficulty of dealing with those Acts by means of a few clauses in a Bill of this kind. It would be unsatisfactory, without an exhaustive review of those Acts, to transfer the administration of the lunatic asylums to the County Boards; for the whole policy of the Acts affecting pauper lunatic asylums proceeded on the assumption that they were *quasi*-prisons, and that the responsibility with regard to their management should be vested in the Visiting Justices. The last and most important feature of the present Bill was that it placed the levying of the county rates, whatever charges might be put upon them, in the hands of the County Boards. He would now pass on to what would, perhaps, be regarded as the most interesting feature of the Bill—namely, the constitution of the Boards; and he could not refrain from noticing the obvious leaning manifested on both sides of the House last year towards the selection of the Union area as a basis for constituting the County Board. But to represent the Unions as such was both objectionable and impracticable. It was their desire to develop and create a new and real interest in the county on the part of the ratepayers; but to make the Union area the basis of election would introduce antagonistic interests of rival rating areas which would militate against this aim. There was—and had been for many years past—a forgetfulness as to what the demands of the county really consisted of, owing to the constant and rapid development of the Union as the more important administrative area. The Union authorities spent as much as 2*s.* 6*d.* or 3*s.* 6*d.* in the pound of the ratepayers' money; whilst on the part of the county very little indeed—in many cases not more than 2*d.* or 4*d.* in the pound—had been spent. There was thus a great difference in the practical interest. He was therefore of opinion that in electing the County Board they ought to look to the parishes as the element common to the county, and to all subordinate areas—although they might arrange the parishes in groups according to existing areas—if they wished the members who represented those areas to regard themselves as representing the county as a whole. Another objection to taking Unions, as such, would be the incontestable claim which would then be raised, on the part of highway districts, local boards, and other authorities, to separate representation. But, further, to make the Union area the basis of election was impracticable, even if it had not been objectionable. No one had been more anxious than himself to reduce the Union areas within the areas of the counties; but the local interests, and the rights of the ratepayers, were very strong indeed. Difficulties stood in the way of his wishes, such as hon. Gentlemen had no notion of, unless they had had experience in the administration of Poor Law. There was also another difficulty—namely, that the registration of the country was intimately connected with the Union system, and that to break it up would be to introduce a very inconvenient change. Besides, as he had pointed out on a previous occasion, not only did Unions overlap the county boundaries, but conflicted with the boundaries of many large towns also, from which circumstance much difficulty would be experienced. He should like, moreover, to remind the House that if the *ex officio* element was taken away from the Boards of Guardians, when engaged in voting for the County Board, they would not, in fact, be exercising that function as a Board at all. He believed that it was most important that the *ex officio* element should always be recognized in any common action by Boards of Guardians. He had objected to the representation of Unions, as such, on the

County Board; but had never been at all opposed to the use of the Union area when convenient for the purposes of election. In that respect it would be found useful in the Southern and Western counties, and as much less convenient in the Northern and Midland districts. They proposed, therefore, that the county Justices should, in the exercise of their discretion at the Epiphany Sessions of the coming year, divide their counties into wards, for the special purpose of electing representatives for the County Boards. In order to construct these wards, they might take any existing area—such as Unions, or broken Unions, divisions, or polling districts—and the Justices were to assign to the wards some distinguishing name or number by which they should be known. The Guardians of the parishes contained within the ward were to elect the member for the County Board; and as the Guardians were already more or less numerous in proportion to the population of the various parishes, consequently the voting power of the different parishes would be likewise in proportion to their population and value. It was proposed that the qualification for the elected members of the County Board should be the same qualification as was now required for a Guardian within the county. The number of members for each county was set out in the Schedule, and it had been so fixed as to be divisible by three, so that the Justices in Quarter Sessions would elect one-third of the members, and the Guardians of the parishes the remaining two-thirds. The Guardians, elected by the ratepayers at the beginning of April in the next year, would proceed to the election of members for the County Boards. Those elections would be held in June, and the new Board would come into existence in the middle of July. All the members of the Board, whether elective or non-elective, would hold office for three years. As for the mode of election, he thought that the system of voting papers was the best. He knew that it was not popular among politicians; but it was useful for such purposes as the one he had in view. Indeed, it was peculiarly suitable to elections when the number of the electors was small, and where the distances were great. In an average county, for instance, there would be only about 400 voters; but it would be easy enough to collect their papers. He hoped it would not be supposed that the Government wished to shrink from the plain and open voting in separate areas; but he believed that the plan of voting by means of papers would be effective, and would be more convenient than any other. The Clerk of the Peace would be the returning officer, and the mode of election would be found set out in the Schedule to the Bill. Now, it might be said, perhaps, that the functions of the County Boards, as laid down in the Bill, were too few and too unimportant. Last year, however, he thought he recognized in the discussions a general opinion that at the outset the number of the functions to be undertaken should not be too great, and was a matter of secondary importance. The Boards, however, would be charged with the administration of the county rate, and the exclusive enjoyment of this privilege would give them a weight, importance, and standing in the county which would establish them on a firm and satisfactory basis. Besides, their work would gradually grow upon them, and nothing would be able to prevent the development of their growing importance. He should have had no objection to adding to their specific functions if he had not felt that by the provisions of the Bill the new body would have work enough for some time to come. With regard to the Schedule of the Bill and the number of representatives from each county, he could only hope that the House would not be inclined to go into detail on the case of each county, but would assent to the numbers of members specified. They had proceeded by ascertaining the number of Unions, of divisions, and of polling places in each county, had compared these with population, and had on that basis determined how many members should sit on each County Board. It would be seen that the County Boards would consist variously of from 24 to 90 members; but the House would remember that last year it had been proposed to give as many as 130 members to Lancashire—the largest Board. By the present Bill, Lancashire would be on an equality with Middlesex and Surrey, and would have 90 members. That was the outline of the measure, which lay in the very small compass of 36 clauses; and there was no reason why, if the House gave its attention to the subject, it should not pass into law during the present Session. There was, he believed, nothing to prevent it, as well as the Valuation Bill, from passing into law, if hon. Members would only show a little forbearance towards measures which had been drawn up with great care. If, however, every hon. Member thought he could devise a policy of election, or a variation from the plan proposed, which was, perhaps, suited to his own views and to his own locality, but which might not be suited to the country generally, then, of course, great obstacles might be thrown in the way of the success of those measures, as would also be the case if extraneous matter, not contained within the four corners of the Bills, should be introduced. But let them be only considered as they stood as *bonâ fide* attempts on the part of the Government to give effect to a wish which had been long entertained and frequently expressed, although never very urgently pressed forward by the country at large, but which every statesman interested in the subject saw must inevitably be carried into execution, and a great step in the direction of the improvement of local government would soon be attained. The right hon. Gentleman concluded by moving for leave to introduce the Bill.

Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That leave be given to bring in a Bill to establish County Boards in England."—(*Mr. Sclater-Booth.*)

Mr. STANSFELD said, he would not attempt to follow the right hon. Gentleman in the details of the statement just submitted to the House. He was bound, however, to say that he had heard that statement with very considerable apprehension and disappointment. The right hon. Gentleman had altered the Bill in consequence of the criticisms to which the scheme of the Government had been subjected last year; but, as far as it had been changed, it appeared to him to have been altered for the worse. The right hon. Gentleman had disappointed the hopes of those who had criticized the former measure in the proposed constitution of the new County Board, which would not take over the whole of the business of the county, but would retain one-third of the Justices on that Board with diminished functions. It was now proposed to retain for the Justices the administration of police, justice, reformatories, industrial schools, and, if he had followed the right hon. Gentleman accurately, lunatic asylums. There were other functions, proposed to be given in the Bill of last year, which would be taken away from the county authorities under this measure. The conservancy of rivers was a matter to be disposed of under another Bill; the election of coroners had been put on one side; the power of altering local areas, proposed to be given to county authorities, was now to be taken away. This last alteration obliterated one of the most useful and promising features of the former measure, considered from the point of view of those hon. Members who were interested in the administration of the county. But what was it that the right hon. Gentleman proposed to give the new County Board? The administration of highways, a partial control of workhouses, and, lastly, what the right hon. Gentleman seemed to look upon as the extremely important function of levying the county rates. Now he, for one, failed to see how the mere duty of having to levy a county rate could lead to a great expansion of the power and functions of these Boards in the future. With regard to the constitution of the Board, they could adopt no other course than to take issue with the right hon. Gentleman even more determinedly than they did last Session. Their view distinctly was, that it was most essential for the constitution of a County Board that it should be built upon administrative areas. He did not agree with the right hon. Gentleman, that a county feeling was to be created or fostered by constituting a poverty-stricken County Board with nothing to do but levying rates as the most important part of its business. County feeling, he was ready to admit, was a thing which it was most desirable to create and to foster; but he could not see how a well-considered system of county government could be initiated by such measures as the Bill proposed. The great object of local government reformers had always been the simplification of areas; but the right hon. Gentleman proposed the institution, at the arbitrary discretion of the Justices of each county, of entirely new areas for the purposes of election. The building up of a County Board on administrative areas, he believed, would not lead to jealousy and rivalry, but, on the contrary, would tend to federate a county feeling which it was desirable to promote. With regard to direct elections, no doubt there was an objection to multiplying them, on account of the cost and trouble; but if members of the Local as well as of the County Boards were to sit for three years instead of one, and their election took place on the same day, there would scarcely be any addition to the trouble and expense, while the power, and consciousness of power, of the bodies concerned would be augmented. We should never succeed in constituting a satisfactory County Board unless we built it up on the administrative area. While desiring to consider this measure from a purely administrative and constructive point of view, he regretted that his first impressions of it compelled him to say that he regarded it as being decidedly inferior to that of last year.

MR. GREGORY considered that the Bill was deserving of support, as a fair and reasonable attempt to deal with a question of a very complicated and difficult nature. He could not agree with the right hon. Member for Halifax (Mr. Stansfeld) in taking exception to the measure, because it did not throw enough burden on the County Boards. On the contrary, it appeared to him to be one of its great recommendations, that it would not overweight these Boards with too many duties at first, as such a course, and requiring attendance of distant members at a considerable sacrifice of time and means, would have a tendency to keep some of the best men away, and allow the management of the Boards and county business to fall into the hands of a few persons resident in the localities where the Boards met. The Bill, as it stood, gave the Board considerable functions. The constitution of the Board appeared to him, as far as he could see at present, a fair and reasonable one; and he thought the measure, as a whole, ought to give general satisfaction, and become law.

MR. RATHBONE said, that without entering into the details of the measure, he must express his regret at its general character. He had always felt that this question could be more effectively dealt with by the Party opposite than by a Liberal Government; but he must say that the first measure was a most unsatisfactory one. They had begun to build the pyramid from the top instead of from the base. It seemed to him that the only motive for beginning at the County Board instead of with the primary administrative area would be to make the County Board useful in bringing into order the inferior parts of our present confused administrative county system. But the right hon. Gentleman had struck out of his Bill the power of the County Boards to bring the lower administrative county bodies into order. Under these circumstances, it did not seem to him that the new County Boards could accomplish the great and main object which it was so desirable that they should effect. It seemed to him that the Bill must be vitally defective, inasmuch as it did nothing to attain the great end of bringing into order the primary areas of local administration as well as the general government of counties. On these grounds, he must own that it did seem to him to be a hopelessly inefficient Bill, and one not worthy the serious attention of the House.

MR. FLOYER observed, that the principle of the Bill, which appeared to him to be a right one, was to make the County Board a county institution. Having been a member of the Committee which sat last year, he could assure the hon. Member for Liverpool (Mr. Rathbone) that the attempt to re-adjust the Poor Law Unions had met with the greatest difficulty. He agreed with the hon. Member for East Sussex (Mr. Gregory) that in constituting County Boards it was desirable, in the first instance, that these County Boards should not be over-weighted with business. The difficulty of getting members to attend from remote parts of the county would be very great, and care should be taken to prevent the business from falling into the hands of a few who happened to live near the place where the Board would meet. At present the magistrates managed the county business. They came from all parts of the county; but only four times a year to the Quarter Sessions. It would be a serious tax upon the time of the tenant farmers, the mercantile men, and the tradesmen who were elected to serve on these Boards, to ask them to come frequently from distant parts of the county to take part in their proceedings. He did not see that the business proposed to be allotted to the County Boards was much less now than it was last year. He did not quite follow the proposed arrangement for placing chronic imbeciles in the charge of the County Board; and he objected to drawing a broad line of demarcation between different classes of lunatics, such as curables and incurables, because he did not see on what principle one class was to be treated differently from another. Taking the whole of the Bill together, he rather liked it, for the reason that others disliked it. He liked the Bill, because it did not do too much. There was nothing sensational about it, that was quite clear; still it aimed at carrying out the wish of a good many people that the ratepayers, directly or indirectly, should have a voice in the administration of the county funds, which, after all, were of very moderate dimensions. The county rates were 1½*d.* or 2*d.* in the pound yearly, while the poor rates were 2*s.* or 3*s.* He was glad that the old divisions of the counties and the parishes were to be respected. It was not necessary to upset existing institutions for the sake of attaining the end desired; and therefore it was well to abide by the parochial divisions which had answered well for centuries. No doubt the Bill would require some amendment in Committee; but, so far as he was concerned, he would be happy to give his assistance in passing it through the House.

LORD EDMOND FITZMAURICE remarked, that the hon. Member for Dorsetshire (Mr. Floyer) had spoken of curable and incurable cases. His own opinion of that Bill was that it was an incurable case. He could not have imagined that he should ever have felt any regret at having moved the rejection of the County Government Bill of last year; but when he heard the description given of the County Government Bill of this year, he confessed that he shed an inward tear over the former measure. He could not have conceived it possible that the fertile resources of the Local Government Board could produce a Bill so bad as the one now being brought in; and, so far as he could gather from the statement of the right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Sclater-Booth), he saw nothing to induce him to refrain from pursuing the same course as he took last Session. The principle of this Bill, so far as it contained any, and also its details, offended against all those views on the reform of local and county government which were popular on that (the Opposition) side of the House generally. The Bill of last year made only a nominal attempt to meet all the evils of those confused and overlapping areas which were a pest and a nuisance to every person having to do with the details of local government; while, moreover, the principle of direct election, which had worked so well in the municipal corporations of the great towns, was not in any degree applied to the body which the Bill proposed to create. Those great evils remained absolutely unredressed in the present Bill, and were in some measure even increased. The right hon. Gentleman opposite (Mr. Sclater-Booth) proposed to break up that unity of county government which had been one of its most admirable features—covering, in fact, not a few of its defects—because he would leave the police, the reformatories, the industrial schools, and the lunatic asylums to the magistrates; while he would hand over the roads, the bridges, and the financial business to the new County Board—that was to say, two authorities were to be set up where there was one before. In the next place, it was proposed to add to the large and confused number of existing areas a new one, to be called into existence at the discretion of the present Court of Quarter Sessions. One of the most important functions of the great municipal bodies was the control of the police arrangements of their several towns and cities. Why were they to extend to the smallest municipality in England a confidence which they denied to the great representative and elective body in a county? The hon. Member for Dorsetshire (Mr. Floyer) praised the measure, because it adhered to the ancient county division which had existed for centuries; but it really abandoned that ancient division, and what hon. Gentlemen on his side had always contended for was that the old county boundary should be preserved, and that the administrative area should be brought within it and consolidated. This Bill, however, set up a County Board with duties so absurdly small that he believed it would meet with one loud peal of laughter, which was all that it deserved. Almost everyone on his side of the

House would give it the most strenuous opposition, and their disapproval of it would, he thought, be shared by the magistrates as well as by the ratepayers of the country. Under these circumstances, he was persuaded the Bill would never become law.

SIR GEORGE BOWYER said, it was a common fallacy to argue that because towns elected bodies in a popular manner to govern the police and exercise other functions of administration, the same privilege should be allowed to counties. The institutions of all European countries made distinctions between municipalities and agrarian provinces, and for an obvious reason. In towns people were close together, they were neighbours, communicated daily with one another, and could easily elect a body to represent their wants and wishes. But in rural areas the business of the people did not bring them into contact with any but their immediate neighbours; they lived at a distance from one another, and popular election became difficult. Hon. Gentlemen opposite might, perhaps, like to see a body influenced by political passions constituted in each county, one that would take part in the election of Members of Parliament and in political struggles. He did not wish for any such thing. He thought the present Bill a great improvement on the Bill of last year, which took a large step towards the abolition of the Quarter Sessions, against which no valid complaint of having administered the county in a wasteful or extravagant manner had been made. On the contrary, the administration of the Quarter Sessions had been highly satisfactory. The members of Quarter Sessions were the largest ratepayers, they lived in the county, and if anything went wrong there they would feel it more than anyone else. The changes proposed in this Bill were less mischievous than those which the Bill of last year contained, and would probably work well. He would support the Bill.

MR. WHITBREAD said, this question of local self-government had been for a quarter of a century at different times under the consideration of Parliament, and the outcome of it all was a Bill which would create a new County Board, and assign to it one duty — namely, the care of pauper imbeciles. The direction of the views of those who supported this Bill seemed to be this—"Don't give these county gentlemen too much to do, because, if you do, they won't do it." What relation would the new Board have to Poor Law or sanitary expenditure? Yet these were the very matters upon which county expenditure turned. This measure might, perhaps, be passed by the Government if they devoted the whole of their strength to the task for the remainder of the Session, and if we did not have more than one or two additional wars to distract our attention in the meantime; but it would not settle any one of the demands which local government reformers were making. It was a tinkering measure, and would only add one more stumbling block in the way of sanitary reform.

MR. J. COWEN said, he was disposed to think that this proposal was one of the feeblest and least liberal of the attempts to solve the question of county government that had been submitted to Parliament during the last quarter of a century. The Bill of last year had been too liberal for hon. Gentlemen opposite; but this Bill would not settle anything at all. Any attempt to peddle with the question, instead of mending matters, would only make matters worse. The question should be dealt with in a broad and comprehensive spirit. The cardinal defect of the Bill was this. All the efforts of county government reformers were to lessen the number of Boards, to simplify the rating, and to bring the administration of the county into a more compact and simple form. This Bill, however, did exactly the reverse. Moreover, the principle of the Bill was unsound and unsatisfactory, and it must be met with the steady resistance of hon. Gentlemen sitting on the Opposition side of the House.

MR. HICK said, he thought the Bill was entitled to the support of the House. In his opinion, the measure of last year was too ambitious. It was open to objection on account of its provisions as to the proposed new Board, and also because it would have taken from the magistrates their functions with regard to the police and the management of county buildings connected with the administration of justice. Those evils were avoided in this Bill. The duties which really belonged to the magistrates were retained to them, and duties which belonged to the Guardians, as representatives of the ratepayers, were continued to them. Those duties, it was said, were not very large; but this was a tentative measure, and by degrees they might be capable of doing a greater amount of work. At present the amount of a county rate rarely exceeded 2*d.* in the pound, while the new duties of this Board would cover at least 1*s* in the pound. He gave his cordial support to the Bill.

Mr. HIBBERT said, that having spoken very strongly against the proposal of the Bill of last year, to make the administrative area a part of the sessional area, he could not help expressing his great regret, in addition to what had been explained by his hon. and right hon. Friends near him, at the proposal made that night. While they had heard such strong opinions expressed against the Bill, he could not help thinking the support given to the measure had been very poor. He would have been better pleased if they could have heard the opinion of the hon. Member for South Norfolk (Mr. Clare Read), who brought on a Motion upon this subject last Session, and carried the whole House with him. He should have liked to have heard also the opinion of the hon. Member for South Leicestershire (Mr. Pell), and to have known whether he was satisfied with the propositions of the Government. He thought that the propositions made by his hon. Friend as to the area were even worse than the propositions of last year—for the reason that they might have the magistrates for the different counties acting in different ways as to the kind of wards they proposed to make. This Bill did not declare what those wards were to contain as to population or rateable value, but left the whole matter to the magistrates to decide. Why could not his right hon. Friend at once agree to take the Union as the basis, and let the Quarter Sessions deal with the overlapping parishes? He did not hear his right hon. Friend's speech; but still he had heard from hon. Friends near him what the propositions were; and he thought it would be far better to defer the whole question than to let it be dealt with in this way. He could not understand why, if such duties as the management of the rates were to be thrown upon the administrators of the new County Bill, other duties at present left to the magistrates might not be added to them? If they were to have the care of the imbecile poor, why could not they give them the care of the lunatic asylums? The Guardians were already entrusted with the lunatics in the workhouses; and to him it seemed that the representatives at the County Boards would be just as able to manage the lunatics of the county as a new establishment built for the imbeciles of the various counties. He could not understand why a difference should be made between the two. If it was desirable to give the County Board the care of the imbeciles, it might be desirable to give them the care of the lunatics also. As to to the question of transferring the police, that was not a proposition in the Bill of last year; and he must add that it was a great question whether it would be desirable, at first, to transfer so important a matter as the control of the police into the hands of County Boards. But he could not help saying that if the matter was worth doing at all, it was worth doing in a much better and more extensive manner than that proposed by the right hon. Gentleman. If he expected to get gentlemen to undertake the duty of representing the districts on County Boards, he must give them more work to do. The less important their work, and the more they curtailed it and made it appear to be of no importance, the less likely were they to get the really important men in the counties to undertake it. There was one improvement in the Bill, certainly—the reduction in the number of the magistrates who were to sit at the Board, and the increase in the number of the representatives, making the proposition two-thirds to one-third; but generally, with respect to the Bill, he did not think it was a measure with which the House would be satisfied.

Mr. SCLATER-BOOTH said, he must congratulate his hon. and right hon. Friends opposite upon the unanimity and alacrity with which they had arrived at the conclusion that they could give no support to the Bill; and he must compliment his hon. Friend (Mr. Hibbert) on the precision with which he had criticized the measure without having heard his own speech in introducing it to the House. Had his hon. Friend heard the speech he would have avoided falling into many grievous mistakes which he would discover he had made when he read it. The hon. Member for

South Norfolk (Mr. Clare Read) might find this Bill much on all fours with what he wanted than that of last year; because, according to his view, the magistrates ought to have reserved to them the control of the police and the administration of justice. The debate had been really a long one, considering that hon. Gentlemen had not had an opportunity of reading the Bill; and therefore he would not say more than he could help in reply to the various remarks which had been made. At the same time, he must notice some observations which had fallen from hon. Members. The right hon. Gentleman opposite (Mr. Stansfeld), and others also on that side of the House, had spoken of the powers of the magistrates to create wards. What he had done was to provide that the Union areas might become areas for the election of County Boards where they were convenient for the purpose; but he did object to the Union, as such, being supposed to be the constituent area of the County Board in future. The right hon. Gentleman, in speaking of putting broken portions of Unions into another Union, had entirely lost sight of the supposed advantage of constituting County Boards out of the Union area. He had already gone into this point, but he must say again that it was far more easy to destroy the county boundaries than Union boundaries; and if a Royal Commission were to be appointed to make administrative areas, it would certainly be the county boundaries and not the Union boundaries which would have to give way. The Union areas had so long been used for local government, and so many administrative duties had been placed on them, that he would defy any Government to break them up. The hon. Member for Bedford (Mr. Whitbread) asked what these County Boards were to do? Well, they were to have the control of all the county money. They would see that the Poor Law expenses also were properly administered. The sanitary work was not given into their control, and why? Because the people would not be governed for such purposes by a County Board, but would have their own local self-government. When they grew to want self-government, they would have self-government, and no community would have its roads, drainage, and streets governed by a Union authority, much less by a County Body. The hon. Member for Liverpool (Mr. Rathbone) complained because he had struck out the power of making recommendations as to areas; but these powers were already inherent in County Boards, and he withdrew the mention of them because he thought that the authority would be able to do all that was necessary in this respect without taking from Parliament power to deal with these matters. The hon. Member for Dorsetshire (Mr. Floyer) seemed to be doubtful as to the more important portions of the Bill—the power to make use of workhouse accommodation for a certain class of imbecile poor. His hon. Friend did not understand how he proposed to discriminate between one and another class of lunatics. But he would find that it was not only easy to do so, but that it had been done with very great success in the neighbourhood of London. The definition of imbeciles, who were to be dealt with under this Bill, was "persons who might be lawfully detained in workhouses;" and they knew that in the Metropolis 5,000 people already had been cared for, much to their own benefit, at a cost of one-third less in this way than if they had been detained as lunatics in asylums—not because they were worse treated or worse fed, but because they could be maintained at a far less cost for management and with a far less proportion of attendants than was required for lunatics. His hon. Friend opposite had been very severe on him for not having given the lunatic asylums to the County Boards; but he had stated his reasons at very great length in introducing the Bill why he felt it was not convenient to hand over by a clause or two to the County Boards the powers and duties which were spread over a number of complicated Acts of Parliament. He hoped also to see the in-door poor treated in a more satisfactory way by-and-bye, so as eventually to reduce the burden of the pauper on the ratepayers. He was asked why the police were not to be handed over to the County Board; but that had never been suggested before as a part of county government, so far as he was aware. No doubt, the towns managed their own police, but it was very doubtful whether that was a desirable power for them to possess; and he believed that when small municipalities once surrendered their police, they were never able to get the management of them again. Besides, when the State paid one-half of the cost of the police, he thought it was very doubtful whether the control of the force ought to be placed under the County Board. He could only say that he had studied this question of local administration for a great many years, and he hoped the Bill that he had now introduced would turn out to be satisfactory to the House. It was constantly said that local administration was in a most chaotic condition. It was only chaotic to lookers on. The people themselves generally knew who governed them, how they were governed, and what money was spent on their behalf. The Bill aimed at obtaining uniformity of management and administration, and the very power it gave to magistrates to select Union areas if they pleased really left the option in a competent local authority to divide the county in the way they might find was most convenient. In that way every county would regulate the election to the County Board in the way it found best; and he believed that the Bill would in this respect be found both practicable and desirable. He believed that Union areas would be tried in his own county, and also in that of his hon. Friend the Member for South Norfolk. The question was one the practicability of which might fairly be left to the discretion and experience of magistrates; and, in his opinion, it would be a great detriment to the Bill, if they endeavoured accurately to settle the areas of each county separately.

Mr. GOSCHEN said, he would not follow the right hon. Gentleman in charge of this Bill (Mr. Sclater-Booth) into criticism of its details, nor would he dwell upon the somewhat extraordinary speech to which they had just listened, in which the right hon. Gentleman had put forward some of the views which underlaid his own opinions on the reform of local government. He said he had left these matters to the counties to be dealt with, whether practicable or not. He did not think it was any great compliment to the magistrates to leave the matter in their hands in this way, with the doubt existing as to whether the reforms he was introducing were practicable or not.

Mr. SCLATER-BOOTH said, he was misunderstood.

Mr. GOSCHEN said, not two minutes ago, the right hon. Gentleman stated he would not say whether these arrangements were practicable or not; but he would leave them to the discretion and experience of the magistrates in each county. Those were the very words he used.

Mr. SCLATER-BOOTH said, what he did contend for was that the magistrates should settle the areas, and should deal with the Unions and broken parts of Unions, so as to make practicable arrangements.

Mr. GOSCHEN said, the right hon. Gentleman threw doubt on the practicability of his own scheme.

Mr. SCLATER-BOOTH, in reply, said, that in his own county, and in Norfolk, he had no doubt this plan would be adopted by the magistrates; while he thought that in others the magistrates might or might not adopt it.

Mr. GOSCHEN said, he would not follow the right hon. Gentleman further into the discussion on that point, nor would he follow him into a discussion as to the objects which he seemed to be aiming at, nor into the points which were not merely matters mentioned in the Bill, but which were matters which were to follow the passing of the Bill, such as the classification of Poor Law relief, and various other matters. These subjects were not dealt with in the Bill. He presumed the right hon. Gentleman, seeing the reception which his measure had met with, was anxious to point out the results which might follow from its passing, in order to make it appear a little more important than it was at present. The right hon. Gentleman had, indeed, tried to rise two or three times before he did; and, seeing that hon. Member after hon. Member get up to express his great disappointment at the most impracticable character of the Bill, he was not surprised at the right hon. Gentleman's anxiety to terminate the discussion. The point, however, to which he wished particularly to call attention was that the support which this Bill had received had been derived almost exclusively from magisterial sources, and there was an extraordinary silence on the Conservative side of the House amongst those able Representatives of the tenant-farmers, who took so great an interest in this subject. His hon. Friend who sat beside him (Mr. Hibbert) had challenged the hon. Member for South Leicestershire (Mr. Pell), and the hon. Member for South Norfolk (Mr. Clare Read), upon this matter. Yet they had preserved a most ominous and significant silence. The House, indeed, was consoled for the silence of those hon. Gentlemen by the assurance of the right hon. Gentleman that the hon. Member for Norfolk would be more contented with this Bill than with that introduced last year, because it ran on all fours with the opinion which he himself had expressed two years previously. It would be more satisfactory, however, to have that assurance from the lips of the hon. Member himself. He did not know whether these hon. Gentlemen intended, even now, to favour the House with their opinions; but, at all events, he trusted it would be noted by the public outside, who watched with much attention for the introduction of this Bill, that the Representatives of the tenant-farmers on the other side of the House had no single word to say in defence of this Bill — notwithstanding the manner in which it had been received on the Liberal side. Perhaps these hon. Gentlemen were reserving themselves for the second reading. He hoped they had a conviction that the Bill would reach a second reading, because the manner in which it had been generally received was not very encouraging in regard to its prospects in that respect. It was for that reason that he so sincerely regretted the silence that those Gentlemen had thought it right and proper to observe on this occasion. He entirely agreed with the disappointment and the general regret which had been expressed as to the provisions of this Bill. It was really not a measure to reform local government at all. It fell short even of the modicum which they were offered last year. Unless those hon. Gentlemen opposite repudiated the idea, he thought that the House and the country would be entitled to assume that the silence with which they had treated the introduction of this measure was significant of the indifference with which it would be viewed by everyone interested in local government.

Question put, and *agreed to.*

Bill *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. SCLATER-BOOTH, Mr. Secretary CROSS, and Mr. CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 105.]

CORONERS BILL.

Select Committee on the Coroners Bill to consist of Seventeen Members:—Mr. ATTORNEY GENERAL for IRELAND, Mr. ASHLEY, Lord EDMOND FITZMAURICE, Mr. GOLDNEY, Mr. HERSCHELL, Lord FRANCIS HERVEY, Mr. HICKS, Mr. LAW, Sir TREVOR LAWRENCE, Mr. MITCHELL HENRY, Sir JULIAN GOLDSMID, Sir PATRICK O'BRIEN, Mr. PELL, Sir MATTHEW RIDLEY, Mr. SOLICITOR GENERAL. Mr. BENJAMIN WILLIAMS, and Mr. YORKE:—Five to be the quorum.

House adjourned at a quarter before One o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Wednesday, 19*th March*, 1879.

MINUTES.]—WAYS AND MEANS—*considered in Committee*—Supplementary 1878-9, £73,220; on Account 1879-80, £8,494,195.

PRIVATE BILL (*by Order*)—*Select Committee*—East Indian Railway, *nominated.*

PUBLIC BILLS — *Resolution in Committee* — *Ordered—First Reading*—Licensing Act (1872) Amendment* [108].

Ordered—First Reading—Trustees Acts Consolidation and Amendment* [106]; Public Health (Scotland) Act (1867) Amendment * [107].

Second Reading—Hypothec Abolition (Scotland) [3].

Committee—Report—Petty Customs (Scotland) Abolition Act Amendment* [91].

Third Reading—District Auditors* [79], and *passed.*

PRIVATE BUSINESS.

EAST INDIAN RAILWAY BILL.

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON, Mr. FAWCETT, Mr. HUBBARD, and Mr. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN nominated Members of the Select Committee on the East Indian Railway Bill:—Power to send for persons, papers, and records; Three to be the quorum.—(*Mr. Edward Stanhope.*)

ORDERS OF THE DAY.

HYPOTHEC ABOLITION (SCOTLAND) BILL.—[BILL 3.]

(*Mr. Vans Agnew, Mr. Baillie Hamilton, Sir George Douglas, Colonel Alexander.*)

SECOND READING.

Order for Second Reading read.

MR. VANS AGNEW, in moving that the Bill be now read a second time, said: In the Session of 1875, it was my duty to introduce a similar Bill. I then spoke at considerable length on the subject generally, and, having a very grateful recollection of the indulgence which I then received, I do not propose on the present occasion to enter upon a history of the law upon the subject, or upon the efforts which have been made in previous Parliaments to effect a change in the present state of the law on the question; but I think it is due to the efforts of those who have been endeavouring to bring the subject before the present Parliament to state in a few words what has been done by them in order to effect the desired change. It is no breach of confidence to say that, when the Parliament met in 1874, the majority of the Conservative Members of Scotland were very desirous that the Government should take up and settle this question; but the House will remember that the Government had only just come into Office, that there was a great deal to think of and much to be done, and they were not able to give it their consideration. In consequence of that, I introduced a Bill in 1874, but was not able to find a day for it. In 1875, I again introduced a Bill, and was fortunate in the ballot, having first choice of a Wednesday. The subject was discussed on the 10th of March, 1875, and on that occasion the Bill was rejected by a majority of only 18 in a House of nearly 300 Members. Out of the 60 Scotch Members 45 were present, and took part in the Division, and of these 42 voted in favour of the Bill, and only three voted for its rejection. Of those Scotch Members who were absent, two had their names on the back of the Bill, and not one of the others would, I believe, have voted against it. That showed an overwhelming, indeed an almost unanimous, feeling on the part of the Scotch Members in favour of the passing of the measure. I do not think there has ever been a stronger expression of opinion on the part of any one portion of the United Kingdom in favour of a particular measure affecting it than on that occasion. In that year, an Agricultural Holdings Bill for England was passed, and a promise made that an Agricultural Holdings Bill for Scotland would be introduced in the following Session. On that, I consulted with a number of my friends, and they and I were of opinion that it was better not to introduce a separate Bill on the subject in 1876, but to deal with the question in an Amendment on the Agricultural Holdings Bill. That Bill was read a second time. I could not oppose the second reading, because, for the first time, the Bill gave the statutory right to the farmers of compensation for unexhausted improvements. I, however, put an Amendment on the Paper, on going into Committee, embodying provisions similar to those in the two clauses of the Bill I have now the honour to submit to the House. Late in the Session the promised Bill for Scotland was read a second time; but it went no further, and it has not been renewed. In 1877 I again introduced my Bill, but I could not get a day for it, being unfortunate in the ballot. Last Session, again, I was not fortunate in the ballot. The day upon which I had fixed—the second Wednesday after Easter—happened unexpectedly to fall within the Easter Vacation. I put the Bill down again, therefore, as the first Order on a subsequent Tuesday; but owing to the collapse of a number of Motions on the Paper, and my being unfortunately called to go on with the Bill at half-past 7 o'clock, only 20 Members were in the House on the occasion, and I had not opened my mouth when the House was counted out. The Bill was then withdrawn, and a Resolution introduced on the subject. It was the first Order of the Day on a Tuesday in the hot weather in July; but on the House meeting at 9 o'clock, after a Morning Sitting and the dinner-hour, I was again counted out. I do not think that the 14 Scotch Members on this side, or the 34 Scotch Members on the other side of the House who failed to attend on those occasions when it was counted out, have any right to throw stones at me in respect to the manner I have attended to the question. This year, I am happy to say, I have been fortunate in the ballot, and on an early day in the Session we are met to discuss the measure, I hope with better prospects than we had in 1875, though I believe the discussion then must have done us good, for the position of the Bill was then not nearly so strong as now. On that occasion, I was met with a Motion that the second reading be delayed for six months, and a week ago there was also a Motion to that effect standing on the Paper in the name of the hon. and gallant Member for the

Ayr Burghs (Sir William Cuninghame). That Notice has disappeared now. A direct attack is not to be made; but, in place of that, my noble Friend the Member for Haddingtonshire (Lord Elcho) has placed a Resolution on the Paper, not in the way of a direct negative, but, to avoid a front attack, he is going to endeavour to turn our flank by causing delay. But I think the noble Lord will find it dangerous tactics to change his front immediately before a general engagement. It is certainly not a proof of strength. In the former debate, as I have said, only two Members representing Scotch constituencies spoke against the Bill, and each of them made certain admissions. My hon. and gallant Friend the Member for the Ayr Burghs said in his speech that if the Bill were limited to tenants with farms of the value of, or exceeding, £200 per annum, he would have no objection to vote for it. That was admitting that the principle of hypothec was not required in large farms. The noble Lord the Member for Haddingtonshire said, on that occasion, that the right of hypothec was not necessary for the landlords; that they could protect themselves, and if they did protect themselves, it would be at the expense of the tenants. My hon. and gallant Friend on the front Bench below me (Sir James Elphinstone) —though he is not a Scotch Member, is a Scotch proprietor, and no one has a better right to speak on the subject than he—said, on that occasion, that if hypothec had affected the landlords only, he would have been prepared to vote for it. These hon. Members, and others I could name, opposed the Bill chiefly in the interests of the tenants, and especially of the smaller tenants; but I must say that I think the farmers of Scotland, both large and small, ought to know their own interests quite as well as any landlords in this House who profess to know what the farmers' interests are, and to speak for them—and it is the belief of those farmers that this privilege of hypothec is injurious to them, and that the retention of it will not be to their advantage. They complain that it injures their credit, that it raises their rents in an unfair degree, and is disadvantageous to them in many other respects. They expressed the opinion that this law was disadvantageous to them most strongly at the last Election, when they returned Members to the House who, with three exceptions, in 1875, voted in favour of the abolition of this privilege. What I may call the small farmers' argument was used by the hon. Member for East Sussex (Mr. Gregory), and the hon. Member for York (Mr. Leeman); and I am very sorry that the hon. Member for the latter constituency is prevented from being present in the House by illness. Now, I wish to examine this argument in regard to the small farmers, and I should like to say what I mean by a small farmer. I would define him as a man who is something more than what we call in Scotland a crofter, but who is less than a large farmer—a man who has a pair of horses, from four to 10 cows, and some young cattle, who employs no hired labour, who is assisted by members of his family, and who, in particular, ploughs his own land. His rent may be something between £50 and £60. He is a man whose whole labour is taken up on his own land. When we come to a smaller scale of farmer, the man's whole time is not employed on his own farm. He hires himself out to work for somebody else—that is the crofter. Much has been said in praise of these small farmers, and I endorse every word of it. They are industrious and prudent, and they have done a great deal, and are doing a great deal of good in their own line. They break up rough land so as to fit it for produce, and prepare the way for those who come after them. They occupy chiefly inferior soils, and I would be the last man to propose anything to their hurt. But those very men do not think this privilege is for their benefit at all—very far from it. In the County of Aberdeen, for instance, they are a very numerous class; but if this Bill is going to be injurious to them, they would hardly have got up a Petition, as they have done, and presented it to this House in favour of the abolition of hypothec, signed by no fewer than 2,841 farmers, of whom a large proportion are of this class. Small farms are generally on poor soils. Large farms are upon better and more easily cultivated lands. That is occasioned, not through the existence of the law of hypothec, but from natural and economical reasons. A man with capital will not select a farm on a bare hill side; he rather chooses a piece of land on which he may expend his money with the greatest prospect of profit. The man with little capital, which he has saved from his labour, can only get the rougher land. Now, the abolition of the law of hypothec will not reduce the number of small farms which were not created by it; and if it does not reduce these farms, it will not reduce the number of persons who occupy them. The abolition of this law may make landlords more careful to whom they intrust their land, and I do not think that would be a disadvantage. It would prevent men with insufficient means—men of straw, who have nothing to lose—offering to take farms, knowing that they cannot pay for them, and thus forcing up the market to those who have really something to lose, and who would be steady good tenants. Farmers, whether large or small, complain that the landlord's privilege enables him to receive and accept offers from men who have not sufficient capital or credit, and I think that a very fair ground of complaint against hypothec. There is a custom peculiar to Scotland—namely, back-rent. Over the greater part of Scotland, with the exception of five counties—two in the North and three in the South West—the farmer is not expected to pay any rent until he has had time to sow, reap, and sell the first crop. That enables a man with insufficient capital to offer for a farm, trusting to have a good harvest in the first year. If he has a good harvest, he gets on; but if he has not, he gets into difficulties; and not only does the farmer and the landlord suffer, but everybody else connected with him. I believe that if the custom, with regard to payment of rent in Scotland, was to become the same as in England and Ireland—that is to say, that a man was to pay his first half-year's rent at the end of the first half-year, it would be better for the landlord and tenant, and would put their relations on a more satisfactory footing. I have no doubt that if the landlord's privilege of being paid in full, whether anyone else gets anything or not, ceases entirely, the custom of back-rent will also be done away with. Another complaint is that the law of hypothec, as it stands, injures the credit of farmers with the public. I think that is the case as far as advances from the banks and other sources are concerned, and in dealing with those from whom they must buy certain articles. For instance, in the case of a failure, where the landlord is paid in full, and all the other creditors get only a dividend—not only is an injury done in the particular case, but it shakes the credit of every farmer in the neighbourhood. Farming, as carried on in Scotland, is carried on to a certain extent on credit. We know that it is a good thing to employ capital in agriculture, because it tends to increase production, and thus augments the national wealth. But this law of hypothec, injuring, as it does, the credit of the farmer, checks production; that checks the increase of national wealth, and limits the farmer's profits, and that keeps down the rent of land, and, consequently, its value. It is argued that hypothec is like other liens, and should not be an exception, and that is the subject of part of the Amendment put on the Paper by the noble Lord the Member for Haddingtonshire. The noble Lord holds that hypothec is only one of many forms of preferential security, and in his speech in 1875, he has told us, as we have often been told, that when it is proposed to modify a law which is found to press unfairly on some portion of the community, we must make a similar change in all analogous laws, although they have not been complained of. Such an argument is merely a plea for delay on the part of those who will not face the question on hand. To tell us we ought not to remedy that which the whole constituencies of Scotland consider a practical grievance, because we do not intend to make other changes which no one wants or asks for, is hardly a reasonable argument to lay before the House of Commons. I deny that this landlord's right is similar to the liens in commercial matters. But whether it is similar or not, I cannot think it is a point worth arguing at this time. What I maintain is, that as this law has been proved to be no longer beneficial to the class it was meant to benefit, it may be treated as an exception, and be dealt with as an exceptional case, and, as a grievance that has been proved, it should be remedied. It has been said, in justification of hypothec, that the landlord is a *qaasi*-partner with the tenant. I do not deny that that was the case once, but I deny that it is the case now. There was once a time when he was the owner of the entire stock and crop, and even found the seed of the farmer. But that is a long time ago. As time went on he became the tenant's sole creditor, and after that he became not the sole creditor, but the largest creditor. All that, however, is changed now. He is no longer the sole creditor. In my own district, for instance, for every £100 of rent paid by the tenant to the landlord, he spends £125 on artificial manures. What has been the result of that expenditure of the tenant's capital upon the land? I can say that, in my own case, having come into possession of my estate nearly 40 years ago, its value now is 50 per cent higher than it was under my predecessor. That has been caused, to a considerable extent, by the amount spent on the land by the tenants in manure, and so forth. No doubt, that is the case also in a great part of Scotland, especially on light lands, and it is of them I am speaking. Light lands, by the application of artificial manures, have been forced to bear much heavier crops than ever formerly it was thought they could bear. Farmers, thus enabled to produce heavier crops, have been enabled to pay much higher rents; and while the landlord's condition has been much improved, the farmer's position has improved to a much greater extent. They are living in a higher social position, and in much more affluence than they were a number of years ago. [Lord ELCHO: Under hypothec?] In spite of hypothec. The landlords of late years, instead of finding capital for the farming of the soil, have really been employing capitalists to cultivate it for them. Seed, implements, labour, and manure, as well as the surface of the ground, go to the making of the crops; and I do not think it is unfair, in the change of circumstances which have arisen of late years, that the landlord should be placed in the same position as other creditors. It is said that if the change should be made in the law of Scotland, which is now proposed, a a change must be made in the law of distress in England. [" Hear, hear!"] I do not agree with the hon. Member in his cheer. Who asks for a change in the law of distress in England? The landlords do not ask for it; the English farmers have have not asked for it. Therefore, there seems no occasion for making such an alteration until the circumstances of the country demand it. When a change takes place in England to the extent it has taken place in Scotland, English Members will undoubtedly come down to this House and make the same demand that the Scotch Members are now making. When the circumstances of the English farmers change as the circumstances of the Scotch farmers have done, they will send Representatives who will advocate their views and carry them out. Until they do that, I do not think anyone need be anxious about the law of distress in England. I know that during this debate I shall be met with the Report of the Select Committee of the House of Lords which sat in 1869. Well, that Report was against any further change in the law at present. The House will remember that a law was passed in 1867 very much modifying what had before been the law on this question, and the amending law had had a very short trial when the House of Lords reported that it was not desirable then to make a change. But 10 years have elapsed since then, and during the time this law has been upon its trial, it has not satisfied the wants of the people, and, having been found wanting, they are asking that a further change should be made. As to the Report, I am not saying anything disrespectful to the noble Lords who formed the Committee in expressing the opinion that their Report was a foregone conclusion. They were all large landholders in Scotland; their opinions were settled before they entered upon the investigation of the question, and no one could have expected them to report otherwise than they did. If that Report were submitted to the constituencies of Scotland, I do not think we should find one constituency which would agree with the conclusions in it. I may now say a few words on the Bill which it is my duty to introduce. It is a similar Bill to that which was before the House last year. The 1st clause abolishes the landlord's exclusive right to hypothec for land rental, either for agriculture or pasture. But there is a Proviso reserving all the rights under existing leases, contracts, or bargains. It is proposed that the Act should come into force at Martinmas—that is, the 11th November next year. The reason for that is that if it is passed into law it will give 12 months to landlords and tenants to consider the matter, and those landlords or tenants who are not under leases can make any arrangement at the end of the year they think fit. The 2nd clause is rather technical in its expression. It has reference to the law known in Scotland as the Act of Sederunt, 1756. If the landlord's right of hypothec is taken away, and if the tenant does not pay his rent at the end of the six months at which it is due, the landlord will have no right at present to take any steps against him until other six months have expired. Under this Act, after twelve months have elapsed, he may take him before the Sheriff's Court, and call upon him to find security for that year and for the next five years. This is the law as it stands, and the 2nd clause of my Bill is to shorten the period mentioned in the Act from twelve months to six months, and to give power, if security is not found, for the removal of the tenant. It does seem hard that the tenant should be able to remain in possession of his land without fulfilling his part of the bargain, and it does appear to me that if the House removes the privilege of the landlord to hypothec, it is only fair to provide that the landlord may not be unjustly kept out of his land by the tenant who occupies it. This clause was in the Amendment which I proposed to the Agricultural Holdings Bill in 1876. I offer this Bill as a solution of the difficulty, believing it to be a fair compromise between the conflicting demands of interested parties. The Bill, therefore, is to carry out two objects—to take away the preferential right which a landlord has to be paid in full for the use of the surface of the ground, while other creditors who contribute as much as he to the raising of the crop only get, in the event of a failure, a dividend on their debts; and, on the other hand, to enable the landlord to come into possession of his land as soon as his tenant fails to fulfil his part of the bargain. If those two objects are not carried out by the Bill now in the hands of the House, I shall be ready to accept any Amendment which the right hon. and learned Lord Advocate or any other Member may propose, that will more thoroughly carry out its object. I propose that the Bill be now read a second time. I am glad to think it will be supported by the right hon. and learned Gentleman.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."—(*Mr. Vans Agnew.*)

LORD ELCHO, in rising to move the following Amendment:—

"That, inasmuch as the Law of Hypothec is the equivalent in Scotland of the English and Irish Law of distress, and inasmuch as many other examples of preferential security over property being given in certain circumstances to particular creditors are to be found in the commercial Law of this and other Nations, this subject, if dealt with at all by Parliament, should be considered as a whole, and not be treated locally and exceptionally as in the present Bill; and in dealing with this subject due consideration should be given to the fact that the preferential security for payment of rent which landlords have from time immemorial enjoyed at Common Law, regulated by the State, has, to the great advantage of the Nation, enabled many industrious and enterprising men of small means to obtain farms and rise in the world, which otherwise they could not have done,"

said, it had not been his intention to take any prominent part in this discussion; and he had still no wish, amongst Scotch Members who were better acquainted with subject than he was, to enter into any lengthened discussion upon the Bill. The subject was a very old one. That was the day upon which the Wigtonshire annual came into full bloom. The hon. Member had told them how the question had been agitated for some 20 years, how they had Motions made upon it in the House, how Royal Commissions had reported, how Bills had been founded on their Reports, how a Committee of the House of Lords had also inquired into the subject; how, finally, several abortive efforts had been made to get the House to deal with it. The hon. Member told them of the perverse fortune that had followed him last year in dealing with this subject. He had the greatest difficulty, they all knew, in getting a day; and having got a day, those Scotch Members who were now all so anxious to have this Bill passed, which was to take away the preferential right of the landlord, were not present, and the House was counted out. How did they account for that? When they contrasted the facts, that these Scotch Members could not be found last year when they were wanted, and were there in such numbers now, they would see that this was something like a Dissolution muster. The fact that a Dissolution was not so remote in 1879 as it was in 1878 might have had something to do with it. His hon. Friend's Bill was as good last year as it was this; his arguments were as sound last year as they were this; yet, while he got no countenance last year, he found himself supported by a vast majority of Scotch Members now. His hon. Friend tried to sneer at his Resolution. The question of urban hypothec was, the hon. Member thought, a matter which ought separately to be dealt with. But what happened last year? They had now sitting opposite them the hon. and gallant Member for Kincardineshire (General Sir George Balfour). The hon. and gallant Member had not been so long trained in the mysteries of Parliamentary tactics and procedure in reference to Bills before them as some other Members; and, consequently, brought a comparatively virgin mind to deal with this subject—and, he might add, a thoroughly logical and intelligent mind. What did he do last year—did he bring in such a Bill as this Wigtonshire annual? Not at all. He brought in a Bill, the object of which was to deal not with the preferential security that the landlord had in land only, but to deal with the preferential security of the landlord in houses as well. That was a consistent and honest and straightforward policy; but he was earwigged by all the burgh Members in Scotland—by the hon. Member for Edinburgh (Mr. M'Laren), no doubt, and by the hon. Member for Glasgow (Mr. Anderson), who were all horror-struck—who said—"You do not mean to say that you are going to repeal the right of hypothec of landlords in towns! What would become of the artizans?"—who, by-the-bye, were equivalent to the small tenants in the country — "they won't be able to get lodgings at any price. This will never do. You must withdraw this Bill." The hon. and gallant Member was amenable to these views, expressed to him so forcibly in the Lobby of the House privately, and illogically withdrew the Bill he had logically tabled, and he (Lord Elcho) now ventured to take the view taken by his hon. and gallant Friend last year. It was not only a logical carrying out of this Bill, but it was more consistent with justice than this Bill; and if it were true that the Lord Advocate was going to give his support to this mode of dealing with the preferential claims of landlords, that Bill of the hon. and gallant Member was more consistent with statesmanship, and more just than this "Parliamentary expediency" method of dealing with the question. He (Lord Elcho) had, in the Resolution which was proposed—rather a long one—["Hear, hear!"] laid down what was the sound principle on this subject. He heard a cheer when he spoke about it being a long one; but he was not then addressing them merely as Scotchmen. It was an English and Irish as well as a Scotch question, and English and Irish Members came down usually to that House at 6 o'clock, knowing nothing of what had taken place, and it was necessary to explain to them in the question before the House what they were really dealing with. Therefore, he had put it in plain language — showing that the law of distress was in principle the same as the more classic term of the law of hypothec. What did this Resolution say? It affirmed three facts. It affirmed that the Law of Hypothec in Scotland was equivalent to the English and Irish law of distress. There could be no dispute about that. It might possibly be necessary to make some little changes, to which he would have no objection, in order to make the law absolutely identical in the two countries; but it was a fact that the law of hypothec was practically identical with the law of distress. The second fact affirmed was that this preferential security was to be found in other things besides land. [Mr. J. W. BARCLAY dissented.] The hon. Member for Forfarshire (Mr. J. W. Barclay), who sat opposite him, shook his head at that; but what was the case? He believed the hon. Gentleman opposite farmed, or did farm, and he remembered hearing him give evidence as an agricultural tenant before a Game Law Committee, and heard from him many very wonderful things. In fact, great sport was afforded to them on that occasion by the hon. Gentleman. It appeared that the hon. Member had ceased to be a farmer now, but he had not ceased to be a shipowner; and had he not a lien upon the cargo carried in his ships if the shipping dues were not paid? If that was so, then he (Lord Elcho) could not understand the shake of the head of the hon. Member; and he was justified in saying that this law applying to land applied to houses and ships and other things as well. But, upon this point, he thought he could bring into court even greater authority upon this question than the hon. Member for Forfarshire. It was an opinion given in a speech upon this very point of the general application of liens and the application of the law of distress on property of debtors on the part of the owners—given, not by the present Lord Advocate, but by the present Lord Moncreiff, whom they all loved, when Lord Advocate of the Liberal Government of those days. They had advanced very fast since then; but in the Liberal Government of those days, hypothec repeal was a question which, when raised, was always spoken against by the Liberal Lord Advocate, who laid down principles in the matter which he believed to be sound in themselves, and which were laid down without any regard to temporary political expediency. What did the then Lord Advocate say? As to the present one, he would not believe it, until he heard it from himself, that the Lord Advocate of a Conservative Government was going, as they were told, to support this revolutionary Bill. For, unquestionably, it was a complete revolution as regards the position of owners of property in land. Lord Moncreiff said—

> As to preferential claims, they were not peculiar to the Law of Hypothec. Instances of them are in existence, and in the laws respecting commerce and manufactures there were numerous cases of lien, rights of redemption, which really amount to just as much in giving preference to one creditor over another as the Law of Hypothec in Scotland did. As regards landlords, the principle of the law is, where the risk is more than commensurate with the interest, then the law gives unusual facilities to recover the claim."

That principle, going through a variety of cases, reasonably applied to the subject let by the landlord, whose means of subsistence from year to year depended upon his rents. When they talked about putting landlords and creditors upon the same footing, they left out of consideration the fact that creditors for manure, corn, or anything else, could ask for the money due on delivery. But the rent, unless they had fore-rent, was not payable in many cases for a considerable time after the tenant got possession of the land; and, further, the landlord, even though he did not get his rent, was liable for all the burdens on land. Not so the corn merchant. He could take the money he got abroad, but the landlord was solely responsible for these burdens. They had very clear evidence given upon this point by Mr. Murray, one of the Commissioners of 1865, before the House of Lords in 1869. In answer to the Question—

> "In Scotland, is not the landlord liable for county rates?"—he replied "Yes." Q. "For half the poor rates?"—A. "Yes." Q. "For the repair of churches and manses?"—A. "Yes." Q. "For ministers' stipends?"—A. "Yes." Q. "For schoolmasters' salaries?"—A. "Yes." Q. "And for repairs of schoolhouses?"—A. "Yes."

And he might have added, had it been in this year instead of 1869—"and for the repair of roads under the Road Act?"

> Q. "Supposing that the Law of Hypothec was abolished, and the tenant became landlord, would he not be liable in all these cases, even if he did not get a penny of rent?"—A. "Yes."

Where, then, was the similarity between the cases of the dealers in manures and corn and the landlords? Mr. Murray further said, as the result of calculation embracing different parts of the country, and taking the average of the rent of the previous 10 years, he found that these burdens were 8½ per cent upon the gross rental. He (Lord Elcho) believed that it would, in all probability, be found that they made up at least 10½ per cent upon the gross rental now. There was thus a broad distinction between the cases; and, therefore, in dealing with this question, they ought to deal with it generally, if they dealt with it all. He came now to another argument, and he thought it a very strong one—the usage which prevailed in foreign countries. Now, they heard a great deal about the injustice of this law—that it was a barbarous one, which had been left to them from Roman times; and if they were to judge from the wonderful document which the Chamber of Agriculture of Scotland had presented to the House last year, this law was the cause of the decline and fall of the Roman Empire. They began their Petition with the most astounding statement—in fact, speaking as it were with the authority of a page of Gibbon, that the fall of the Roman Empire was entirely owing to the Law of Hypothec. In an Appendix to the Report to which he referred, and which he did not think received sufficient attention, they would find what was the rule in foreign countries. In Austria, landlords had a preference over other creditors. In Baden it was the same. In Bavaria it was likewise the same, though there the preference varied to some extent. In Poland this law rested upon the Common Law. In Belgium it was the same, and they could claim rent for three years back. In Germany this preference rested upon the general body of the Prussian Law. All agreed in granting a preference. In Darmstadt it was the same; in Radical France, which had come through so many revolutions, the landlord had a right of hypothec, and the *Code Napoleon*, it was well known, was founded on the Roman law. In France there was no agitation on the subject, not even by Gambetta. What was the reason of this difference between France and Scotland? In Scotland the landowners were few, and the tenants were many; but in France the tenants were comparatively few, and the landowners many; and so the farmers were agitating against the landlords on this question, and getting the support of so many Scotch Members as against the landlord. This, however, the farmers should bear in mind, when they looked on what was going on in the course of their Parliamentary history. They ought to remember the great fact that they had had a Liberal Lord Advocate resisting this Bill, while now they were told a Conservative Lord Advocate was going to support it; and they might depend upon it, when the time came that the agricultural labourer was enfranchised, and bore to the farmer the same relative position that the tenant-farmer did now to the landlord, this was as certain as that the sun would rise to-morrow—though in London they might not see it—that there would be hon. Members—God forbid that he should say that it would be the case with any hon. Members who were now sitting there — but when that day came, there would be hon. Members who would be found to take up the case of the labourer as against the tenant-farmer, just as there were Members now to take up the case of the Scotch farmer against the landlord. A Law of Hypothec existed also in the free City of Hamburgh; in Hesse it was the same; and it was the same in that country which, if they were to believe an article written by the late Prime Minister in a magazine lately, England would follow her in decadence—Holland. In fact, the state of the law in Holland was similar to that in Scotland before they amended it in the latter country in 1869. In Italy they had a law, giving security to the landlord, which was adopted from the *Code Napoleon.* In Saxe-Coburg, if they had not preferential security, the rent was generally paid half-yearly or quarterly, and was secured to the landlord. In Saxony there was a preferential claim to the landlord. In fact, Wurtemburg was the only Vans Agnewed country in Europe—the only country in which there was no preference given to the landlord; and he wished the hon. Member joy of this solitary example in favour of his legislation. Even in America, what was the state of things? There was a preference given in the States of Alabama, Georgia, and Pennsylvania; whilst in New York the landlord was on the same footing as other creditors; but by attachment a preference might be acquired even there. That was the state of things in Europe, and also in America; and he ventured to think that this Law of Hypothec could not be so iniquitous, impolitic, and injurious a law as it was said to be in this document from the Scottish Chamber of Agriculture, or it would not have been found pervading all Europe, and even still holding its own in America. So much for the first part of his Resolution. If they dealt with this question, which involved great principles of legislation permeating their whole commercial legislation, it ought to be dealt with in a statesmanlike way, and not in an isolated and exceptional way, as this Bill proposed to deal with it. They ought not to have one law singled out for abolition, without a regard to the general principle on which their legislation ought to be conducted. He therefore proceeded in his Resolution to say that it was not expedient to make this change. What was the object of all their legislation with regard to the land and farming? It was for the benefit of agriculture. It was not for the benefit of the individual farmer, or it ought not to be, at least. It ought not to be for the benefit of the landlord, but ought to be for the benefit of the nation, by producing the greatest amount of crops in the best way. Granting this, however, was it necessary to abolish this law in Scotland? The barren moors and hills had been subdued and reclaimed, until the agriculture of Scotland was a bye-word for its excellence, and all that, they must remember, had been effected under this very law. They might say it was in spite of it if they chose; but it was quite as open for him to say that it was in consequence of it. They, at any rate, agreed that it was concurrently with this law, if not in consequence of it, that this state of things had been produced. The hon. Member for Wigtownshire had described the state of his own estate as that of a perfect garden, until they might almost expect the shares of the railways would rise, owing to the number of persons who would flock to see it when his speech was read. His interpretation that it was in consequence of hypothec was a natural one. He wanted no more than this admission. He said that if they looked to the condition of the country—and he was, indeed, willing to accept the statement of his hon. Friend as to the condition of his own farm—they had every reason to be satisfied; and how had that happy state of Scotland been brought about? This brought him now to the latter part of his Resolution. It had been brought about, he asserted, by the industry and enterprize of their farmers; but it was not by the large farmers alone. No doubt, in his own county, large farmers, by their industry and enterprize, were doing, and had done, much in the way of reclamation of waste land; but this subduing of the hills and moors of Scotland had been done by the small farmers generally. It had been done by the little men who had risen from the rank of peasants. They got a horse and cart, and took a bit of land, and rose gradually, until they had become great and wealthy men. All through the evidence presented to the Commission, they had this shown as the great characteristic of Scotland—that men had raised themselves by small means to become farmers of the largest holdings. They might take the case of Mr. George Hope as an example. He believed that his father began in a very small way, and he himself eventually became one of the greatest farmers, and, after having retired from farming, was enabled to become the proprietor of two estates in Peeblesshire. What did the Committee say upon this subject? They said that the evidence taken both in the present and former inquiries was conclusive as to the fact that the law of hypothec afforded facilities, by which industrious and intelligent men raised themselves from very humble positions to those of prosperous farmers. There were many instances of shepherds and agricultural labourers raising themselves to the comfortable position of tenant-farmers by the facilities afforded them of obtaining land, which they could not have had but for the Law of Hypothec, and the Commission said that there could be no greater mistake than to withdraw these facilities from such men. The late Lord Dalhousie and the Duke of Argyll, Liberal statesmen, always spoke in the same way. He (Lord Elcho) therefore held, looking to the interests and safety of the State, that there could be no greater misfortune than that they should have only two classes in it—the large landlords, who were the owners, and the large tenants, who were the occupiers of the soil. This would be the result if they were to drive out of the market, as must invariably be the case if they abolished this law, the small and industrious farmer, and prevented him from rising. In the far North there had been a great deal of waste lands transformed into the richest corn land in Scotland or Great Britain. This land had been given to these small farmers for nothing for a certain number of years. They afterwards held it for a small rent, and gradually increased the rent until it returned a fair amount. In this way, improving tenants were gradually enabled to take into their hands farms of rich alluvial land. That was a sound system. They had it on evidence that could not be denied that if this law was abolished landlords, in their own defence, instead of giving 12 months', 18 months', or two years' credit to their tenants, would be obliged to fore-rent, and possibly combine farms together, and turn comparatively small holdings into large grazing farms, and thus there would be a monopoly created on the part of the big farmers to the injury of the small farmers. That was not to be desired, and he questioned whether fore-rents would be of advantage. He was sorry to say he was speaking at a time when there was great agricultural distress. These times of distress told not only upon small farmers, but upon the big farmers. Some of the latter, who were most eloquent at agricultural club meetings, were not prospering at this moment. How was the difficulty met in many cases? It was met by the landlords, who could afford to show consideration for their tenantry, giving them two or three months' grace when their rent became due. But pass this law, and they could not do that, and when bad times came again—and let them not think the passing of this law would prevent them from having periodical recurrences of bad times—they would not be able to attribute these bad times to the Law of Hypothec, as he did not doubt would be done in the course of this debate, and they would suffer from the impossibility of landlords showing this consideration to their tenants. Fore-rents would take an enormous sum out of the pockets of the tenants. When this question was first mooted, and the antidote of fore-rent was mentioned, there was a howl of indignation in *The North British Agriculturist*, or somewhere. It was said—

> "Is it possible that the landlords of Scotland can be so hard-hearted as to fine their tenants £8,000,000 by compelling them to pay fore-handed?"

He had a letter from Mr. Murray, Crown Agent, who gave evidence before the Lords. He said he had seen it stated that the effects of the abolition of hypothec would be to make the tenants pay two rents in one year, which practically meant a disbursement to the extent of £7,000,000. Looking to all these questions, he (Lord Elcho) thought it was not expedient in the national interest to make this change. If it were to be made at all, it ought to be made on some broad principles; and they ought to consider its bearings in other countries as well as their own before they thought of making it. His hon. Friend the Member for East Sussex (Mr. Gregory) had put an Amendment on the Paper, to which he had not the least objection. His hon. Friend proposed that the law ought to be maintained and assimilated to the law of England. There might be things in the law of England which it might be desirable to adopt in the Scotch law, and there might be things in the Scotch law which it might be desirable to put into the English law. He had no objection, therefore, in the least, to the Amendment, or to the assimilation of the law of the three countries. He had to apologize for the want of preparation in his speech; but he had to say that it was only two days ago that he determined to speak upon the subject, and since coming to that determination his time had been very much occupied. Monday, for instance, was spent in witnessing the tenacity of one Irish Member, and the skill in anatomizing of another, who occupied seven hours with one item in the Estimates.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, Order!

LORD ELCHO said, he would not, indeed, have spoken, if he had not heard that Her Majesty's Government were going to support this Bill. He owned that he heard that with great astonishment, because he ventured to think that if this question was to be dealt with, as he had said already, it ought to have been dealt with on some broader principles than those of Party and political expediency. It must, he was afraid, be under pressure of political expediency that the Government were acting. The principle of the matter at issue remained absolutely unchanged. Nothing had occurred in any way to alter or change the character of the Act they were proposing to repeal; and when he reminded them that so late as the year 1875 the Government opposed this Bill, and that 19 Members of the Government, besides three Members of the House, who were not then in the Government but were so now, had resisted the abolition of the Act, he thought he had shown grounds for his assertion that it was on political expediency that they were proceeding. He should be glad to hear what light had suddenly dawned on the Treasury Bench which was not brightly shining on them in the year 1875, and what the possible reason of it could be which had induced 19 Gentlemen—Cabinet Ministers and others—who had voted against the abolition of this Act, now to vote in favour of its abolition. Far be it from him to lecture, or presume to say anything approaching a lecture, to the Lord Advocate, the Treasury Bench, or any other Gentlemen in the House. But he could not help thinking that the reason for this sudden change of opinion was the Mid-Lothian Election that was impending; but he ventured to say that, by doing what they were doing, by being untrue to their former convictions on the subject, they would not retain a seat in Scotland they would not otherwise have retained, nor would they gain a seat which otherwise they would not have gained. On the contrary, if they had resisted this as a Government, and if every Scotch Member had voted against the Government and carried it, what would the position of these Members have been on the hustings? They could have said—"We have had the courage to go against our own Government, and we have passed this law, abolished hypothec in spite of them." He thought their position would have been better. Each Government had a *raison d'etre*, and the *raison d'etre* of the Conservative Government was not to give way to the passing blasts of political expediency, but to take their stand on sound principles of legislation. He ventured to think that the country, when it refused to return a majority to the late Government and put the present Ministry in Office, did so in the belief that they had secured a Government which would have the moral courage to resist what were called "popular cries," which were founded, in many cases, on wrong principles, and that they would have had some bulwark upon which they could rely. But even granting that this change of policy on the part of the Conservative Government did secure them the Election in Mid-Lothian, or a gain of a seat somewhere else, that would be a very trifling gain compared with the loss which would attend the loss of confidence on the part of the country in a Conservative Government. This matter would affect not only Scotland, but the whole of the country. He, therefore, begged to move the Resolution which stood in his name.

Mr. BAILLIE COCHRANE, in seconding the Amendment, said, he wished to guard hon. Members against any false impression which they might have received from the speech of his hon. Friend who introduced the question. One of his observations was that the Scotch landlords were in favour of this Bill ——[Mr. Vans Agnew: I said nothing of the sort.] The Scotch proprietors and Scotch gentlemen who were in favour of it were those who were standing for Scotch constituencies. It was thought very convenient to count out the Bill last Session, and doubtless his hon. Friend knew it would be counted out——[Mr. Vans Agnew: No, no.] Well, then, he might have known it, and the fact that it was counted out then, and that they had now such a muster of Members, was a clear indication, as had been pointed out, that they were approaching a General Election. They knew what this Bill was. It was the thumbscrew applied by the Scotch constituencies to candidates. Let them ask any gentleman connected with Scotland, who was not standing for a Scotch constituency, and he would tell them that it was not necessary. Why, then, were Scotch Members made by absolute compulsion to support this measure? He was sorry, he must say, that the extreme Liberalism which was prevalent in Scotland had devised this as the first blow that was to be made against the agricultural interest, and they believed this Bill was a crucial test to their Scotch Members. His hon. Friend who moved the second reading of the measure had said that agriculture was very prosperous in Scotland. It was, no doubt, the fact that Scotch farming was a model of farming, and was praised everywhere; but this pre-eminence in the face of Europe had been maintained under the Law of Hypothec. This was not a question merely affecting landlords. As landowners they could protect themselves. If a farm went into the market, instead of giving a year and a-half to tenants in which to pay their rent, they had only to make them give security for the money before they entered the farm, or make them pay in advance. But it was a most important question as affecting the improvement of small farms, and the improvement of small farmers. If they carried a Bill like this, they would undoubtedly make a monopoly of farming. It would be surprising to him if the Liberal Party—the English Liberal Party—were to think of supporting a Bill of this kind, which was really to give the land in monopoly to the large farmers, and to turn out a most valuable class of men who had laboured so admirably, and had raised themselves, as the small farmers in Scotland had done. He thought it was one of the worst signs of the times that this Bill should be so universally supported by candidates on the hustings. He was sorry to hear that the Lord Advocate and the Government had changed opinions upon it. He knew that it was a great cry in Scotland—a great Liberal cry—and that the Government hoped to gain support by supporting this Bill. He, therefore, appealed now to the English Members to listen to people who were well acquainted with Scotland, who had Scotch property and Scotch interests, and who were not Scotch candidates—and he thought they would agree with them that, if the House passed such a Bill as this, they would inflict a great blow on agriculture in Scotland, and would do great injury to that admirable class in the country—namely, the small tenant farmers.

Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "inasmuch as the Law of Hypothec is the equivalent in Scotland of the English and Irish Law of distress, and inasmuch as many other examples of preferential security over property being given in certain circumstances to particular creditors are to be found in the commercial Law of this and other Nations, this subject, if dealt with at all by Parliament, should be considered as a whole, and not be treated locally and exceptionally as in the present Bill; and in dealing with this subject due consideration should be given to the fact that the preferential security for payment of rent which landlords have from time immemorial enjoyed at Common Law, regulated by Statute, has, to the great advantage of the Nation, enabled many industrious and enterprising men of small means to obtain farms and rise in the world, which otherwise they could not have done,"—(*Lord Elcho*,)

—instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

VISCOUNT MACDUFF said, he would like, with the indulgence of the House, to say a few words on this question, though he confessed that he felt almost ashamed to have to go through some arguments which had been so often brought forward, and, he might add, pretty well hammered out from every point of view. He was glad to think that, by a slow and mysterious process of evolution, all Her Majesty's Government had now gradually emerged into the condition of full-fledged supporters of the abolition of hypothec. The noble Lord said he was sorry to see they had made use again this afternoon of the old argument about the small tenants. He recollected, when this question was last brought forward, four years ago, it was said that hypothec was necessary to prop up the small tenants. He did not believe anything of the kind, and must confess that he had always been rather amused at his noble Friend (Lord Elcho), and those who thought with him upon this question, being so thoughtful as to take the small farmers under their wing. It had always been a stock argument with those who thought with the noble Lord on this question to say that the abolition of hypothec would extinguish the small tenant, and that it should, therefore, be maintained on grounds of general expediency. He could not agree to anything of the kind. He yielded to none in his appreciation of the work done in Scotland by small tenant-farmers. He had had practical experience himself of their energy, enterprize, and frugality; which had converted acres of wild morass or stony hillsides into fertile corn fields. But could anyone seriously maintain that these admirable qualities had been brought out by the Law of Hypothec? He believed that they would have existed if the Law of Hypothec had never been heard of. He was quite ready to admit that the Law of Hypothec was of use in a remote period, when the landlord and tenant were on an entirely different footing; but all that made this law then necessary had long since passed away. One was told often, and he had even heard it in that House, that the Law of Hypothec must be maintained in order to protect the poorer class of farmers against the richer. That seemed a very attractive argument. For his own part, he rejoiced to see a large number of small tenants. But was it seriously meant that their legislation was intended to encourage men without capital to take farms? Surely such an argument was at variance with every sound economic and commercial principle, and would, if pushed to its logical conclusion, land them into rank socialism. It came to this—that the economic advantages of capital were so unfair that they required this law to counter-balance and nullify them; and he did not think that, in spite of able advocacy opposite, the House of Commons would be found to support such a view. What was wanted in Scotland was not a large class of small impoverished farmers, dependent for their very being on their landlord, and living only in his approving smile, but a class of farmers, whether large or small, who should be independent men, possessed of energy and enterprize, and not beholden to their landlords for the capital with which they cultivated the soil. He did not mean to imply that farms should be held only by large capitalists, but that farms, whether they were of 20 or 1,000 acres, should be held by men whose capital bore a fitting proportion to the land they rented; and when he heard of hypothec helping the small tenants, he could not help thinking that those who advanced such arguments were fondly dreaming of the feudal days, when the farmer, recognizing in his landlord his only means of subsistence, looked up to him for everything, and was in fact, if not in name, little better than a serf. If landlords were so solicitous as some seemed to think for the multiplication of small farmers, why did they not proceed to divide their present holdings into small ones, and thus encourage so worthy a class? But he saw no such tendency, and could not help thinking that this argument of the "small tenants" had been ingeniously dragged forward to cover an unpopular and untenable position. It was almost an insult to Scotch farmers to say, as he had often heard it said, that agriculture in Scotland could only flourish when bolstered up by the antiquated Law of Hypothec. He had said before that the fullest possible concession ought to be made to the utility of this law in remote times. It had rendered undeniable services to agriculture when it was in its infancy, and when the landlord was virtually the tenant's only creditor. But now-a-days circumstances had entirely changed. The landlord was now no longer the only creditor of his tenant. In very many cases he was far from being the largest creditor, and farmers had frequently told him that their manure bill was often double their rents. Indeed—and this was an argument which did not appear to have been sufficiently appreciated—while other creditors, in dealing with a farmer, risked, not unfrequently, a considerable portion of their capital, the landlord could, in the nature of things, risk no more than the interest on his—namely, the rent of his land. But the anomaly of this law was that it gave a preference claim to the landlord over all other creditors, which must necessarily diminish the credit of the farmer with his banker and the general public. Now, his noble Friend laid some stress upon preferential security being given over other sorts of property. This might be advisable under certain circumstances; but, unless it was specially desired by both parties, it ought not to be maintained, save on some ground of general expediency, and none such was found to exist in favour of hypothec. As for landlords, he maintained that they did not want this law, and upon well-managed estates it was rarely, if ever, put in force. Were it abolished to-morrow, ample securities of another kind might be easily devised. In letting a farm a landlord ought to look to the means of the applicant; and it was neither to his interest, nor to that of the tenants, still less to that of the land, to encourage men of insufficient means to take farms, relying upon this Law of Hypothec to see them through. He was told that the difficulty of settling this question arose from the inconvenience of making a different law for Scotland from that which obtained in England. That was the gist of the argument of the hon. Member for East Sussex (Mr. Gregory), as developed in his Amendment. He did not pretend to be well versed in the opinion of England on that question, though he noticed, a short while ago, that, in a speech at a Chamber of Agriculture in an Eastern county, a proposal was made to do away with the law of distress. He did not presume to offer any opinion on this subject to English farmers; but he viewed the question as a purely Scotch one, which ought to be settled on principles thoroughly understood and appreciated in Scotland. Precedents were not wanting for introducing Bills applying to one Kingdom only, or different Bills on the same subject for each Kingdom. An Agricultural Holdings Bill was brought in for Scotland separate from that which was passed for England, and a Game Act had actually been passed for Scotland without a similar measure being proposed for England. Athough, on principle, he should always be happy to see the laws of the two Kingdoms assimilated, yet, until the assimilation could be brought about, he did not think that the House need be moved by any such consideration from giving its assent to the measure now before it. This was a time of general and wide-spread depression in the country, and prices were not likely to rule for some time to come in favour of the agricultural classes. He could not help thinking that it was a propitious moment to remove an old long-standing grievance, and to settle the question in a manner which had been approved over and over again by a practically unanimous vote of the Scotch people.

SIR GEORGE DOUGLAS said, he had much pleasure in supporting the Bill of the hon. Member for Wigtownshire, not under compulsion, but because he felt convinced that the time had come when agricultural hypothec should be abolished in Scotland. Scotchmen had now had many years' experience of that law, and he could not but observe that the feeling of objection to hypothec was much stronger and more universal now than formerly. The present landowners of Scotland were, he believed, quite indifferent as to its continuance, while the majority of the tenant-farmers felt it to be a great drawback to their credit and their interests; and in times of general depression like the present, when a succession of unfavourable seasons, bad crops, and trade crises were taking place, they had difficulty in getting those temporary advances from bankers which were a great help to the farmers. Owing to the climate and the geographical formation of the country, the extent of land capable of cultivation in Scotland was very limited, and the demand for farms and agricultural produce had yearly increased. The discoveries of science were extensively applied to husbandry, and had enabled farmers to obtain much larger returns from the soil than formerly was possible; but this could only be done by great efforts. It must not be forgotten that prices had risen of late years. From inquiries which he made a few years ago in the East of Scotland, he found that the expenditure for feeding stock, artificial manure, and seeds, not including labour and machinery, in many cases exceeded the rent paid, and in others approached the amount. On one farm rented at £600, these expenses amounted to £670, while the bill for labour, manual and horse, was about £800. On a farm which had a rent of £1,500 a sum of £1,100 was paid for artificial manures, seeds, &c., and £1,400 for labour. On a farm worth £1,700 the cost was £1,900 and £1,600. These figures were taken from farms, the leases of which were generally about half run, and where no excessive improvements had been carried on. He had other figures which it was unnecessary to trouble the House with; but he might say that on a rental of £12,500 no less than £11,500 was spent in manures, &c., and £11,700 for labour. With this knowledge of the expenses of carrying on a farm, it could scarcely be shown that the law should be maintained, however useful it might have been in bygone times, when capital was scarcely known among the farmers of Scotland, when small holdings were the rule, and when the circumstances of agriculture were totally different from those of the present day. Why the interests of the landowners should be protected against those of other creditors, without whose assistance the tenant would not be able to extract from the soil sufficient to pay his rent, he did not know. It was quite true that the landowner had probably the principle interest in the farmer's credit. That he and his tenant were bound together for a period of years, while the labourer, after his engagement for the year was over, was free to seek fresh employment elsewhere, and while the seed merchant and the implement maker need not again transact business with a farmer who was not a good customer. On the other hand, the landowner under present circumstances, when so much was demanded from farmers, required no law to protect his interests. He always had it in his power to make searching inquiry into the antecedents of anyone who offered for his land, and to make stringent conditions as to its management. Sequestrations for rent were not common in ordinary years in Scotland, and when they did occur it was frequently on estates where the owners had not taken precautions in the selection of their tenants, who had been men who offered high rents, but who were unacquainted with farming, and fell behind in the first or second season. No doubt, the present system of hypothec did tempt men to offer higher money, and induce them to take larger farms than their means would warrant. On many farms, he believed, the terms were now being advanced. Under a proper system there should be no accumulation of arrears, and hypothec would be unnecessary. In his own district they had an excellent system of long leases, and the only protection they required was some protection from ground game, and the abolition of hypothec.

SIR EDWARD COLEBROOKE said, he was anxious to avail himself of this opportunity to state to the hon. Member who had brought forward this proposition, that the proposal he had made opened fair ground for a settlement of the question. He was anxious also to bring back the House to the propositions the hon. Member made at the close of his speech, and to leave out what constituted the staple of the hon. Member's speech as to the defects of the law. He had always felt that there were some defects in the law. With these views, he came down to the House without any knowledge as to the course the Government were about to take, or without any clear knowledge of what views the hon. Gentleman was about to advance. He had endeavoured to study the 2nd clause, and to see what the power remaining to the landlord would be under that proposition. Not being a lawyer, he was unsuccessful; but what he understood the proposition now to be was that the hon. Member would give greater effect to a law some 200 or 300 years old. Whatever might be the defects of that law, the principle of it was worthy of consideration, and he would advise those who had hitherto opposed this Bill to waive their objections to it, on condition that they should obtain security for their rent; and, secondly, some reasonable process for terminating the lease in case of the tenant being unable to carry out its due provisions. These conditions were essential to the abolition of hypothec. If hypothec was abolished, it became necessary to protect the honest man against the bad, and to that end there should be a law to secure the payment of rent. As he understood it, the 2nd clause would give not merely the power to the Sheriff to compel the tenant to give security for his rent, but it would also give power of summary removal. That was a strong proposition, and he questioned whether the proposal now made would have exactly the same popularity as proposals for the abolition of hypothec had hitherto received. At the same time, something of that kind must be done, if they were to do justice between the parties; and without having any idea of the course the Government were going to take, his idea in coming down to the House was to get them to reconcile the law to the interests of the two parties affected. He was glad to find that the Government were about to take a step in this direction, and it seemed to him desirable that the Lord Advocate should speak as early as was consistent with his dignity, so that the House might know what they were going to vote upon. He did not agree with those who said it was within the power of the landlord to obtain any protection he pleased. No doubt, many did so on land that was not let from year to year; but on leases of farms extending over 19 years the landlord parted with his property for a term, during which, in ordinary course of nature, the tenant might in all probability change. The landlord lost his control, and could not have the same knowledge of the party who might succeed. He therefore required the protection of the law in case the farmer should not be a person who should make good use of his farm. These were reasons why he thought it was most important, if there was not preference given to the landlord, that there should be power of strictly compelling the tenant to give security without any prejudice against any other creditors. Entertaining these views, he was anxious to bring the House back to the discussion on the particular points of the Bill. He would not go into vague generalities as to the imperfection of the law and the desire to maintain the tenant's independence, but would go to what the practical effect of the proposal of the hon. Gentleman would be. He was prepared to give his support on these conditions. He could not agree with all the hon. Gentleman had said in his speech as to the grounds of objection to the existing law, though he did not dispute that they were very strongly entertained by the tenant-farmers of Scotland, that the Law of Hypothec produced undue competition, and prevented farmers from obtaining credit. All that a landlord required was to see whether the candidate for a farm was a man of good character, and whether he had stock enough for his farm. He could not say the law had encouraged the landlords to accept small tenants; but it had encouraged them to give to those tenants leases which they would not have had in former days without giving proper security. On the other hand, he admitted that when they came to examine the law, there was something to be said as to the hardship of giving preference credit to a landlord, though cases did not often occur in which the other creditors of the tenant suffered. Still, he thought, on principle, the position was not defensible. While a landlord had a right to ask that he should have security for his payment, he should have the same position as other creditors, and if he failed to support his claim in time, he must take the consequences. In this view, he thought the tenant had a right to ask of Parliament what was asked for by the hon. Gentleman. Holding that view he would appeal to Her Majesty's Government to inform the House as to what their views were, and also whether Her Majesty's Government would take the Bill themselves. It seemed to him that the hon. Gentleman (Mr. Vans Agnew) would have a very poor chance of the Bill ever coming on again except in the small hours; and if there was a reasonable prospect of a settlement he did not see why Her Majesty's Government should not seize the chance, or at all events, give a day for the discussion of the points. Because the real discussion would be in Committee. When they came to a Division, probably the second reading would be carried. What they had to decide was whether the proposition made in the Bill was a fair one. The giving of summary power of ejectment was a matter for consideration, which he would adjourn to another occasion. They ought to consider not merely what the effect of this Bill would be in Scotland, but what the effect would be in England. He did not think they could separate the agricultural and urban hypothec so distinctly as was supposed in this Bill. He represented very largely an urban constituency, and wished to see justice done to his people as well as to others, and if this Bill was passed with regard to agricultural subjects, he did not think it would be possible to resist the demands of urban tenants. He thought the alteration should be given to both. Entertaining these views, he would not oppose the second reading of this Bill.

MR. CLARE READ said, that when he last joined in a discussion on this subject he had the honour of a seat on the Treasury Bench. The noble Lord the Member for Haddingtonshire (Lord Elcho) said the Government was about to change its front, because they opposed the Bill on that occasion. They had not changed, because that was the only chance Members of the Government had in their days of liberty to speak and vote as they pleased. On that occasion, the hon. and gallant Member for Portsmouth (Sir James Elphinstone) said if hypothec was abolished there would be nothing in Scotland but a bloated aristocracy of large farmers. Of course, the jocular way in which the hon. Member said that deprived it of its sting. It was a Conservative Government in 1867 which amended the Law of Hypothec; and as he had said to the farmers of Norfolk, so he would say to the Liberal farmers of Scotland, that, after all, they got the chief part of their relief from a Conservative Government. It was said that if they passed this law, there would be no more small Scotch farmers. If it was so, it was a libel on the landlords of Scotland, as it meant that they would not be good Samaritans, would not be generous to their tenants unless they could do so with other people's money. Large farmers in England had generally the worst land, and small farmers the better land. It was often found in England that a generous landlord, wishing to make some provision for an old servant or small tradesman on the estate, intrusted him with a few acres which he was utterly incapable of managing, and it generally ended in his coming to grief. If there were more care exercised in the selection of small tenants it would be an advantage. The small farmers of Scotland had constantly petitioned the House in favour of the abolition of the Law of Hypothec, and he did not think there had been one Petition in favour of its retention. The question was one essentially of home rule. The farmers of Scotland demanded it, and he maintained that they ought to have it. When it was said that the constituencies of Scotland did not represent the small farmers, he found that the franchise was £14 rent, which would surely embrace the vast majority of small farmers. These were the men who wished that their Members, whether Liberal or Conservative, should vote for the abolition of the Law of Hypothec. As to the argument of the noble Lord that if they abolished the Law of Hypothec they would abolish the Law of Distress in England, all he could say was, that when there was the same unanimity among the farmers of England the House would grant their request. Another reason why he had changed his mind was the operation of the Agricultural Holdings Act in England. In England the farmers had simply asked that the capital employed in the cultivation of the soil should be theirs, and that they should be preserved from the ravages of ground game. They had obtained neither, nor had they been obtained for Scotland. The noble Lord said the landlord was an exceptional creditor; and so he was, for he only risked his rent, which was his interest; he could not lose his capital, which was his land. It had been said that in the farmers' clubs in England there was very little mention of the law of distress. He admitted that it was not often discussed, but whenever it had been discussed it had been condemned in its present form. He wondered his hon. Friend (Mr. Gregory), who was so anxious to perpetuate the Law of Distress, should not turn his legal mind to its improvement. The hon. Member had said, four years ago, that he thought it would be beneficial if the Law of Hypothec in Scotland could be assimilated to the Law of Distress in England; but he (Mr. Clare Read) considered the latter was worse than hypothec in Scotland. In hypothec everything was done above board, and a landlord could not move without going to a court of law; but under the Law of Distress a man might, without warning or proof, go and seize a tenant's goods, and employ for that purpose not the legitimate officer of a Court, but any trumpery vagabond out of the streets. Not only that, but he could seize for as much as six years' rent. Then the noble Lord (Lord Elcho) had said that the Law of Distress was not very generally put in force either in England or in Scotland. [Lord Elcho: I did not say so.] Then he would say it. [Lord Elcho: It is the fact.] No doubt it was, and he would rather hire a farm of his noble Friend without any formal agreement than take the most liberal lease from some other landlords; but it did not follow that the Law of Hypothec was good. On many estates, no doubt, it was not put in force; but where the landlord was very needy, or grasping and avaricious, or unjust, it was put in force to the great detriment not only of the tenant on that estate, but to the injury of agriculture by damaging the credit of tenants generally. It could not be said now, as was said four years ago, that agriculture in Scotland was very prosperous. They might not be so badly off as in England, but it was no longer true in either country that the farmers "flourished and complained." It had been urged that the landlord was a partner, who committed his capital to another for a share of the produce. That might have been a very good argument in times gone by, when the landlord found the capital, the seeds, and the stock, the tenant being a sort of serf; but circumstances were very much altered now, and the banker, merchant, seedsman, and the labourer had to be considered as well as the landlord. Rent was like the interest of money; and just as the usurer who demanded his interest in advance would not get so much as if he gave credit, so landlords, if they were to demand their rents in advance, would have to be content with less rent. He denied that the abolition of hypothec would prejudice the interests of mortgagees. As the tenant-farmers of Scotland urgently demanded this repeal, and made it a test question at Elections, he should no longer withhold his vote, but would give it cheerfully for the second reading.

Sir DAVID WEDDERBURN, in supporting the Bill, said, he wished there had been more English and Irish Members present, because he should like to draw their attention to certain facts. The history of this Bill was very instructive, as bearing—although it might only be in a minor degree, but very distinctly—on the question of Home Rule. This question of the abolition of hypothec was one regarding which the people of Scotland were at present practically unanimous; and the four hon. Gentlemen whose names appeared on the back of the Bill were Representatives of Scotch county constituencies, and sat on the Government side of the House. It was now 10 years ago since he had the honour to contest the constituency of South Ayrshire, and he was at that time in favour of the abolition of the law, while his hon. Friend who now sat for the county was against its abolition, and he believed one reason why his hon. Friend was not returned on that occasion was because he opposed that abolition. He now rejoiced to find the name of his hon. Friend on the back of this Bill, and he welcomed him as an influential convert to its principle. Now, he found there had been four Divisions within the last 10 years in this House on this subject. In 1869, the late Member for Forfarshire (Mr. Carnegie) introduced a Bill which was more sweeping in its provisions than the present Bill; and he succeeded on that occasion in obtaining 129 votes in its favour, and there were 93 recorded against it. The Ayes included 27 Scotch Members, and the Noes 22 Members. That did not argue that there was any great majority of Scotch Members in favour of the abolition of this law; but, only two years later, Mr. Carnegie took another Division on the same Bill, and he did not find any very marked difference then in the votes given. There were then 28 Ayes and 24 Noes; but, owing to the opposition of Mr. Leeman, the cause of whose absence from the House to-day they all regretted, the Bill was rejected by 186 to 107. The reason of the hon. Member's opposition was that he considered the Law of Distress in England and the Law of Hypothec in Scotland to be inextricably bound up, and through the influence which he possessed with English Members he was able to get the rejection of the Bill. In 1873, after Mr. Carnegie had left the House, he (Sir David Wedderburn) had the honour to introduce the same Bill affecting not merely agricultural but urban hypothec, and at that time they were only able to get 85 in favour of the Bill, and 149 were against it. It might appear, from a superficial observation of these numbers, that the cause had seriously fallen off in the amount of support it was able to obtain; but the point to which he wished to call attention was this—there were in the minority 35, and in the majority there were only 20, Scotch Members. These three Divisions were taken in a Parliament which was very largely Liberal in its majority; but what was still more important was that in the only Division taken in this Parliament in which the Conservatives were in the majority, there were 41 Scotch votes recorded for the Bill, and only three against it. He repeated, that upon this matter Scotch people were practically unanimous, and he must protest against hon. Members, such as the hon. Member for the Isle of Wight (Mr. Baillie Cochrane), attempting to tell English Members what the feeling of Scotland was. The hon. Member might be a very good Member for the Isle of Wight; but, holding the opinions which he did, he very much doubted whether he would find a constituency in Scotland which would elect him. He (Sir David Wedderburn) did not think this Bill went far enough; but he should gladly support it, because, as far as it went, it was in the right direction, and he appealed to English and Irish Members to concur in the view of the Scotch Representatives, and to support this moderate measure of reform.

THE LORD ADVOCATE (Mr. WATSON) said, he agreed entirely with the observation that had been repeatedly made in the course of this debate, to the effect that this question had been thoroughly discussed on more than one occasion. It was, therefore, quite unnecessary to enter into an argument upon every point that could be raised *pro* or *con* the measure. He could hardly conceive that the noble Lord (Lord Elcho) should have felt the surprise he expressed at the action of the Government, when he took into consideration this other fact—that not only were the people of Scotland almost unanimous—both tenants and landlords—in favour of the abolition of the Law of Hypothec, but that the Representatives of the people in that House were practically unanimous on that point—the only remaining apostles of hypothec being, in fact, the noble Lord himself and another hon. Member for a Scotch burgh. The Amendment of the noble Lord formulated all those objections to the measure which its opponents could rely on. Taken as a whole, it was obviously an appeal to the English Members. He assumed, as the basis of the Resolution, that the Law of Distress and the Law of Hypothec were identical in principle. Well, that might be so or not. They were certainly somewhat similar in character, being both remedies competent to the landlord, and he did not say which was the best or the worst. He did say, however, that from what he knew of the relations existing between the agricultural tenant and his landlord in England, and from what he knew of the case in Scotland, he was by no means satisfied that the result was precisely the same in both countries. He was disposed to hold—indeed, he was satisfied as far as his experience went—that in Scotland the relations between landlord and tenant approached much more nearly to an ordinary commercial contract. There was more of what in England would be termed rack-renting. In Scotland it was simply a matter of contract. If the tenant did not give the commercial value of the land, he did not get it as tenant. Therefore, regarding it from that point of view, he did not hesitate to say it had long been his opinion that no case could be made out for the Law of Hypothec, and no good argument adduced for its maintenance. It had been said that there were other liens known to the law. The noble Lord made a very unhappy allusion when he referred to the lien that a shipowner had over the cargo he carried in his vessel. Those liens depended upon possession of the thing over which the lien extended. There were many liens of that kind, and he had never heard any objection to those on principle, because possession was, in those cases, with the man who had the right of lien, so that there could be no mistake about it, whereas the main objection to the Law of Hypothec in Scotland was that the man who held the lien was not in possession. The law had been somewhat relaxed within the last few years; but still a purchaser was not safe unless he paid for and carried off his purchase at once, or unless he bought it at a public auction after seven days' notice had been given to the landlord or his factor that such auction was to take place. Now, various authorities had been quoted by the noble Lord from the words of Gentlemen who had sat in that House, and who had held the Office of Lord Advocate; but he rather thought the noble Lord scarcely did full credit to these Gentlemen in stating their views on this question. He knew very well that in 1870 the present Lord Young, then Lord Advocate, stated distinctly to the House that he had been a Member of the Committee which had inquired into the Law of Hypothec, and the result of the inquiry had been to confirm the opinion he had always entertained as a lawyer, that hypothec was an entirely exceptional lien, altogether indefensible on legal principles. He bowed to the authority of Lord Moncreiff; but he should take the liberty to quote in full the passage which the noble Lord had quoted in part. Lord Moncreiff said—

> "I do not think that any light is to be thrown upon the matter of the landlords' hypothec"—(referring to those liens which formed the second branch of the statement in Lord Elcho's Resolution)—"except that it shows it is not inconsistent with the great principle of law that where the risk is disproportionate to the interest there should be special security. Beyond that I do not think there is any analogy in the case."

He (the Lord Advocate) accepted that ruling, and it would have been a good deal more to the point if the noble Lord had gone on to show that the landlord did incur exceptional risks when he gave his land into the possession of a tenant for a yearly rent. He quite admitted that in such a case as maritime hypothec there might be something to be said for the exceptional character of the risk; but he should like to hear from anyone who took the view of the noble Lord what there was which a man embarked in adventure, when he let a farm, beyond the risk of the mere loss of interest, so as to bring it within the rule laid down by Lord Moncreiff. That statement of Lord Moncreiff's was by no means favourable to the Law of Hypothec, unless it could be shown that exceptional risks were incurred by a landlord in letting a farm. The last point raised by the noble Lord's Amendment was as to the existence of urban hypothec. There was, however, this distinction between urban and agricultural hypothec—that, practically, no legislation had been demanded, so far as he knew, in the one case, whereas it was clamorously demanded in the other. Whenever the urban landlord or tenant made out a case and complained, it would be time for the Legislature to interfere; but that House ought not to occupy itself with remedying fancy grievances, when those labouring under them appeared to be totally unaware of their existence. He did not desire to enter further into argument; but he should ask their English Friends, on whatever side of the House they sat, to consider whether this was a matter affecting them at all, and whether they ought not to be guided by the unanimous opinion of those who were really concerned? He would ask them to consider this question as a Scottish question, and not merely to say—"The Law of Hypothec in Scotland is the same as the Law of Distress in England, and both must stand or fall together." They must satisfy themselves that the relations between landlords and tenants in the one country were the same as in the other. [Lord

ELCHO: Hear, hear!] The noble Lord said, "Hear, hear!" He was sure the noble Lord did not wish to see the Irish Land Act introduced into Scotland. His purpose was to delay this measure, in order that he might have the opportunity of reducing everything in Scotland to the same level with England and Ireland. If that was his object, then he would have to wait a long time. Perhaps he meant to delay this reform until the Land Laws of Scotland were assimilated to those of England, and so leave the question to be indefinitely postponed. The system of tenant-right was very much interwoven with the system of land-right, and he was afraid that for all practical purposes, if they were to have any reform of tenant-right at all, they must start with that reform from a Scotch point of view; and they could not expect a measure changing the law so radically as the noble Lord desired within any reasonable compass of time. The hon. Baronet the Member for North Lanarkshire (Sir Edward Colebrooke) had appealed to him to state what the intention of the Government was with regard to that part of the Bill which dealt with the remedy of a landlord. He entirely agreed with the views of the hon. Member to this extent—that when they converted a contract of a privileged and exceptional character into something very nearly approaching, if not entirely consisting of, a commercial contract, it was not right that the landlord should be without his remedy. The condition upon which the tenant possessed the land was that he paid rent, and he did not think it would be seriously proposed that the landlord was to be entirely without a remedy, and that if the tenant did not pay the stipulated rent, or any part of it, he was to be entitled to retain possession for any length of time. The law of Scotland, as it stood at present upon that subject, was very distinct. There was an Act passed, not by the Legislature, but by the Judges of the Court of Session, in the year 1756, which practically regulated the matter. If a whole twelvemonth's rent be unpaid—and the practice then was to pay the rents yearly, and not according to the system of half-year's payment which had since sprung up—if it were unpaid, then the tenant might be brought at once before the local Judge, who ordained him to find caution within a short time for the arrears due, and also caution for five years' rent to follow, or to quit the farm at once; and if he were two years' rent in arrear, the lease was entirely extinguished, and the tenant-right was at an end. That had often been called "Judge-made law," and abused as such; and, taken in conjunction with the right of hypothec, that law certainly was somewhat severe; but those who blamed the Judges in that respect entirely left out of view that the older law of Scotland, which prevailed in 1756, was very much harsher, and that the Judges of that period thought they were very much mitigating in favour of the tenant the rule which prevailed during the period of agricultural depression which followed the Rebellion of 1755. It was in favour of the tenant entirely that the Act of Sederunt in question was passed. The hon. Member who had charge of the Bill had introduced the provision that at the end of six months there should be the same remedies against a tenant that now existed at the end of twelve months. If the hon. Member for North Lanarkshire (Sir Edward Colebrooke) was not satisfied with that, then he must say that it appeared to him to be a provision sufficiently stringent. He thought that something less might have sufficed; but he certainly did think that, failing the rent, or security therefor, there ought to be a power of removal. But these were matters of detail. They did not in the least degree affect the principle of the Bill, and he saw no reason why the second reading should not be granted, because the matter to which he had last alluded, in response to the appeal of the hon. Baronet the Member for North Lanarkshire, was one that might most appropriately be disposed of in Committee of the House.

GENERAL SIR GEORGE BALFOUR said, he could most heartily support the principle of the Bill, believing that the abolition of the right of hypothec, which entitled the holders of land to unjust priorities, such as at present prevailed in Scotland, would be beneficial, not only to the landlords and to tenants, but to the whole of the country. In supporting the second reading, he desired to make a few observations with regard to the remarks of the noble Lord the Member for Haddingtonshire (Lord Elcho) respecting tenant-farmers. The noble Lord's usually candid mind had not on the present occasion induced him to give full credit to the tenant-farmers for what they had done for the agriculture of Scotland. He had brought forward the right of hypothec as one of the great means by which that wonderful change in the cultivation of the soil of Scotland, which was a marked feature in modern days, had been accomplished. He had said that this hypothec had been instrumental in raising up a set of farmers who had done all this good for the country. But he would remind the noble Lord that the great epoch from which dated the vast extension of the farm cultivation in Scotland commenced in 1770. That was the great landmark which guided all those who had studied the question as to the beginning of the improvement of agriculture in Scotland. In order to see what had been the result, it was essential to examine with great care the provisions of that great legislative measure, known as the Montgomery Act, and which had continued in practical operation, with but trifling changes. The Legislature, seeing the great evils which arose from the impoverished condition of many of the landlords who were merely life-holders of nearly all the lands of Scotland, decided upon making a vast change in the land system of Scotland. They passed a law whereby, first of all, landlords holding entailed estates were enabled to extend their leases for 19, 21, and 30 years; and next the Act, so far as it intrusted the impoverished landlords with the power of improving their lands by means of active, industrious, and skilled farmers, provided, at the same time, for money being raised for the purpose of erecting suitable buildings, and for making other improvements. It was to these measures, together with the employment of larger capital on the part of tenant-farmers, that the great improvement which had taken place since the year 1770 was due. The right of hypothec, which had existed from the earliest years, when holders of land provided cattle, seed, and implements for agriculture, and paid merely for the labour, had in reality nothing to do in effecting the improvements. The noble Lord had raised very strongly the question of the great risk which the landlords had incurred in giving over their lands to be cultivated by tenant-farmers. He would remind the noble Lord of this important fact—that, taking the value of the whole land of Scotland to be equal to £230,000,000, the capital invested by the tenants in its cultivation was represented by £40,000,000 or £50,000,000, and, therefore, the farmers risked infinitely more than the landlords risked, because the whole of this vast sum was actually in daily use, and exposed to deterioration and loss, as of late years. The amount of landlord risk was comparatively small. The annual interest on the capital value of the land could not be more than £7,000,000. Therefore, the farmers annually risked five times the sum that the landlords risked. It was upon that ground that he urged that the tenant-farmers of Scotland should have every consideration. It was mainly owing to the enterprize and knowledge of farmers, and to the use of their capital, that improvements were traceable. Nay, more, he would say that within 20 years the land of Scotland had increased in value to the extent of from £40,000,000 to £45,000,000; and without ascribing all this increase to farmers, yet a large share of the improved value might justly be ascribed to them, and that of itself constituted a claim which the farmers had upon the landlords to the extension of agriculture. He urged that not only the right of hypothec should be abolished, but that all other impediments—as, for example, the Game Laws, should be removed. The interference with the mode of cultivation, such as most of the leases so unwisely enforced, should be abandoned by the landlords. The defective buildings, not only for the farm labourers, but for cattle and other farming purposes, should be replaced by the landlord, or the rights of tenants to compensation recognized. But the true policy was for the owners of lands to invest in permanent improvements, and thus leave farmers to use their capital for purely agricultural purposes. He was very glad to hear that the hon. Member for South Norfolk (Mr. Clare Read) advocate in the strongest manner the right of the farmers to get the result of their improvements. He said distinctly that every relaxation of the impediments which landlords had placed upon the cultivation of the soil had been attended with good to the landlords, in a far higher degree than to tenant-farmers, and, through them, to the whole of the country. He not only cordially accepted the abolition of one burden, that of hypothec, but he urged that freedom of contract between landlord and tenant should be enforced; and he, therefore, deprecated any terms being laid down in Act of Parliament which farmers and landlords could provide for in leases. After the declaration which had been made by the Lord Advocate, he thought it would be unwise on his part to trespass further on the attention of the House.

MR. GREGORY said, that he had opposed previous measures on this subject, and having considered this Bill with reference to those which had preceded it, and having heard the arguments that had been advocated in its favour, he had not, like the hon. Member for South Norfolk (Mr. Clare Read), changed his mind. He still thought it was an objectionable measure, and he would state shortly his reasons for so thinking. It had always occurred to him, in connection with this measure, that they should consider whether it involved a matter of general principle, and that principle capable of extension, and if so, whether sufficient grounds were laid down for making this alteration. With due respect to the Lord Advocate, he could not altogether agree with him in saying that this question of hypothec and distress was dissociated from the question of lien. He thought there was a considerable connection between them; but he would treat this matter merely as a question of hypothec in Scotland or distress in England, and the principle involved was that the landlord should have a remedy, and a speedy one, in respect of rent which was due to him for the occupation of his property. He did not think that any hon. Gentleman who had addressed the House in support of the Bill had alleged that such a claim on behalf of the landlord was in the abstract an unjust one. But the abolition of it was put simply as a question of expediency, and of a general wish on the part of the agriculturists of Scotland. With respect to the question of expediency, it was admitted by his hon. Friend who had introduced the Bill that during the existence of this law his own property, at all events, had, within a limited period, increased in value some 50 per cent under its operation, and certainly Scotch agriculture was not at present in a backward condition. But amongst the grounds alleged in favour of the abolition of this law, it was stated that the security of other creditors of the tenant was lessened by the preferential claim which it gave to the landlord. What evidence had they of that? It appeared, from the evidence given before the Committee of the House of Lords, that the losses of these persons from bad debts had really been nothing. The majority of them could not make their losses above 1 per cent upon the whole of their trade, and he should like to know if many businesses in the country were carried on upon better terms than that. He would remind the House that they were dealing with a principle which applied not only to agriculture, but to urban hypothec. He admitted, however, that as regarded the operation of the Law of Hypothec and the Law of Distress, they were not in a satisfactory position. He should like to see an assimilation of the process in both countries. He considered that the Scotch Law of Hypothec was objectionable, in that it gave a right of distress before the rent had accrued. It was altogether inconsistent with abstract justice that there should be a claim before the debt was actually incurred. On the other hand, he thought that the law of Scotland was better than that of England, in that it required something of a judicial process before the law was put in force. In England the process in many cases was now very objectionable, and it was placed in the hands of persons to whom the power ought not to be given. Again, as to the English law, he thought power extended too far back. He should be quite willing to limit the power of distress in England to a period of one year, or, at the very utmost, to two years. If the law of the two countries were put upon a reasonable footing in these respects, a great many of the grounds now alleged in favour of the abolition of the one or the other would be removed.

MR. J. W. BARCLAY thanked the Government for having given their assent to this Bill, and especially the right hon. and learned Lord Advocate, for the very clear and strong exposition which he had given of the views of the Government. He was glad the right hon. and learned Lord had not committed himself to the support of the 2nd clause of the Bill. The power already possessed by landlords was of an extremely arbitrary and harsh character; and although most landlords might be trusted to exercise it in a proper way, it would be in the power of an unjust landlord to ask security from a tenant, even if only one day in arrear, as a means of getting possession of a farm. The arguments of the noble Lord the Member for Haddingtonshire (Lord Elcho) had been so completely answered by his hon. Friend opposite (Mr. Clare Read), and by the right hon. and learned Lord, that there was no occasion to refer to them any further. The landlord's lien depended entirely on a fiction of the law. This lien of the landlord differed essentially from all other liens with which he (Mr. J. W. Barclay) was acquainted in this respect—that it existed without custody of the goods over which the lien extended. In every case of commercial lien the lien was lost when custody was lost. To raise the contention that whatever moved across the land became the landlord's was absurd. He was pleased to hear the noble Lord's remarks about the enterprize of the tenant-farmers. No doubt, what he said was perfectly true. A great number of the smaller tenants had got possession of morasses and turned them into smiling cornfields. There was, according to the noble Lord, no rent payable for those waste lands; but he could not follow the noble Lord's argument that this circumstance was in favour of the Law of Hypothec. No doubt, many landlords in Scotland had assisted the tenants who had insufficient capital when they offered the highest rent; but to say that the landlords would not assist the tenants unless they were sure of the rent was a libel on the landlords of Scotland. There was no new argument to offer on the question. The present position of agricultural affairs was the most conclusive argument. For several years back, from one cause or another, to a considerable extent owing to the existence of the Law of Hypothec, capital had been drained away from agriculture, and now the whole agricultural interest was suffering from want of capital more than from anything else. The man who entered on a farm with an insufficient capital had found out that it was the most hopeless thing a man could do to enter upon farming with an insufficient capital. The profits had never in his (Mr. J. W. Barclay's) experience been enough to enable a man to pay interest on borrowed capital; and so, when the first wave of disaster came, he became engaged in a struggle to carry on and maintain his hold on the farm, which continually got into a worse condition, and by-and-bye was returned to the landlord in a very deteriorated condition. This Law of Hypothec, instead of being a tenant's question, as used to be alleged, had made itself a landlord's question, as the landlord would discover more and more within the next few years. The only hope he could see for agriculture in the meantime was this—that there should be the greatest encouragement offered for capital being taken to the cultivation of the land, for it was only by employing a large quantity of capital on the land that he could see any hope of farmers in that country being able to compete with foreigners at all, and he feared that even the abolition of the Law of Hypothec might be too late to accomplish that object. Under the most favourable circumstances, it must be years before the condition of agriculture could approach what it was 10 or 15 years ago. It was all very well for farmers with small capital to take farms when a general advance in prices was going on, which helped them to carry on; but when a movement downwards came the want of capital was quickly discovered, and the landlords suffered. Seeing, then, the condition of agriculture, he would urge hon. Members to agree to the second reading of that Bill to-day, and that the Government should take it into their charge. It must be very evident to hon. Gentlemen on both sides of the House that the utmost efforts of the opponents of the Bill would only defer the passing of the law for a year or two. If, in the meantime, capital was being still more completely frightened away from agricultural pursuits, the difficulty would become all the greater to induce it to come back. He hoped, therefore, that they should have a Division that afternoon, and that hon. Members on both sides would unite in passing the Bill.

Sir WILLIAM CUNINGHAME said, he desired to explain the reasons which had led him to support the Amendment of his noble Friend (Lord Elcho), instead of persevering with his own proposal that the second reading of the Bill should be postponed till that day three months. His reasons for adopting that course were two—in the first place, because it was strongly pointed out to him that it was very desirable that those Members of the House who were not already aware of it should be made acquainted with the position of the Law of Distress in England in reference to, and in connection with, the Law of Hypothec in Scotland; and, in the second place, because he felt convinced that by giving precedence to the proposition of the noble Lord, he would be able to secure that the matter should be laid before the House in a much more able manner than he would have been himself able to present it. With regard to the first of those reasons, he thought it could not be denied, after what had been already said, that the Law of Distress and the Law of Hypothec were identical in principle; and with regard to his second reason, he thought that the way in which the case against the Bill had been presented by Lord Elcho—the distinct and eloquent way—fully justified him in the course which he had followed. There was one point to which he thought it was highly desirable that the attention of the House should be directed, and that was the argument and the position of his hon. Friend the Member for Wigtownshire (Mr. Vans Agnew), and many of those who followed him, in regard to the view which he took upon this question. The argument of the hon. Gentleman, speaking broadly, amounted pretty much to this—that the Law of Hypothec, by limiting the tenant's credit with his tradesmen to a greater extent than it increased it with his landlord, was an operation injurious to agriculture. That argument had also been dwelt upon by the hon. Member for Forfarshire (Mr. J. W. Barclay), who had assured the House that agriculture in Scotland at this moment was suffering from insufficient capital, and that nothing but the infusion of fresh capital could save it from being completely swamped by foreign competition. With regard to these opinions, all he could say was that he thought the House ought to require, in a matter of this importance, something more than mere assertion. Hon. Gentlemen had themselves admitted that this was an ancient law which at one time proved beneficial to agriculture, and the *onus probandi* of proof lay upon those who said that it had lost that character. It seemed to him in the last degree improbable that the abolition of the Law of Hypothec would increase the tenant's credit with his tradesmen to a greater extent than it would diminish it with his landlord. He could quite understand that if a tenant were owing his landlord £100, £200, or £300, a banker would not advance so much money to him as if he did not owe anything; but he could not understand how the doing away with his debt would increase his capital to a greater extent than the amount of that liability. If the operation of the law were such as some hon. Members had described, he did not think the House would have been left in any doubt upon the subject. A Commission had been appointed to inquire into the matter; and if the state of things had been of the nature which had been referred to, one would have expected the witnesses to have assured the Commissioners that such was the state and operation of the law, and to have said—"We cannot get credit with our bankers, our seed merchants will not allow us sufficient length of time, and we are crippled in capital on that account." As a matter of fact, that was not the case, as anyone would see who had taken the trouble of reading the evidence. The objections which the tenant-farmers had invariably urged was that the law encouraged what they called unfair competition—that it brought men who had no capital into the trade, and that it placed farmers in the position of having to compete with what were termed "men of straw." That being so, it appeared to him that what was alleged by the hon. Member for Wigtownshire was simply a product of his own imagination. He did not, for one moment, suppose that his hon. Friend was in the least insincere in the manner in which he had brought forward the question, or that he did not believe in the argument which he had advanced. No one who knew the pertinacity with which the hon. Member had brought forward this question—although he must sometimes have felt that he did so under considerable difficulty, both in his own case and certainly in the case of his Party—would be inclined to accuse him of any want of earnestness. All he desired to show was that the contention of the hon. Member was not the fact, and that his argument was almost entirely different from the arguments of those who were anxious to see the Law of Hypothec abolished. As he had said, the view of the tenant-farmers of Scotland — the view of a proportion of them, whether a small or a large percentage—was that the existing law increased the rents, that it brought forward the men of straw, and that thus the tenant-farmers were placed at a disadvantage. They also contended that the law was unjust; but their objections were not to be found in the mouth of the hon. Member for Wigtownshire, or of those who took his view. The inference was that the contention of the hon. Member was an afterthought, and that while attacking the law he did so for reasons with which he himself could not concur. As to the arguments brought forward by others who were equally as earnest in the matter as his hon. Friend, it appeared to him that their object was obviously a selfish one. They had made their own fortunes in a trade—if he might use the expression—and they wanted to establish a monopoly in that trade. He did not blame them; most people were selfish, and this was a selfish age. Probably what was done by the men who were engaged in other occupations—masons, carpenters, lawyers, doctors, and, indeed, almost everybody —was not very discreditable to tenant-farmers. At the same time, he thought the majority of hon. Members would agree that it was not an object with which the House need very much sympathize, or one which it was bound to go any considerable distance out of its way in order to facilitate. When a demand of this description was made, it appeared to him that the House ought to look with special care to the probable results of the change which it was proposed to make. That was a point which, in his opinion, was a great deal too much overlooked, alike by those who advocated the proposed abolition and those who defended the present law. It had been said that this was a tenant's and not a landlord's question; but as to the position in which tenants and landlords would stand after an abolition of the law, no one had taken the trouble to consider. The fact was that it was very difficult—it was almost impossible—to say what would be the exact result of the measure of the hon. Member for Wigtownshire, should it be passed into law. Suppose that that which had often been suggested as the probable result took place. Suppose that landlords found it an absolute necessity, in order to secure themselves reasonably and fairly, not to exact fore-handed rents, which would not give them the same security as the present law, but to require their tenants to pay a sum into the bank as security, or to pay their rents in advance, was that a result which was likely to be beneficial either to landlords, or to tenants, or to agriculture in general? It seemed to him, so far as the tenants were concerned, that they must necessarily be placed in a worse position than that which they occupied at present, and that they would undoubtedly experience a loss of a considerable part of that capital which had hitherto been employed in connection with the farm. Would it be to the advantage of the landlord? Quite the contrary. His reasoning would be either that he must get rid of his tenants, or allow his property to be farmed with a smaller amount of capital than was now the case. Was not this, therefore, a landlord's question, and not only a landlord's question, but a question of vital importance? Again, supposing landlords found it impossible to place their tenants in the position they would desire, then it appeared to him that, from the landlord's point of view, the question was still more important. Then they would simply have to take their tenants without any security at all. All these considerations pointed to the conclusion that the results which were likely to follow the abolition of hypothec ought to be very carefully weighed and considered before the House made a change which, in his opinion, would be of a very doubtful character, which would be a sort of a leap in the dark, and the only object of which was to enable the tenant-farmers, or a certain number of them, to form a trades union amongst themselves. There was another matter of some little difficulty on which he thought he ought not altogether to be silent, and that was the question of the apparent unanimity of Scotch opinion on this subject. He entirely admitted the force of the argument as to the number of

Scotch votes which might be given in favour of the proposal now before the House; but he disputed the idea that that majority of votes would prove that the majority of Scotchmen were in favour of the abolition of the existing law. He would go further and dispute that it would even prove that a majority of tenant-farmers were in favour of hypothec being done away with. He said so for this reason—they all knew that Scotch tenant-farmers were very fond of following their leaders. They collected together at agricultural dinners and other meetings which they were accustomed to frequent, and listened to the animated and apparently convincing speeches made by two or three prominent farmers, whom they looked upon as the chief men in their districts. They took their opinions from the men to whom he referred; and those men, being of the richer and wealthier amongst their class, were very naturally, he did not say improperly, biassed towards that view which was likely to benefit themselves. The smaller farmers followed them, and in that way it came to be supposed that on this subject they were pretty nearly unanimous in opinion. But to show that the views of the tenant-farmers were by no means so strong as some hon. Members appeared to think, he would mention what had occurred recently in his own neighbourhood. His hon. and gallant Friend the Member for South Ayrshire (Colonel Alexander) had his name upon the back of this Bill. No doubt, the reason of that was that the hon. and gallant Member thought that the measure embodied the opinions of the majority of the tenant-farmers in his district. He happened to know, as a matter of fact, that that was not the case. He had tested the question by issuing a circular upon the subject—a circular which was as fairly drawn as possible. He chose from the valuation roll the first 15 names in each parish in South Ayrshire, and he asked the persons whom he so selected whether they thought the Law of Hypothec ought to be retained or abolished? He had not the exact numbers at present beside him; but the general result was that he received about 150 replies, and that five to three were in favour of the maintenance of the existing law. That was in the constituency of his hon. and gallant Friend (Colonel Alexander), and he thought that the fact which he had just mentioned threw some doubt upon the statement as to whether a majority of even tenant-farmers wished a change in the present Statute. He would appeal to the population generally, and he claimed the burghs in his support. To his mind, it appeared to be absolutely certain that if the principle of the present law were to be departed from and discredited by this Bill being accepted, the measure must sooner or later be extended to burghs, and that, he was convinced, would amount to a national disaster. As to the alleged unanimity on the part of the Scotch Members, he need not go very far for unanimity on the other side of the House in order to abolish a law. He thought it would be allowed that almost any proposal in that direction was favourably received on the Liberal side of the House. But, with regard to the position of some other hon. Members, he thought the matter might be explained in this way. They had been led to believe that the subject was of less importance than it really was; they had been tickled with the idea that it was a tenant's and not a landlord's question; and they thought they would be justified in yielding to the wishes of their tenantry. He would only say, further, that he regretted extremely to hear from the remarks of the hon. and learned Gentleman (the Lord Advocate) that her Majesty's Government felt inclined to accept this measure. With regard to what had been said as to a change of front on the part of the Administration, he would only observe that although, as had been shown, the Government, on the occasion of the last Division, did not act altogether as the Government, yet it must be allowed that the Bill would not have been rejected at that time had the Government not been more or less inclined to oppose it. Nor would it be accepted on this occasion unless the Government gave it some support. He could not help hoping that the change of attitude on the part of the Administration was caused more by a real change of opinion than by any mere question of expediency. If expediency had anything to do with the change of attitude to which he referred, it would, in his estimation, be very discreditible. He would like to appeal to those hon. Members present who did not feel it absolutely incumbent on them to go into the Lobby with the Government on the present occasion to come forward and assist them, and give those in Scotland a still further opportunity of considering the question, which, he believed, was not at all understood by those who were interested, and more especially by the small tenant-farmers. They had not the slightest idea that it would be followed with any unpleasant result; and he felt sure that when the measure was clearly and thoroughly understood by them, as it would be more clearly understood after the present debate, there would be a great many who formerly would have been inclined to favour the change in the law that would alter their opinion. He trusted that the Bill would not be passed, or, if read a second time, that it would be postponed in order to give the people of Scotland an opportunity of discussing the matter before such an important change was made.

Mr. R. W. DUFF said, he wished to congratulate the Government on the course they had pursued in the matter; but there was one point which he should like to have explained. He understood, in the speech of the Lord Advocate, that he spoke of the land in Scotland being rack-rented.

The LORD ADVOCATE said, he certainly made use of that expression, but it was covered by the accompanying words. He did not mean that the land was rented at extortionate rates, but that it was generally let at full market rates.

Mr. R. W. DUFF said, he thought it would be generally understood, at least by Scotch Members, that rack rents meant getting as much as possible out of a tenant for the land in question, and he must deny that that was the case in Scotland. What usually occurred was, that when a 19 years' lease had expired the land was re-valued, and the landlord offered it first to the sitting tenant. If he took it at the increased rent he was at liberty to do so; but, if not, it went into the market. That system prevailed to a great extent in Scotland; and there were cases on record in Scotland, as no doubt in England also, where men had gone on occupying the same farm for years in that way. He understood the Lord Advocate to say that he admitted the principle of the 2nd clause of the Bill, although it might possibly require some amendment in Committee; but still he was understood to support it, as explained by the hon. Gentleman who introduced the Bill. The House had had some remarks from the hon. Member for South Norfolk, who always spoke with authority on agricultural questions. He told the House, among other things, that the farmers naturally looked to the Conservative Governments for all improvements. Perhaps he was right in saying so in regard to that particular measure; but there was one omission which he failed to supply—namely, that the question of hypothec had been moved from the other side of the House, and during that time there was not one Conservative who had ever supported it. They seemed to be acting on the principle of taking the kettle off the fire just before it boiled over. But, whatever the principle might be on which it was done, he was glad to have the support of the Government in doing away with the law which he believed to be universally unpopular in Scotland. His own experience differed very much from that which had been expressed by other hon. Members; and he was quite satisfied that, in his own county, the farmers were almost unanimous in wishing the Law of Hypothec to be abolished. He thought that was one of the reasons why the argument with regard to the small farmers broke down, because, undoubtedly, in that part of the country, the average holdings of the farmers were much smaller than in other places. His own opinion on the question was that the small farmers—such men were alluded to by the hon. Member for Wigtownshire (Mr. Vans Agnew)—were in a better position than were the large farmers. He thought the arrears of rent were, generally speaking, much less than on large ones. The small farmers were not so much compelled to carry on their business on credit, and he believed their position was a much better one. He thought that that was a strong argument against the remarks made about the small farmers being against the change. He had listened with much interest to the speech of his noble Friend the Member for Haddingtonshire (Lord Elcho), and on one point he agreed with him—namely, that, as a matter of principle, urban and rural hypothec ought to go together. He thought the noble Lord was perfectly right in saying so. At the same time, he would not say that he would only vote for the present Bill because he could get no other. He would also like to remind those who had quoted the opinion of Lord Moncreiff as an authority in favour of the Bill, that the learned Lord, when he spoke in favour of such a Bill, distinctly stated that the urban and rural hypothec should go together. It also suited the noble Lord to quote another Lord Advocate, Lord Young, who certainly was the first Lord Advocate who supported such a measure. The noble Lord alluded to the landlord's interest, and stated that it was not to the interest of the landlords that this law should be done away with. Speaking as a landlord himself, and, he believed, also speaking as representing the views of many other landlords, he could say that they had no desire at all to retain the law. They could always make themselves secure and perfectly safe. He was quite sure no legal gentleman acquainted with legal hypothec would have any difficulty in making themselves perfectly safe even if the law was done away with, and, indeed, he could see no reason why the law should be continued even with regard to the landlord's interest. It seemed to him that by doing away with the Law of Hypothec they would be strengthening the position of the landlord and tenant. His noble Friend was a great advocate of freedom of contract; but the Law of Hypothec was against freedom of contract. How was a man to have freedom of contract under such a law? If the noble Lord was really sincere in desiring that freedom of contract which he advocated, he would remind him of a Resolution which was passed by the Northern Chamber of Agriculture some time since, which declared that the continuance of the Law of Hypothec was inconsistent with freedom of contract. He thought that conclusion was a perfectly sensible and logical conclusion to be drawn; and if the noble Lord was sincere in his desire for freedom of contract, he would call upon him to show his sincerity by changing his view on the question before the House. His hon. Friend the Member for Forfarshire (Mr. J. W. Barclay) had said that what was wanted to remove the present condition of distress in the country was more capital, and he admitted that that would assist in some degree; but what was wanted to assist still more was greater freedom in the law of entail. He thought that was a question which, sooner or later must come before the country, for there was no doubt that the tying-up the land under legal restrictions did far more damage than even the Law of Hypothec. However, that was a subject upon which he could not enter at the present time; and he could only say in conclusion that the law, being an unjust one in principle, he should have very much pleasure in giving his support to his hon. Friend opposite.

MR. M'LAREN said, he should not take up the time of the House, and should only address himself to one or two points of the measure. He wished to point out, with regard to urban hypothec and rural hypothec, that the two things must be kept entirely apart. It had been stated that the two things should go together. He took issue on that point, and from what he knew of the Records of that House, he would undertake to say that if they searched those Records, they would not find a single Petition on them in favour of the abolition of urban hypothec. If they searched the records of the newspapers in all the towns in Scotland, he did not think they would find any account of meetings held in favour of the abolition of urban hypothec, and the same remark applied to Chambers of Commerce, merchant companies, and guilds of all kinds. He had never heard of any such body who wished to abolish it. The hon. Member for Roxburghshire (Sir George Douglas) gave the House some interesting details respecting the results of enforcing the law. Let them take the case of a farm where the rent was £2,000 a-year. There would, according to the hon. Baronet, be another £2,000 spent on the farm on manure, and another £2,000 in labour, so that the result of a sequestration for rent would be most injurious to the tenant by swallowing up £4,000 of outlay. He would lose not merely his farm, but also all the amount of capital which had been laid out on the ground, and which in the future would benefit the possessor of the ground by producing crops, &c. When a landlord distrained for rent, he swallowed up not merely the value of this rent, but the whole of the tenant's capital as well, and of which the landlord got the ultimate benefit. A Parliamentary Return had been issued showing the number of houses in towns and their valuation, for laying on the house tax; and if hon. Members would examine those Returns they would find that, with comparatively few exceptions, they were valued at sums under £100 a-year, and it was only on this rent that the urban hypothec applied. Let them look at the Law of Hypothec in rural districts, and compare it with that. The dissimilarity was excessively great. A man occupying a house at £100 a-year in town could embark in trade almost to any extent, and if bankruptcy took place, he might have creditors to whom he owed £20,000 or £30,000; and how did the Law of Hypothec apply in that case? No man, with any self-respect, would allow the rent of his house to fall into arrear, the result being that there was no rent due except for the current half-year. But in that case what was allowed for hypothec was simply £50 on the security of furniture, &c., and all the estates were distributed among the creditors with the exception of that £50. But far different was the case of the farmer. Some Glasgow Bank people failed for sums varying from £1,000,000 to £2,000,000 and £3,000,000; but it would probably be found that the rent they paid was under £300 a-year. All the landlord's right of hypothec in that case would be £150 secured on the furniture; but hundreds and thousands of pounds realized by the assets of the bankrupts were distributed among the creditors. There was really no kind of analogy between the operation of the town and the rural hypothec. The landlord in the country swallowed up everything, although the tenant was indebted to the manure and seed merchants, the wheelwright, the smith, or the farrier, and to people of all kinds. The House had no right to take those different kinds of hypothec together, and say that the one was the same as the other. A paper had been recently distributed among hon. Members of the House, giving an account of the debates that had taken place therein on the Mines Regulation Act; and it appeared from that pamphlet that four hon. Members who spoke in that debate had indicated that they had worked in mines themselves, and so could speak on the subject with authority. As well might the noble Lord the Member for Haddingtonshire expatiate on the benefits of the old mining laws, and say that those men who rose to be Members of that House had done so, not from their own natural talents simply, but because they began life in a coal-mine, as take the line of argument he had done, by attempting to show that the Law of Hypothec had been the means of raising very small farmers to positions of wealth and influence. The whole thing was a fallacy. They had no right to put the two things together, and say that the one was the cause of the other. He might as well look at the clock which was going on a mantlepiece over a fire, and say that the clock was going because there was a bright fire burning beneath it. Although the Bill would no doubt be carried in the House on the second reading, that would be a mere farce if Her Majesty's Government did not determine to support it and carry it through to a practical conclusion. It would otherwise be a mere matter of form. Hon. Members, when they found the right hon. and learned Gentleman the Lord Advocate standing up and making an excellent speech in favour of the Bill as he did, must expect that in consistency, and on every principle of justice, and in the interest of public policy, that the Government in its future stages should give the Bill their thorough, honest, and hearty support, and carry it through to a conclusion.

SIR GRAHAM MONTGOMERY said, that as one of the Members of the last Parliament who took a very prominent part in opposing the Bill, he wished to say a few words. Before the last General Election in 1874, no doubt there was a great cry in Scotland for the abolition of the Law of Hypothec. There was a great cry in 1874 for its abolition, and at that time he confessed he pledged himself no longer to oppose the abolition of it. At the same time, he entirely disputed the contention that the whole of the tenant-farmers of Scotland and the great majority of the people of Scotland generally were in favour of its abolition. For himself, he believed that if the Act of 1867 had gone a little further, and had prevented the sequestration being put in force before the rent was due, they would not have heard anything of this cry for the total abolition of the law. He thought it was very unfortunate that that Act did not go a little further, because that Act did certainly put an end to almost all the grievances which were the cause of the cry for the abolition of hypothec originally. No doubt, under the old law, there were great grievances, and in some cases nothing could be more unjust than its enforcement. As a Scotch Member, he wished to say that he felt great objection to the abolition of the law. They would, by doing so, put the Scotch landlords in a very invidious position. In the present condition of contract and leases, no tenant could be called upon to pay his rent till something like a year or 18 months after it was due. That was a great concession to the tenant-farmer, and a great advantage to him. One of the witnesses before the House of Lords stated that it was equivalent to a landlord supplying a tenant with capital equal to a year's rent. He believed that was really the case; but when the Bill was adopted, and the Law of Hypothec was abolished, the landlords in Scotland would have to adopt the practice of fore-renting the land, and that would put the landlord in a very invidious position. In Scotland the custom had always been to give the tenant-farmers a much longer time to pay their rents, and more especially the poorer and smaller tenants; but the result of the Bill would be to make them pay up much sharper than before. He did not know what the feelings of the Scotch tenant-farmers generally might be on the subject; but he could not help feeling that a great many of them were in favour of it, simply because they had been led into that view by others. He was quite sure that a great many of those who were in favour of it were not aware of the effect of passing such a Bill as the one before the House; and he felt sure that if they understood what would be the effect of it, that they would not be so much in favour of it as they were at the present time. He quite agreed with a great many speakers, that if the Bill was passed—whether it was to pass or not he did not know; he was not going to help to pass it, although he was not going to oppose it—there must be an amendment of the Law of Ejectment. The present Law of Ejectment, which the Lord Advocate explained to the House, was a very cumbersome one, and they knew that under that law a landlord might have to take a case to the House of Lords, and all that time the rent was accruing. He, therefore, contended that with a Bill like the present one they must have a law of ejectment, which would put the landlord in the position of being able to eject a tenant in a much speedier way than under the present system. While he regretted he could not follow Her Majesty's Government in this Bill, at the same time he did not feel it his duty to vote for the Amendment.

MR. RAMSAY said, he would not detain the House by any remarks of an extended character; but he felt that the strong statements made by hon. Members on both sides of the House required some modification. It had been stated by his hon. Friend the Member for Edinburgh (Mr. M'Laren) that there was a radical distinction between urban and rural hypothec; but, in his opinion, the principle of urban hypothec and the principle of rural hypothec were entirely alike, and there was no distinction between the one and the other. The hon. Member had stated to the House that a tenant-farmer might have invested a capital of some thousands of pounds in his farm in paying for materials, all of which might subsequently be appropriated by the landlord. But a similar case to that might happen to a tenant in town, when his household furniture became liable to be seized for rent. It was true, however, though you could sell a bed from under a tenant in the town, you could not touch the household furniture of the farmer. Unanimity with regard to this measure had been spoken of by hon. Gentlemen on both sides of the House, and the hon. Gentleman who introduced the Bill spoke of the landlords of Scotland as being in his favour.

MR. VANS AGNEW: I am not aware that I did. I did not intend to do so, and I do not think I did.

MR. RAMSAY said, he was under the impression that the hon. Gentleman did say so, and that the Lord Advocate also stated that there was unanimity in Scotland in favour of the Bill. He (Mr. Ramsay) did not deny that, so far as any opinion had been expressed, that opinion had been in favour of the Bill. But he ventured to say that many of the people did not regard the Bill as of any great importance; and the Petitions that had come to the House from Scotland had been chiefly from tenant-farmers—the occupiers of arable land. It might be that the exercise of the right of hypothec by the landlord was by some considered essential; and he would say, having had experience with regard to grazing farms, that he had never known any case in which the Law of Hypothec had proved injurious to farmers where grazing was the chief occupation. In such districts he had not heard much in the way of complaint. But he believed that, in consequence of the agitation that had taken place upon the question among the occupiers of arable land, other districts had been pervaded by similar sentiments to those expressed in favour of the Bill, without knowing what the effect would be. In that way the opinion, so far as it had been expressed, no doubt was in favour of the Bill. But he did not remember that a single Petition for or against had been presented to the House from the Commissioners of Supply in any part of Scotland. Until the opinion of Scotland was obtained, it could not be said that the people were unanimously in favour of the Bill. He was of opinion that if the Law of Hypothec was abolished to-morrow, the landlords of Scotland would still be able to look after their own interests, and would do so. With regard to the 2nd clause contained in the Bill, the hon. Gentleman, in his opinion, had not clearly expressed his meaning in reference to the remedy open to the landlord; and the Lord Advocate, in explaining that clause, did not state in what form it was proposed that the clause should stand. Unless the question as to the nature and extent of security was definitely stated, it was impossible that the Bill could become law to the satisfaction of the people of Scotland. He did not intend to oppose the Bill; but it would be for those who, like himself, were of opinion that the urban and rural hypothec stood upon the same footing, to propose Amendments in Committee with respect to all rents due in Scotland.

Mr. BAILLIE HAMILTON said, it appeared to him that there ought to be only two parties considered as interested in this question—namely, the Scotch landlord and the Scotch tenant; but opponents of the Bill seemed to be afraid that the principle of Free Trade which they advocated would cross the boundary, and spread itself throughout England, and end that law of distress which seemed to be so dear to them. He, however, thought the tenants of England could hardly be so attached to the Law of Distress as the landlords; but assuming that they were, where, he asked, was the agitation for its repeal to come from? It, therefore, appeared to him that this fear was baseless, and any opposition on this ground to this Bill would be an exercise of selfish might. He was not radical enough to ride roughshod over the landlord if he had no other protection; but without the Law of Hypothec he considered he had ample means of protection within his power, and therefore, as regarded him, the maintenance of the law was unnecessary. Competition among farmers in Scotland was sufficient to allow a farmer to pick and choose his tenants; and if he did not pick suitable ones, he ought not to be protected by special legislation. It was impossible to state the landlord's case more clearly than had been done by Sheriff Smith of Elgin, who had said that if a landlord did not give any credit or take any risk, he would have to take a lower rent than if he did give credit and take some risk, and if he did give credit and take some risk, he would probably get a higher rent than if he did not. Well, he believed that this view of the question was taken by a large majority of Scotch landlords; that they were personally indifferent as to the proposed change in the law; and that the objections entertained by some were based altogether upon their sympathetic interest in the small tenant, whom they thought the abolition of hypothec would injuriously affect. But was that the opinion of the tenant-farmer of Scotland? How many Petitions had been presented to the House of Commons during the last six years against the Bill of his hon. Friend? How many hon. Members representing Scotch agricultural constituencies were there who had not pledged themselves, if not to support, at least not to oppose this Bill? How many of those Members would say that the abolition of hypothec was viewed with apprehension by any considerable number of those who had sent them there? He could only say that no representation of the sort had ever been made to him; and he believed the tenant-farmers of Scotland were, practically speaking, at one in their dislike of the law, and unanimous in their desire for its repeal. No one could deny that hypothec had done good service in its day, and that the existing tenantry of Scotland had, to a large extent, been built up by its aid; but the day of its utility was past. It was like the supports of an arch, which could now stand by itself. It had been said that this preferential security had been enjoyed by Scotch landlords from time immemorial. He recommended Scotch landlords to make the most of their time, and to enjoy it while they could; for they might rest assured that if this Government was too timid or too Conservative to seal its doom, its funeral knell would soon be rung by other hands. But what did time immemorial mean? It meant a time of which they had got memorials sufficient to tell them that the farmer was then little better than a serf, and nothing better than a peasant cultivator of the soil, while, to all intents and purposes, the landlord retained possession. In those days little or no capital was required or possessed by the tenants. The income of the landlord fluctuated with the price of grain grown upon his farms, and he shared, in common with the tenant, the results of a prosperous or an adverse season. Under the modern system, when leases of 19 years at a fixed cash rental were universal, when agriculture was becoming more and more a science, and, above all, when the oil-cake and the manure merchant were often creditors for as much or more than the landlord, it did seem that the condition of affairs had so materially altered since the noble Lord's "time immemorial" that the hon. Gentleman was, in his opinion, fully justified in pressing this question upon the attention of the House and the Government. He had stated that the landlord was not unfrequently not the largest creditor of the farmer; and in order to prove that he would quote a very few figures, kindly placed at his disposal by the tenant-farmers in the county he had the honour to represent. One of the gentlemen stated that whilst his rent, in round figures, amounted to £2,030 he expended from January 1, 1876, to January 1, 1877, upon oil-cake, £1,895; upon manures, £774; making a total of £2,669, or £638 more than he paid his landlord. Other similar cases might be quoted. Then, considering the ample security that the landlord had at his disposal, were hypothec abolished, it did seem hard that the tenant should be, by its continuance, unnecessarily fettered and injured as regarded his credit in those dealings which were essential to carry on his business, and essential in order that the maximum amount of produce might be obtained from the soil. When Mr. M'Combie told them that Aberdeenshire was a county of small farmers, and that between 2,000 and 3,000 of them signed a Petition in favour of the abolition of hypothec, he only gave a sample of the feeling which pervaded all Scotland. There were exceptions, of course, and doubtless many farmers would willingly leave things as they were; but if the wishes of the tenantry could be fully tested, the amount of unanimity on this subject would astonish even those who thought they knew best. With regard to the two last lines of the Amendment of the noble Lord the Member for Haddingtonshire (Lord Elcho), he could say that no one more truly sympathized than he did with the struggle for advancement of industrious and enterprizing men; but he could not think that the interests of a great existing class should be postponed in order to foster competition by a few men of small means. Nor was that all. Agricultural interests had suffered so severely during a series of bad years, and with foreign competition reducing prices to the lowest point, that farmers without a little surplus capital had been nearly ruined. But if such men as the noble Lord the Member for Haddingtonshire pleaded for bad character and adequate capital, the abolition of hypothec would not prevent their taking such farms as their means would allow. Probably it would make landlords a little more cautious in their selection of tenants; but in the long run it would be found the best thing for the country. He regretted that the Government had not hitherto seen fit to take up the question. The Bill was not the mere outcome of a private Member's hobby. It was the expression of the well-considered and earnest desire of thousands of those tenant-farmers who were the best and most powerful friends of the Conservative Party in Scotland. They believed that the present law acted prejudicially to the credit and welfare of the tenant; that it was non-essential to the landlord, and inequitable as regards other creditors; and as the Bill in no way affected England, and would prove, he believed, to be conducive to the best interests of agriculture in Scotland, he trusted that amongst its supporters that day the Scotch tenant-farmers would not look in vain for the names of the right hon. Gentlemen on the Treasury Bench.

Mr. M'LAGAN said, he was sorry to interpose between the House and a Division; but he wished to say that, while he favoured the 1st clause of the Bill, there was something about the 2nd clause which he could not understand. The present law was very severe, and this 2nd clause appeared to increase the severity. There was no doubt that some difficulty existed at the present time in getting quit of a tenant who could not pay his rent, and who had been sequestrated by the landlord by his exercising his right under the Law of Hypothec. He knew a case in which the Law of Hypothec was exercised in consequence of a man failing to pay his rent. The man lived on the farm for five or six years afterwards, notwithstanding the legal steps taken to put him out of his farm, and damaged the farm to a great extent. It was clear that the landlord must have some remedy in his hands; and he hoped, when the Bill was in Committee, that some proposals would be made by which the landlords would be able to resume possession of their farms by some easy process when the rents were not paid. As he had often troubled the House upon the question, he did not intend to make any further remarks.

Mr. VANS AGNEW, in reply, said, he had endeavoured to lift this question out of the region of Party politics, and to treat it as a matter of political economy, and in this light he thought the discussion showed it should be regarded. The objections which had been urged to details of the measure could be suitably discussed in Committee. As he stated earlier in the day, he was prepared to accept any Amendment by the Lord Advocate, or other hon. Members, which would more satisfactorily meet the wants of the country. It had been his desire in this Bill not to propose more alterations in the present law than might be necessary. He would not go further into the questions of detail; but would merely make an appeal to English and Irish Members in the House. This was a Scotch question, and a local question. It had often been before the House; and the result of the present division would show that only two Scotch Members were ready to vote against the Bill.

Mr. BAILLIE COCHRANE, interrupting, complained that the hon. Member was making his speech over again.

Mr. VANS AGNEW thought that the hon. Member, who had been so long in the House, would know perfectly well that he had the right to reply on the debate, and he was not replying to any observations the hon. Gentleman made. The Scotch Members of Parliament were considered to understand their own affairs; and as to what had been said about this Bill affecting the English Law of Distress, he would remark that if the House were to maintain the Law of Hypothec, which was not a good law, on account of some remote possibility of England being injured, he did not think they would be treating the Representatives of Scotland fairly. If the House thought their Representatives had proved their case, he asked them to let them have their own way on a matter in which they were so united.

Question put.

The House *divided:*—Ayes 204; Noes 77: Majority 127.—(Div. List, No. 48.)

Main Question put, and *agreed to.*

Bill read a second time, and *committed* for *Tuesday* 1st April.

WAYS AND MEANS.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

(1.) *Resolved*, That, towards making good the Supply granted to Her Majesty for the service of the year ending on the 31st day of March 1879, the sum of £73,220 be granted out of the Consolidated Fund of the United Kingdom.

(2.) *Resolved*, That, towards making good the Supply granted to Her Majesty for the service of the year ending on the 31st day of March 1880, the sum of £8,494,195 be granted out of the Consolidated Fund of the United Kingdom.

Resolutions to be reported *To-morrow;*

Committee to sit again upon *Friday*.

MOTIONS.

TRUSTEES ACTS CONSOLIDATION AND AMENDMENT BILL.

On Motion of Mr. Osborne Morgan, Bill to consolidate and amend the Acts relating to the

Disposition of Property held upon Trust or as a security for money, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. OSBORNE MORGAN, Mr. GREGORY, Mr. ALFRED MARTEN, and SIR HENRY JACKSON.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 106.]

PUBLIC HEALTH (SCOTLAND) ACT (1867) AMENDMENT BILL.

On Motion of Dr. CAMERON, Bill to amend "The Public Health (Scotland) Act, 1867," *ordered* to be brought in by Dr. CAMERON, Sir WYNDHAM ANSTRUTHER, Mr. M'LAREN, Mr. VANS AGNEW, and Mr. MACKINTOSH.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 107.]

LICENSING ACT (1872) AMENDMENT BILL.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Resolved, That the Chairman be directed to move the House, that leave be given to bring in a Bill to amend "The Licensing Act, 1872."

Resolution *reported*:—Bill *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. RODWELL, Mr. Serjeant SIMON, Mr. ARTHUR MILLS, Mr. LEATHAM, and Mr. MARK STEWART.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 108.]

House adjourned at five minutes before Six o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Thursday, 20th March, 1879.

MINUTES.]—PUBLIC BILLS—*First Reading*—District Auditors* (30).

Committee—Medical Act, 1858, Amendment (16-31).

Report—Bankruptcy Law Amendment* (8).

Third Reading—Marine Mutiny Act (Temporary) Continuance*; Mutiny Act (Temporary) Continuance,* and *passed.*

NAVY—H.M.S. "BOADICEA."

QUESTION. OBSERVATIONS.

LORD COLVILLE OF CULROSS said, he wished to put a Question to the noble Earl the Under Secretary of State for the Colonies, of which he had given him private Notice. It was, Whether it is true that, in consequence of the refusal of the local authorities at the Cape of Good Hope to allow some cases of small-pox to be sent ashore from H.M.S. "Boadicea" on her arrival at Simon's Bay from the West Coast of Africa on the 28th of January last, six days after the disaster at Isandlana, that vessel was compelled to remain at anchor and in quarantine in Simon's Bay during a period when her presence and that of her crew would have been of the utmost importance towards re-inforcing the troops and inspiring confidence in Natal. The *Boadicea* arrived at Simon's Bay from England; but on her way had touched at some ports on the West Coast of Africa, and in this way, unfortunately, small-pox got on board—so that on her arrival at Simon's Bay she had 13 cases on board. Her captain applied for permission to land these sick men; but leave was refused. He made a second application to be allowed to land them at a point of land which projected into the sea, where they would be completely isolated from the population in the neighbourhood; but this was also refused, and he was told he must remain in quarantine at anchor, and at the expiration of 21 days after the recovery of the last case he would be allowed praticque. The unfortunate ship was consequently detained pitching and tossing in Simon's Bay, exposed to a strong south-easterly wind, and it was not likely that with such treatment the epidemic could be stamped out. In February a fresh outbreak took place, affecting two officers and 23 men, amongst them being Captain Romilly. His was an aggravated case, and the greatest fears were entertained of his life; but he was happy to say that his life had been spared, to the great relief of his numerous friends in this country. He had now been invalided, and would come home. Sanitary precautions were, no doubt, all very well; but the Colonial official mind, in this case, appeared to have come to the conclusion that it was of much more importance to keep small-pox out of Simon's Bay than to send this magnificent ship on to Natal at a moment when her presence would have been of the utmost importance. He thought his inquiry of so much importance that he had ventured to bring the matter under the notice of the House.

EARL CADOGAN, in reply, said, that the facts were as stated by his noble Friend. Since the occurrence had become known, the Secretary of State for the Colonies had made strong representations to the Cape Government, with a view to induce it to modify its quarantine regulations. With reference to his noble Friend's statement that the presence of the *Boadicea* and her crew would have been of the utmost importance towards re-inforcing the troops and inspiring confidence in Natal—it was, no doubt, important to re-inforce the troops at the Cape; but he thought it more than doubtful that troops just landed from a ship in which there was small-pox would have been brigaded with the other troops. He must also say that he could hardly agree with his noble Friend that the presence of such persons would be calculated to inspire confidence at Natal.

MEDICAL ACT, 1858, AMENDMENT BILL—(No. 16.)

(*The Lord President.*)

COMMITTEE.

Order of the Day for the House to be put into Committee, read.

Moved, "That the House be now put into Committee on the Bill."—(*The Lord President.*)

Lord EMLY: My Lords, I had not the opportunity of making any remarks on the second reading of this Bill; therefore, I trust your Lordships will allow me to occupy your time for a few moments on the present occasion, and I shall presently move an Amendment in Committee, which, if the noble Duke accepts it, will give great satisfaction to the Profession in Ireland. The object of this Bill, as your Lordships are aware, is to amend the Act of 1858. The chief object of that Act was, as far as possible, to provide that no person should be placed on the Medical Register without having passed a proper examination. Unfortunately, there were no fewer than 19 distinct Licensing Bodies, each of which had the power of fixing their own standard of examination. The fact of there being so large a body of co-equal authorities, it was thought, would render them likely to underbid each other; and many of them might set up a low standard of examination in order to induce students to come to them. In order to meet that difficulty, by the 20th and 21st clauses of the Act of 1858, the General Council was empowered, in case of any of these Bodies falling short in that respect, to appeal to the Privy Council; and if the Privy Council were convinced that the examinations were not efficient, they were empowered to suspend the right of registration in respect of qualifications granted by the College or other Body in default. Now, I believe that both the noble Duke and the noble Marquess the late President of the Council will testify to the fact that there never has been an instance where this power has been exercised. These 19 independent Bodies, with their separate examinations, have continued up to this day. Now, without troubling your Lordships with any remarks of my own upon that subject, I will state a fact which occurred not long ago as to the way in which they have underbid each other. In February last a gentleman, a licentiate surgeon of the Royal College of Surgeons in Ireland, presented himself for examination before the College of Physicians; but he showed such ignorance, that the Examiners were unanimous in rejecting him. Within a fortnight or three weeks, however, he sought and obtained, after a special examination, a licence to practise medicine from the College of Physicians of Edinburgh. A fact of that sort must convince your Lordships of the absolute necessity of putting a stop to this system of competition amongst these different Bodies, and securing a uniformity of examination. An obvious way to do this was suggested by the noble and learned Lord the Lord Chancellor some eight or nine years ago. What he suggested was, that there should be one Examination Board for the United Kingdom; that nobody should be allowed to present himself before that Body who had not a certificate from one of these 19 Bodies, and that no one should be placed on the Register, and be qualified as a medical practitioner, without having received a certificate from the Central Body. But both the noble Duke and the noble Marquess agreed that there would be so many difficulties in the way of carrying out that proposal, that they could not adopt it. With great respect to them, however, I do not see that these difficulties are so great. I think the thing resolves itself into a very simple one—a question of money. It was, beyond doubt, necessary that the Examining Body should hold the examinations in London, Edinburgh, and Dublin, and it would be impossible to get eminent men to act as Examiners without paying them highly; but, if only in the interest of the poorer classes, who cannot, like your Lordships, choose the medical men who are to attend them, I think it would be well to defray from the Public Exchequer whatever might be necessary to carry into effect an improved system. All, however, I now ask is to make the scheme of the noble Duke as perfect as it can be made. His scheme is, that there should be a Conjoint Board for each portion of the United Kingdom—that is, one in London, one in Dublin, and one in Edinburgh—and that the examinations should be conducted by these different Boards, to a certain extent under the control of the General Medical Council. This has been described by the College of Physicians of Ireland as a plan by which the Examining Bodies would be reduced from 19 to three—one for each Kingdom. I confess, however, with great respect, that I do not think the noble Duke goes far enough. It appears to me his Bill of last Session, which provided that the General Medical Council should frame the standard of examinations which was to be carried out by the Conjoint Board, was a Bill much more likely to be successful than the Bill now proposed, because that sort of control which he imagines the General Medical Council will exercise over the standard of examinations to be framed by the Conjoint Boards is not likley to be successful. I appeal to the experience of the last 20 years, and I point out to the noble Duke that the General Medical Council have the power to interfere, and they have never once interfered; and, certainly, I think the Amendment which I shall hereafter move will work better than the proposal of the noble Duke. Your Lordships ought to have some security that persons shall not be allowed to practice without having a sufficient knowledge for their Profession. I shall be glad to hear any reasons which the noble Duke may urge why there should not be a uniformity in the examinations, and why this should not be secured by allowing the General Medical Council to fix those examinations. If that is done, there will be much greater hope that the Bill will work successfully.

THE DUKE OF BUCCLEUCH: My Lords, I have just now presented a Petition from the Faculty of Physicians and Surgeons of Glasgow, praying that the Bill may not pass in its present shape. They say such an organic change in the mode of granting licences, however desirable, can only be justified for the reason that under the present system there have been evils which call for redress. It appears to me that this measure, so far from inquiring into that matter first, and then legislating upon it if necessary afterwards, is about to legislate first, and then inquire afterwards. What the Petitioners object to is, that the Universities of Scotland are, for the first time, to be deprived of the rights given to them by Charter, and by the Legislature, for the licensing of students for the practice of medicine and surgery. With regard to the Universities of Scotland, there are three which have great medical schools. The students in these schools have to pass the most stringent examinations; they have Professors, who, though they might have large private practices, yet have for their primary duties the duties of instruction; and, in addition to the examination by the Professors, there are independent Examiners selected by the *Senatus Academicus* from the most eminent men in the Profession. These gentlemen assist in the examinations, and they keep up a very high standard indeed. I believe that the University of Edinburgh, and the School of Medicine in that University, is second to none in Europe. Moreover, at the present moment, large sums are being expended in Edinburgh to make the power of giving efficient instruction greater. I think the best plan would be to send this Bill to a Select Committee or to a Royal Commission, who would be better able to thoroughly investigate it than a Committee of this House. The Bill deals with a subject of the utmost importance; and, judging from the Schedule, it would take a person many hours to ascertain what is the present law, and what is to be struck out of it, and what made new. I object to patchwork legislation of this kind—we ought to go about legislation of this nature properly. The noble Lord opposite (Lord Emly) has stated that he knew an instance of a student having got a certificate from the Edinburgh University within three weeks of having been rejected either in England or Ireland. I shall be glad if the noble Lord will inform me of the name of the individual, in order that I may make particular inquiry into the matter—for I can hardly conceive such a thing to be possible.

THE DUKE OF RICHMOND AND GORDON said, he would not reply to the remarks of the noble Lord (Lord Emly) then, as the whole subject would be raised when they got into Committee on the 15th clause. With regard to the suggestion of his noble Friend behind him (the Duke of Buccleuch)—that the Bill should be referred to a Select Committee—he could not concur with his noble Friend and the Petitioners that any further inquiry on the subject was necessary.

Motion *agreed to;* House in Committee accordingly.

Clauses 1 to 4, inclusive, *agreed to.*

Clause 5 (Attaching of licentiate to medical authority by holding medical diploma).

THE MARQUESS OF RIPON: My Lords, before this clause passes, I wish to say a few words in reference to it. I do not propose to divide the House; but I must say the clause appears to establish an inconvenient and clumsy system. I know very well what are the difficulties which beset this question; and I am so well satisfied with having obtained, under previous clauses of the Bill, the establishment within no very long period of Conjoint Boards of Examination in each of the three divisions of the Kingdom, that I will not press my noble Friend to strike out this clause at the risk of the failure of the main principle of the Bill, more especially because I am convinced that, if this Bill pass, this clumsy inconvenience will not be found in existence very long. I may be allowed to call your Lordships' attention to the system which this clause establishes. Under clauses already passed, there are set up three Conjoint Boards of Examination—one in each division of the Kingdom—one in England, one in Scotland, and another in Ireland. After their establishment, no person will be able to get his name placed on the Register until he has passed an adequate examination before one of these Boards, which examination is to be of such a character that it will give the public the security that every person whose name appears upon the Medical Register has a certain definite minimum amount of medical and surgical knowledge. It would seem natural, when that system is established, that the man who passed such an examination should be at once put upon the Medical Register; but the Bill, as it stands under this 5th clause, proposes to interpose between the examination and the placing of the individual upon the Register—a process of this description: a person who has passed an examination, and who is therefore proved to be qualified to practise, is required to make application to one of the 19 Medical Bodies of the country, to ask them to attach him to their body. If the authority he petitions should either refuse to attach him, or neglect to do so for one month, he can go to the registrar, with his qualifying certificate, and get his name placed upon the Register. It appears to me that this would establish a very inconvenient system, which would be disadvantageous alike to the public and to the Medical Corporations and to the individuals who have to pass the examinations. It would be inconvenient to the public, because it would tend to deprive them, at least in appearance, of the great advantage of the system of examinations. That great advantage is that, whereas now the fact of a man's name being on the Register does not show that he possesses a definite qualification, hereafter he is not to be put on the Register without having a defined and distinct qualification. Having established particular and uniform examinations throughout the Kingdom, the 5th clause will introduce a sort of vague and imaginary distinction between the persons whose names will appear on the Register. Under the clause, they will be divided into practitioners attached to Medical Authorities and practitioners who are not. There will be no difference in the qualification, for the certificates will have been given at the same examinations. It will simply imply that some Medical Body, in their own discretion, has attached one man and refused to attach another. The public will think this implies some disqualification on the part of the person who has not been attached. This clause will prevent the Medical Register from bearing that simple and single character of qualification, to secure which is one of the objects of this Bill. It seems to me that the clause will not operate to the advantage of the Medical Corporations themselves. As the clause stood before the noble Duke amended it, it would undoubtedly have operated to their financial benefit, as they would have been able to charge fees for attaching. But my noble Friend, who never intended that this should be done, has cleared up the matter by the Amendment he has introduced. What will happen? Why, either that the Medical Corporations will attach everyone who applies, that the whole thing will become illusory and a sham, or they will largely exercise their power of refusing to attach; and after a time, when the public finds that those who are attached and those who are not attached have exactly the same qualification, the tendency will be to discredit attachment to the Medical Corporations, and probably to discredit the Corporations themselves, or, at all events, to lower the value of attachment to those belonging to the Corporations. I have no doubt the system established under this clause would be rapidly swept away if there were a considerable number of persons left unattached. As regards the individuals who pass the examinations, I do not think it is right that, when a person has passed a strict examination before one of these Conjoint Boards, which, on the hypothesis on which the Bill is founded, gives all adequate security for his competence to practise medicine and surgery, you should force him, whether he likes it not, to go and ask one of these Corporations to attach him to their Body, at the same time that you place no relative obligation on the Corporation to accept him when he so applies. I consider that this clause will place those who have passed a satisfactory examination in an unfair position, or, at least, in one to which they ought not to be subjected. It seems to me to cast an unjust slur upon persons who do not obtain the attachment which, under this clause, they are required to sue for. It may be asked why I do not ask you to strike out the clause? It may not be expedient that I should do so, though I am satisfied that the clause is an unnecessary one, and that it will prove a sham in its working. The noble Duke had, no doubt, some reason for introducing it, and it may be that he could not very well have done without it. I felt it my duty to make this protest against the clause in question, though, so far as the Bill itself is concerned, I hope it will pass through Parliament without any very material alteration. I do not propose to divide the House upon the clause; but it was due to your Lordships and to the public that I should explain my view upon the point.

THE DUKE OF RICHMOND AND GORDON thought that after the statement of the noble Marquess it was incumbent upon him to say a few words. He was glad to find that the clause was not to be opposed. He did not think, however, that the noble Marquess, had he even been sitting on that side of the House, would have felt justified in taking any other course than the one he had taken. In legislating on this subject, their Lordships were bound to pay attention to existing Bodies on matters of this kind; and after considerable communications with them on this subject, he found that he could not anticipate the successful issue of the Bill without that clause.

Clause *agreed to.*

Clauses 6 to 14, inclusive, *agreed to.*

Clause 15 (Examination rules for securing uniformity of examinations for qualification).

LORD EMLY, in accordance with what he had stated, proposed to amend the clause by placing in the hands of the General Medical Board the duty of framing the rules and regulations for the examination of persons desiring to be placed on the General Register, to be applicable to all parts of the United Kingdom. He proposed to strike out the first words of the clause—"The Medical Authorities of each part of the United Kingdom . . . . shall, subject to the approval of" the General Medical Council, frame, &c., the effect of which would be to place upon the General Medical Council itself that duty. He intended also to move an addition to the first section—

"So that in all respects the curriculum of study, subjects for examination, standards for passing, and fees payable, shall be alike in each part of the United Kingdom."

Amendment *moved,* in line 1, leave out from ("The") to ("approval of,") in line 6, both inclusive.—(*The Lord Emly.*)

THE MARQUESS OF RIPON said, he certainly thought that the proposal which his noble Friend made was one which, if adopted, would improve the Bill. The proposal of the noble Duke was, that the existing Medical Authorities should have the preparation of these examinations and rules, and when they had prepared them, they should be subjected to the approval of the Medical Council. In all previous Bills the proposal had been that the Medical Council should have the preparation of these rules. Now, as the great object was to secure that these rules should be practically uniform for the three Conjoint Boards, it did appear to him that the most certain mode of obtaining that desirable end was that they should be prepared by one and the same Body. The Medical Council consisted of representatives from all parts of the United Kingdom; and he did certainly think, if they wanted uniformity, they could not better obtain it than by agreeing to this Amendment.

LORD O'HAGAN also supported the Amendment. There was the strongest feeling in the Medical Profession in Ireland in reference to this part of the Bill. They had a proper appreciation of the efforts of the Government in introducing this measure, and they had an equal appreciation of the difficulties which surrounded the subject; and he certainly hoped the noble Duke would see his way clear to accepting the Amendment. There ought to be uniformity in the qualification of medical men in the three Kingdoms. He was familiar with the North of Ireland, and had had experience derived at the Assizes, where he had seen most miserable exhibitions arising from persons professing to be qualified men, but who were scarcely possessed of any qualification at all. It required no argument to show that a single Body could act with more uniformity than many in settling the rules for qualification; and, therefore, if the noble Duke could do anything to equalize the qualifications, by having it with a single Body acting on a single principle and a single view, it would be far more effective than two or three Bodies. As far as this cardinal point of the Bill was concerned, he thought this was a wise and salutary Amendment, and one which ought to be adopted.

THE DUKE OF RICHMOND AND GORDON said, that the question of the rules in reference to the qualification of Medical Practitioners was an important one, and it had been his duty to look into it in consequence of the various representations which had been made to him from different parts of the three Kingdoms. He had thought that the proposition contained in this clause was the best mode of dealing with the subject, though he admitted that it differed from the course he proposed last year. But, inasmuch as he had the greatest possible confidence in the General Medical Council, which was composed of some of the most scientific men in the Medical Profession of the three Kingdoms, and as he wished to obtain as much uniformity of action as possible in those who would frame the new rules and regulations—indeed, uniformity was the great object of the Bill—and also feeling the weight of the observations of the noble Lord opposite, he would not oppose the first part of the Amendment proposed by the noble Lord—that part relating to the standard. He should, however, reserve to himself the question of the fees.

Amendment *amended*, by omitting the words "and fees payable," and *agreed to*.

THE DUKE OF RICHMOND AND GORDON moved to add, at end of first sub-section, the words—

> "And it shall be the duty of the General Medical Council to see that the examination rules in each part of the United Kingdom are so framed that the qualifying certificate shall as nearly as possible be granted on equal terms, so far as regards the curriculum of study examinations and standard."

He would hereafter consider whether he could accept the proposal about equality of fees.

LORD O'HAGAN hoped that an arrangement would be made by the noble Duke that the fees to be paid by students should be equal everywhere. He looked upon the three Conjoint Boards under this Bill as three parts of the same General Examining Board, and, under all the circumstances of this new legislation, the different Medical Bodies should charge the same fees.

Motion *agreed to;* words *inserted* accordingly.

Sub-section 3 (The examination rules shall determine the conditions of admission of candidates to the examinations, and shall provide for the admission thereto on special terms of medical students who have begun their professional studies before the passing of this Act, and of persons who have obtained medical diplomas in or studied in any British possession or foreign country, or have passed other examinations).

THE DUKE OF BUCCLEUCH moved an Amendment, to add at the end of the sub-section the words—

> ("And shall further provide that every member of a university who shall have passed the professional examination at such university for the degrees in medicine and surgery conferred by it, shall be exempted from any separate or further examination for a qualifying certificate under this Act, provided that such department of such professional examination, so far as regards all those subjects on which the medical board is required under a scheme to conduct examinations, shall have been conducted before a board of examiners of whom one half in number at least shall be examiners appointed by the medical board of that part of the United Kingdom in which such university is situate.")

The noble Duke contended that the Medical School of the University of Edinburgh was second to none in Europe, that the Medical School of the University of Glasgow stood very high, and Aberdeen, though not so large, was equally carefully conducted; but St. Andrews had not a regular Medical School. If there were any rivalry in those Schools, it was as to the standard of excellence, and thus for the good of the public. It was plain that if the standard of the Medical Board was lower than that of the Universities, the students would go to the Medical Examining Board and not to the Universities. He desired that the reputation of those Medical Schools should not be depreciated by the operation of this Bill, and therefore he moved this Amendment, which he did not consider to be in any way contrary to the principle of the Bill.

THE MARQUESS OF LOTHIAN supported the Amendment, as he believed that, if the Bill passed as it stood, it would be a serious injury to the Scotch Universities. There could be no doubt as to the thoroughness and efficiency of the Medical Examinations in Scotland, and nothing ought to be done to impair those Examinations. Although some of the Profession might have private practice, yet their first duty was to teach, and they had the most absolute appliances for carrying out the theoretical or practical part of the education of their students. With reference to what had been said with regard to uniformity, the object of the Bill was to have a fixed uniformity for a minimum of education, but there was to be no fixed uniformity of the maximum of education. He trusted their Lordships would agree to the proposal which had already been stated.

THE DUKE OF RICHMOND AND GORDON said, he was aware none of their Lordships would expect to hear from him any remarks attempting to depreciate the Universities of Scotland, as he had the honour of being the Chancellor of one of them. His noble Friend the noble Duke behind him (the Duke of Buccleuch) had stated—what was no less than true—that the reputation of the University of Edinburgh as a Medical School was world-wide. That was admitted on all sides—but he was sorry to say that on this occasion he was unable to accept the principle contained in his noble Friend's Amendment. He was very much astonished to hear from his noble Friend who spoke last that if this Amendment was accepted it would in no way affect the principle of the Bill. He conceived that the proposal of his noble Friend went to the root of the Bill. The object of the Bill was that there should be one portal of admission to the Medical Profession; and this it was proposed to attain by establishing a Conjoint Board in each division of the United Kingdom, in order to put a stop to the anomalies that now existed, and which resulted from there being 19 Medical Licensing Bodies in the three Kingdoms. He did not think his noble Friend could have thoroughly considered the effect of the Amendment which he had proposed, which was, that instead of having one Body for each division, they would have no less than 13 altogether. According to his noble Friend's proposal, he would admit the four Universities of Scotland. He was surprised to hear the noble Marquess (the Marquess of Lothian) say he spoke in the interests of the Universities. He was not attempting to legislate in the interests of the Universities, but was trying to legislate in the interests of the whole community. But if it was a great advantage to have the power which the clause proposed to give to the four Universities of Scotland, they would have to give the same power to the four Universities of England; because, if it was an advantage to the Scotch Universities, it would be equally an advantage to the English Universities to have the power. Then the two Irish Universities would, no doubt, also ask to be put in the same position; and, with the three Boards which it was proposed to constitute under this Bill, they would have no less than 13 Licensing Bodies in the place of the 19 Bodies they had now. The Amendment of his noble Friend, therefore, went to the very root of the Bill; and he did not hesitate to say that, if it was carried, it would be equivalent to moving that the Bill should be passed upon that day six months.

Amendment *negatived.*

Sub-section 5 *struck out.*

Sub-section 6 amended consequentially to the first Amendment.

THE DUKE OF RICHMOND AND GORDON moved, at end of clause, to insert as a new sub-section—

"All rules made in pursuance of this section when confirmed by the Privy Council, and all rules made in pursuance of this section which do not require to be submitted to the Privy Council, shall be laid before both Houses of Parliament as soon as may be after such rules are confirmed and made respectively, if Parliament be then sitting, or, if not, as soon as may be after the beginning of the then next session of Parliament."

Motion *agreed to;* words *added.*

Clause, as amended, *agreed to.*

Clauses 16 to 18, inclusive, *agreed to.*

Clause 19 (General provisions as to scheme for Medical Board).

THE DUKE OF RICHMOND AND GORDON moved, in page 12, line 6, to leave out from the first ("scheme") to the end of the clause, and insert—

("The scheme shall also provide for paying out of the said fees the expenses of the examinations and of carrying into effect the scheme, and for paying the cost of continuing to maintain under the control of any medical corporation any such medical museum or medical library, or both, as may before the passing of this Act have been ordinarily maintained for general public purposes by such corporation in their capacity of granters of qualifications for registration under the Medical Act, 1858, and have been so maintained out of fees paid by applicants for such qualifications, and may be of such importance to the promotion of knowledge in medicine or surgery as to deserve to be maintained out of fees payable for examinations for qualifying certificates and for applying the surplus, if any, towards the public purposes of any medical corporation in connection with the examinations.

The Duke of Richmond and Gordon

"An annual account of the receipts and expenditure in respect of such fees shall be submitted to the Privy Council at the time and in the form required by them, and shall be laid before both Houses of Parliament.")

THE MARQUESS OF RIPON suggested that the rules of the scheme for the Conjoint Boards should also be laid before Parliament, as well as the examination rules.

THE DUKE OF RICHMOND AND GORDON consented.

Motion *agreed to;* Amendment made accordingly.

Clause, as amended, *agreed to.*

Clause 20 *agreed to.*

Clause 21 (Power of medical authorities to constitute diplomas).

THE MARQUESS OF RIPON said, that it seemed to him essential that the Authorities should grant one and the same diploma to all persons coming up for attachment. He would therefore propose to add to the clause words to the following effect:—

"Provided always, That one and the same medical diploma shall be granted to all persons for the purpose of being so attached."

THE DUKE OF RICHMOND AND GORDON said, he was inclined to agree with the noble Marquess, but asked that the matter should be left until the Report.

Clause *agreed to.*

Clauses 22 to 24, inclusive, *agreed to.*

Clause 25 (Scheme for examination, licensing, and registration of midwives.)

THE DUKE OF RICHMOND AND GORDON said, after considering this subject, he came to the conclusion that he would strike the clause out now, and bring the subject up again on Report.

Clause *struck out.*

Remaining clauses and schedules *agreed to.*

The Report of the Amendments to be received on Friday, the 28th *instant;* and Bill to be *printed* as amended (No. 31.)

BANKRUPTCY LAW AMENDMENT BILL.

(*The Lord Chancellor.*)

(No. 8.) REPORT.

Amendments *reported* (according to Order).

The LORD CHANCELLOR said, that having considered the discussion on the 21st clause the other evening, he had prepared a new clause to be substituted for it, which he hoped would meet the views of his noble and learned Friend (Lord Selborne).

Clause 21 (Second General Meeting) *struck out.*

New Clause moved instead thereof—

In page 11, line 16, leave out from ("discharged") to ("If") in line 18, and insert,

("Provided always, that no such special resolution shall be passed until after the expiration of two months from the date of the provisional order; and upon an application to the court by any creditor of the debtor within one month after the filing of such special resolution, the court may (notwithstanding the special resolution) refuse to grant to the debtor an order of discharge, or suspend the same from taking effect for such time as it thinks fit, or grant the same subject to any condition or conditions touching any salary, pay, emoluments, profits, wages, earnings, or income which may afterwards become due to the debtor, and touching after acquired property of the debtor, upon proof being furnished to the court by any creditor of the debtor of any facts the proof of which would have entitled the court under this Act to refuse or suspend the order of discharge, or grant a conditional order of discharge if the debtor had been adjudged bankrupt. If no such application be made or proof furnished by any creditor within the above period of one month, the court shall at the expiration of such period grant to the debtor an absolute order of discharge. Every order of discharge granted under this section shall have the same effect as if it had been granted to a debtor adjudged bankrupt. Upon the passing of such special resolution the administration of the property of the debtor shall be proceeded with under the provisional order.")

Clause *agreed to,* and *inserted* in the Bill.

Amendment made, in Clause 39, as follows:—

In line 25 insert the following subsection:—

(*a.*) "That the creditors of the bankrupt under the bankruptcy have not received, and on a proper estimate of the assets are not likely to receive, a dividend or dividends amounting in the whole to ten shillings in the pound, and that the insufficiency of his estate to pay such dividend has not been caused through any negligence or fraud of the trustee."

Bill to be read 3ª on *Monday* next.

House adjourned at Seven o'clock,
till To-morrow, half past
Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Thursday, 20th March, 1879.

MINUTES.]—New Member Sworn—Lord Brooke, *for* Somerset County (Eastern Division).

Supply—*considered in Committee*—Civil Service Supplementary Estimates, 1878-9.

Ways and Means—*considered in Committee*—*Resolutions* [March 19] *reported.*

Private Bill (*by Order*)—*Second Reading*—Hundred of Hoo Railway*.

Public Bills — *Ordered* — *First Reading* — Lunacy Law Amendment [111]; Land Tax Commissioners' Names* [109]; General Police and Improvement (Scotland) Provisional Order (Paisley)* [110]; Consolidated Fund (No. 2)*.

Second Reading—Parliamentary Elections and Corrupt Practices [78].

Committee—*Report*—Drainage and Improvement of Lands (Ireland) Provisional Order Confirmation* [94].

QUESTIONS.

INDIA—THE INDIAN BUDGET.

QUESTION.

Mr. FAWCETT asked Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Whether, considering the serious position of Indian finance as disclosed by the recent Budget, he can make any arrangement which will afford the House the opportunity of considering on an early day the proposals of the Indian Government for the coming financial year?

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER, in reply, said, it would undoubtedly be desirable that this year the financial arrangements of India should be brought under the notice of the House at an earlier period than usual. It was all the more necessary on account of the proposal about to be made for a grant by himself. He had consulted his hon. Friend the Under Secretary of State for India; and, in concert with him, he thought an undertaking might be given that the Indian Budget would be brought under the notice of that House in the course of the month of May.

Mr. FAWCETT gave Notice, that when the Indian Budget was brought forward, he would move a series of Resolutions asking the House to express its opinion of the imperative necessity of reducing the expenditure of India, considering the present position of Indian finance.

CORONERS (IRELAND).—QUESTION.

Mr. O'SHAUGHNESSY asked the Chief Secretary for Ireland, Whether Her Majesty's Government will, during the present Session, proceed to carry out by legislation, wholly or partially, the suggestions made to him on the 7th ult. by a deputation of the Irish Coroners with regard to their position?

Mr. J. LOWTHER: Sir, a Bill has, I understand, been introduced on the subject of coroners which does not apply to Ireland; but there appears to be a fair opportunity for considering the case of Irish coroners, as the Bill, I am told, is to be referred to a Select Committee, and I understand that four Irish Members have been selected to serve on that Committee.

IRISH CHURCH TEMPORALITIES COMMISSIONERS—THE REPORT FOR 1878.

QUESTION.

Mr. HEYGATE asked the Chief Secretary for Ireland, When the Report, for 1878, of the Irish Church Temporalities Commissioners will be published?

Mr. J. LOWTHER: Sir, I am informed that there are some technical matters requiring adjustment, which will delay the presentation of the Report. I cannot exactly say how soon it will be ready, and a fortnight may elapse before it can be presented.

SOUTH AFRICA—SHIPMENT OF ARMS.

QUESTION.

Mr. RITCHIE asked the Secretary of State for War, Whether returned Government rifles and revolvers are now sold by public tender; and, whether, in view of the fact that many of these are purchased for a few shillings and shipped to Africa, the Government will consider the advisability of discontinuing such sale?

Lord EUSTACE CECIL: Sir, in answer to the Question of the hon. Member, I have to say that no revolvers or breech-loading arms have been sold that I am aware of. There have been two public sales of muzzle-loading rifles, all of which were unserviceable, and for the most part unsafe. These sales took place last year, and no further sales are contemplated at present. I may add, as no doubt my hon. Friend is very well aware, that a large quantity of breech-loading arms are yearly sold in Europe and America, which may possibly find their way to the African market. As regards the price of the arms sold, I cannot give a precise answer; but I think *5s.* or *6s.* each would be the nearest sum I could fix.

THE BRITISH MUSEUM—THE NATURAL HISTORY COLLECTION.

QUESTION.

Lord ARTHUR RUSSELL asked Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Whether Her Majesty's Government intend, on the removal of the Natural History Collection from the British Museum to South Kensington, to carry out the recommendation contained in the Fourth Report of the Royal Commission on Scientific Instruction (page 23), and to effect a change in the governing authority of that division of the British Museum?

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER: Sir, the arrangements which will have to be made on the removal of the Natural History Collections from the British Museum to South Kensington are under the consideration of the Government; but they are still in so inchoate a state that I cannot answer with any precision the Question of the noble Lord.

PUBLIC LOANS—PUBLIC WORKS LOANS BILL.—QUESTION.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN asked Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Whether the Public Works Loan Commissioners are already enforcing the conditions of Clause 4 of the Public Works Loans Bill before that Bill has been read a second time; and, if this course has been taken, whether he will give instructions that the system adopted by the Commissioners during the last ten years, in fixing the method of repayment of Public Loans, shall not be changed until after this House has had an opportunity of discussing the principles of the Bill and expressing an opinion upon it; also, whether he could give any information as to the probable time when the second reading of the Bill would be taken?

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER: Sir, with regard to the last part of the Question, I am afraid I am not at present in a position to fix a day for the second reading of the Bill. Having regard to the state of Business, I think it would be inconvenient to make it a first Order; but I am trying to get as early a day as I can for the discussion of the Bill. With regard to the other part of the hon. Gentleman's Question, I may state that the 4th clause is that which prescribes that in future loans shall be always repaid by instalments, and not by means of annuities, including both principal and interest. But, though that clause would make the practice compulsory, it is now competent for the Public Works Loan Commissioners to require repayment in that way. In point of fact, they have always had that power, and they have very largely exercised it in some instances. I am informed by them that there has been no variation in that practice since the Public Works Loans Bill was framed and introduced, except in one particular in the case of the Labourers' Dwellings Act of 1866. That, of course, is not the Artizans' Dwellings Act of 1875. That one case of variation has been made with the sanction of the Treasury. It was entirely within the power of the Public Works Loan Commissioners and the Treasury to make that arrangement; and it is not effected under Clause 4 of the Public Works Loans Bill now before the House.

JAMAICA—FLOGGING FOR LIBEL.

QUESTION.

MR. ERRINGTON asked the Secretary of State for the Colonies, Whether it is true, as stated in West Indian newspapers, that a Criminal Code is being passed for Jamaica in which flogging is provided as a punishment for libel, whether "wilful" or "negligent;" and, if so, whether this provision was introduced with the knowledge or sanction of Her Majesty's Government, and what course he proposes to pursue in the matter?

SIR MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH: Sir, a draft Criminal Code was prepared in this country for Jamaica in 1877, by the direction of my Predecessor in office, and a copy of it was presented to Parliament in August of that year. It was also sent out to Jamaica for consideration there by the Colonial Legislature. It contains a provision for whipping as a punishment for intentional libel, if the libel impute an infamous crime, but not for negligent libel, nor for intentional libel except in the case specified. It is now under discussion by the Legislature of Jamaica; and when that discussion is concluded it will be returned here, with any amendments that may be made, for my consideration and decision, when this and other points will, of course, come before me. But no part of it will be put into force until it has received the assent of the Secretary of State.

CRIMINAL LAW — THE DEVONPORT WATCH COMMITTEE.—QUESTION.

SIR WILFRID LAWSON asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether the Inspector of Constabulary has again reported that the Devonport Watch Committee continue the practice of making a preliminary investigation into all police charges against licensed houses before such cases are brought before the magistrates, with the result that half of these charges have been suppressed during the last year; and, if he sees his way to any method of checking the irregularity reported by the inspector?

MR. ASSHETON CROSS, in reply, said, it was quite true that the Inspector had made the Report to which the hon. Baronet alluded. As he had before stated, he entirely disapproved the practice, and he would say so again. The results, however, were not quite the same as the hon. Baronet stated. The Town Clerk wrote that during the year 19 cases were reported, that 16 were summoned, and that only three were dismissed by the Watch Committee. But he (Mr. Assheton Cross) could not help observing that if this practice had not been followed at Devonport, more cases would probably have been brought forward by the police.

LAW AND JUSTICE—CRIMINAL ASSIZES.—QUESTION.

MR. COLE asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, If he can inform the House how many of the 125 prisoners recently stated on the highest authority to have been acquitted at the Criminal Assizes in October and November last were charged with offences triable at Quarter Sessions?

Mr. ASSHETON CROSS, in reply, said, the number acquitted was 122, and not 125. Of that number 16 were chargeable with offences which could have been tried at Quarter Sessions.

NAVY — THE ROYAL YACHT "OSBORNE."—QUESTION.

Dr. KENEALY asked Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Whether it is true as stated in the papers that a sum of £20,000 of public money has been recently expended on the Queen's ship "Osborne," which conveys the Duke of Connaught to the Mediterranean; and, if not, what sum; and, if the said ship has not already cost the Country nearly a quarter of a million?

Mr. W. H. SMITH: I must beg leave, if the House will allow me, to answer the Question, instead of my right hon. Friend. The amount which has been, and will be, spent upon the *Osborne* is between £18,000 and £19,000. This amount includes the new boilers, an overhaul of the machinery, and a refit generally. I need hardly say that this refit was necessary, or the work would not have been undertaken, and it would have been carried out quite irrespective of His Royal Highness the Duke of Connaught's visit to the Mediterranean. It was undertaken, in fact, long before it was known the Duke would visit the Mediterranean. The original cost of the *Osborne* was £105,919, and, including the £18,000 just spent upon her, a further sum of £71,000 has been expended upon her since, and she has thus cost £177,000. She was built in 1869-70.

DOMINION OF CANADA—THE NEW TARIFF.—QUESTIONS.

Mr. JOHN BRIGHT asked the Secretary of State for the Colonies, If he can lay upon the Table of the House a Copy of the new Tariff now before the Canadian Parliament; if any communication has taken place between Her Majesty's Government and the Governor General, or Government of Canada, on the subject of the proposed increased Customs and Protective Duties in Canada; whether it is intended to represent to the Canadian Government the impolicy of a war of Tariffs between different portions of the Empire; and, whether it is true that the "instructions" to Lord Lorne omitted, for the first time, the Clause requiring that Bills imposing differential Duties should be reserved for Her Majesty's approval?

Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH: Sir, a summary of the proposed Tariff has been received by telegraph, but not such a complete statement of it as I could lay before Parliament as correct. The summary reached me on the 11th of March, this being the first communication I had received of the details of the scheme; and on the following day I was informed by the Governor General that his Government proposed to bring it before the Dominion Parliament on the 14th of March. There was no time evidently then for any detailed examination of the proposals, and I therefore telegraphed that—

> "Her Majesty's Government regretted to observe that the general effect of the Tariff was to increase duties already high, but deemed that the fiscal policy of Canada rested, subject to Treaty obligations, with the Dominion Legislature."

The Canadian Government fully understands the fiscal policy of this country; and I may add that I believe, though I could not positively say so at present until I have seen the actual Tariff itself, that there is nothing in the present proposals which has not been previously sanctioned, at least in principle, by Canadian legislation. In 1876-7, as the result of much correspondence between my Predecessor and the Dominion Government, the Instructions to be issued to Lord Dufferin's Successor were thoroughly revised, and in that revision the clause specifying certain classes of Bills—among them being Bills imposing differential duties—as those which should be reserved for Her Majesty's approval were omitted. This was done without any reference to a Protectionist policy, the Dominion Government, as the right hon. Gentleman is aware, then in Office being freetraders. The alteration of the Instructions, however, of course, in no way interferes with the power of reservation and of disallowance, those powers being fully set forth in the British North American Act of 1867.

Afterwards,

Mr. JOHN BRIGHT said, he wished to ask a Question of the Secretary of State for the Colonies, which he ought to have put immediately the right hon. Gentleman sat down—Whether he understood, notwithstanding the omission of the clause to which he referred in the Instructions of the Marquess of Lorne, that, in case of any proposal to enact differential duties on the part of Canada, the Bill would be submitted to the Government before it was adopted? He also wished to know, Whether the right hon. Baronet knew of any case now pending in which the Government of Canada was engaged in negotiation with some foreign Government with the view to the imposing of differential or increased duties? If the right hon. Gentleman had not heard of such a case, he could not, of course, expect an answer.

SIR MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH: I am not aware, Sir, of any such negotiations. With regard to the first part of the Question, perhaps, the best answer I can give to it will be to read the telegram which I sent to Canada, which received the sanction of the Government. It was in these terms—

> "They deemed the fiscal policy of Canada rested, subject to Treaty obligations, with the Dominion Parliament."

CENTRAL ASIA—REPORTED RUSSIAN ADVANCE ON MERV.—QUESTION.

LORD ROBERT MONTAGU asked Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Whether he can give any information to the House concerning a report in the "Standard" of March 18th, announcing the despatch of 20,000 Russian troops across the Caspian to unite with other troops, and with the probable intention of seizing Merv?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: No, Sir, I have no information that I can lay before the House. We have heard reports as to the movements of the Russian troops in that quarter; but we have no information that would justify us in stating what their probable destination was.

SOUTH AFRICA—DESPATCHES.

QUESTION.

MR. CHAMBERLAIN asked the Secretary of State for the Colonies, Whether the Government have addressed any communications to Sir Bartle Frere, on the subject of his policy in South Africa, since January 23rd, 1879, and besides the short Despatch of February 12th; and, if so, whether there is any objection to laying them upon the Table before the day fixed for the discussion on the Zulu War?

SIR MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH, in reply, said, he informed the hon. Member the other day that there would be some further despatches, and among them would be found those communications to which he referred. They would be in the hands of hon. Members on Friday or Saturday.

JAPAN—MEDICINAL OPIUM.

QUESTION.

MR. MARK STEWART asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, When the publication of the new regulations for the admission of medicinal opium into Japan may be expected; and, whether he has any objection to lay them upon the Table of the House as soon as they are agreed upon, together with all Correspondence relating to this subject?

MR. BOURKE, in reply, said, that Her Majesty's Minister in Japan had been instructed last month to send home the new regulations on this matter. They had not yet arrived. They could not be presented to the House until Her Majesty's Government had an opportunity of considering them.

GAS AND WATER SUPPLY (METROPOLIS).—QUESTION.

SIR UGHTRED KAY-SHUTTLEWORTH asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, with reference to what he said in his Speech of April the 5th last Session, viz:—

> "No one could hold the office which he had the honour to fill and refuse to admit that there were great faults in the government of London; he would go further, and say that there were questions connected with it which must undoubtedly be settled, seeing that Bills had been introduced by the Metropolitan Board of Works for taking upon itself the whole of the Water and Gas supply of London, and taking into account the Report of the Fire Brigade Committee which sat one or two Sessions ago,"

Whether, having made this statement, and, further, having on behalf of Her Majesty's Government been the cause of the abandonment, both last Session and again this year, of the Metropolitan Board's Bills for dealing with the Water supply of London, he intends to make any legislative proposals on these subjects during the present Session?

MR. ASSHETON CROSS in reply, said, he was glad to find that the words he made use of last year had made such an impression, and it was not his wish or intention to retract any of them. Since he made the speech referred to, he had been in constant communication with his right hon. Friend the President of the Local Government Board, and the matter had certainly not been lost sight of. The subject required very careful consideration, and he could not promise any immediate legislation.

ARMY DISCIPLINE (ANNUAL) ACT.

QUESTION.

SIR ALEXANDER GORDON asked the Secretary of State for War, Whether he will lay upon the Table of the House, before the Second Reading of the Army Discipline and Regulation Bill, a Copy of the proposed Army Discipline Annual Act, by which the proposed permanent Army Discipline Act will be annually brought into operation?

COLONEL STANLEY, in reply, said, he had no objection to lay on the Table of the House a Copy of the Bill referred to. The Bill in question simply recited the Preamble of the Mutiny Act, the number of men voted by Parliament, and, finally, attached the permanent Act. That was the whole substance of the measure.

NAVY—H.M.S. "BOADICEA."

QUESTION.

LORD CHARLES BERESFORD asked the First Lord of the Admiralty, Whether it is true that on the arrival of H.M.S "Boadicea" at Simon's Bay on January 28th, with some cases of smallpox on board among the Kroomen, leave was refused by the Colonial sanitary authorities for the sick men to be sent on shore to the naval hospital, and whether in consequence the progress of the disease on board was seriously increased; and, whether the presence of the "Boadicea" and her ship's company at Natal would have been of the utmost national importance during the time she was detained by the action of the colonial authorities?

MR. W. H. SMITH: Sir, I must express my extreme regret that this fine ship could not, on her arrival at the Cape, have proceeded at once to Natal. She arrived at the Cape with 14 cases of smallpox on board, and it is true that the Colonial authorities refused permission to land the sick men. They were, however, transferred to the *Flora*, the receiving ship, and it was hoped that this action would have stamped out the disease. Unfortunately, a second attack broke out a fortnight later, and still further detained her. After these outbreaks, it was absolutely necessary that the ship's company should be isolated and the ship remain in quarantine for fumigation, etc. Therefore, had the ship proceeded to Natal, her services could not have been utilized. The Colonial authorities imposed a quarantine of 21 days from the date of the last appearance of smallpox on board the ship.

CRIMINAL LAW—CASE OF JAMES SWANTON.—QUESTION.

MR. SULLIVAN asked the Chief Secretary for Ireland, If it is true that in the case of a man named James Swanton, who died at Glengarriff under suspicious circumstances on the 24th of December last, the coroner did not attend to hold an inquest until the 7th of January; who was responsible for such delay; and, is it the fact that no post-mortem examination of the body took place?

MR. J. LOWTHER: I learn from a telegram received from the sub-inspector of the district that the circumstances attending the death of James Swanton were these. He and his wife retired to bed on the night of the 23rd of December in a state of intoxication. During the night the husband fell out of bed and died the following morning. The death was reported to the Coroner the same day. An inquest was held on the 31st of December. The verdict was to the effect that death was caused by apoplexy, accelerated by cold and drink. Under these circumstances, no *post-mortem* examination was considered necessary.

DURATION OF PARLIAMENTS.

QUESTION.

MR. W. H. JAMES asked Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, If there would be any objection to lay upon the Table of the House a Return of the exact duration of the several Parliaments from the year 1603 to the present time?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER, in reply, said, there would, of course, be no objection to lay this Return on the Table; but he wished to call the hon. Gentleman's attention to the fact that a very minute table of the duration of the several Parliaments from the reign of Henry VIII. to the present time was already in his hands. Any one of the calendars to which everybody had access gave the date of each Parliament, its duration, and the number of years, months, and days for which it sat. In these circumstances, such a Return as the hon. Member asked for would hardly be necessary.

ARMY—SIXTEEN-SHOOTER RIFLES.

QUESTION.

COLONEL BARNE asked the Secretary of State for War, Whether the Military authorities have considered the propriety of arming a certain proportion of each battalion of the Army with sixteen-shooter rifles to be used for hand to hand fighting?

LORD EUSTACE CECIL: The question of magazine arms is under consideration, but no decision at present has been arrived at. An exhaustive trial was made in the United States in 1877-8. Out of 27 magazine rifles, one was selected as most suitable for military service. A few of this pattern have been ordered for trial, and a few also of a pattern approved by the Austrian Government. When these have been thoroughly tested, we shall be in a condition to come to some decision on the subject.

THE LORDS' COMMITTEE ON INTEMPERANCE—THE REPORT AND EVIDENCE.—QUESTION.

MR. BLAKE asked Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, If he will be good enough to cause Copies of the Evidence taken before the Lords' Committee on Intemperance, together with their Lordships' Report thereon, to be supplied to Members of this House?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: I believe the whole evidence taken by the Lords' Committee has already been printed and distributed. It is only necessary, therefore, to send a message to their Lordships, asking for the communication of their Report, and the Secretary for the Treasury will move that it be laid on the Table.

MALTA—THE RECENT RIOTS.

QUESTION.

MR. ANDERSON asked the Secretary of State for the Colonies, If he will cause the whole Correspondence between the Colonial Office and the Local Government at Malta respecting the riots of the 15th May last to be laid upon the Table?

SIR MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH, in reply, said, there would be no objection to do as the hon. Member asked.

NEWSPAPER CORRESPONDENTS IN THE FIELD.—QUESTION.

MR. ANDERSON asked the Secretary of State for War, If it is in accordance with Army Regulations that the Staff Officers of a General on active service in the Field should hold also appointments as newspaper correspondents?

COLONEL STANLEY: Sir, the Regulations of the Army do not sanction Staff officers of a General on active service in the field holding any such appointments; while officers are held personally responsible for any reports relative to the numbers, movements, or operations of the troops, for any military details which they may make known without the special permission of the General in command, or for allowing any information to get beyond their control, so as to find its way into unauthorized hands. Any deviation from these Orders must be upon the personal responsibility of the General in command.

MR. ANDERSON hoped the right hon. and gallant Gentleman had taken, or would take, care that General Roberts paid attention to this Regulation.

ISLAND OF CYPRUS—HEALTH OF THE TROOPS.—QUESTION.

MR. A. C. BARCLAY (for Mr. BRASSEY) asked the Secretary of State for War, If it is the intention of Her Majesty's Government to make further inquiry, by a Medical Commission or otherwise, into the probable effect of the climate of Cyprus on the health of British troops quartered there, or if any plan is already arranged for protecting the troops from disease, or for removing them from the island during the summer months?

COLONEL STANLEY: Sir, a very exhaustive Report on the subject has been received from Sir Anthony Home, the principal medical officer, and will shortly be laid on the Table. That Report deals so fully with the matter, that at present I do not think it necessary to suggest the appointment of any Medical Commission to make further inquiry. I understand that a good summer station has been found for the troops, at a considerable elevation, and probably a portion of the 20th Regiment will soon be removed to Malta.

PARLIAMENT—STATE OF PUBLIC BUSINESS.—OBSERVATIONS.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: Before proceeding to the Orders of the Day, I would ask permission of the House to call their attention to the present state of Business with reference to the Civil Service Supplementary Estimates and the Excess Votes, which stand as the First Order of the Day. The House is aware that it is necessary that these Votes should be passed, and that the authority to pay the money out of the Exchequer in respect of them should be given before the 31st March, the close of the financial year. The process which is necessary is, that, after voting in Committee of Supply the Supplies that are asked for, the Report should be taken as the next stage. Then a Resolution will have to be proposed in Committee of Ways and Means, and that also has to be reported. Then a Bill has to be brought in, and passed through all its stages in both Houses; and it is necessary that that process should be gone through at least a day before the 31st of March, in order that the further steps may be taken which are necessary for getting the money out of the Exchequer. If any failure were to take place in that respect, we should be put to the alternative either of not supplying the money for certain services for which it is necessary, or we should be in the position of being almost compelled to violate the Appropriation Act, which, of course, is not to be contemplated. Therefore, it is really absolutely necessary for the regularity of our proceedings, that we should get these Votes through in proper time. I have had the days very closely calculated, and I find that unless we are able to pass these Estimates to-night we shall not be in time. There are, I know, a large number of Notices down on going into Committee of Supply, and several of them refer to matters of great interest, and upon which, no doubt, considerable debate might arise, and the House is always naturally, and I may say properly, unwilling to take up the voting of Supplies very late in the evening. I am therefore now about to make an appeal to hon. Members who have Notices on the Paper to allow us on this occasion to go into Committee of Supply without discussing those Notices. But I feel that it would be unreasonable in me to make that request to hon. Members, if I were not able to put them in as good a position as if they had not made that sacrifice, and I believe that it is in my power to do so by a proposal which I shall now make. It is this—if hon. Gentlemen will consent to waive their Notices to-night, and to allow you, Sir, to leave the Chair, and let us go into Committee, and if—which I cannot doubt—we get through the Supplementary Estimates and the Excess Votes to-night, I should then propose on Monday to place Supply, not as the First Order of the Day, but as the Second. The First Order will be the formal stage of Committee of Ways and Means, which will only occupy a few minutes; and thus Supply would practically become the First Order. Standing as the Second, however, it would not come within the Rule which was passed the other day; and, therefore, all the Notices which are on the Paper for to-night, might be brought forward in their order on Monday. I make this proposal for the advancement of the Public Business, and I think hon. Gentlemen will see that it is one which is fair, and that it does not impose any disadvantage upon those to whom I make an appeal.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, that having the first Notice on the Paper, he would at once accede to the right hon. Gentleman's request.

SIR GEORGE CAMPBELL said, he had a Notice on the Paper upon a very important question, which he was most anxious to bring before the House. His position was a somewhat peculiar one, as he had intended to bring it on the previous Friday, but had not been able to do so in consequence of the action of the Government. However, he would return good for evil, and submit to the Chancellor of the Exchequer's necessity, though he hoped that an opportunity would be given him for bringing the question forward.

MR. DILLWYN also consented to withdraw his Notice.

ORDERS OF THE DAY.

—∞0∞—

SUPPLY—COMMITTEE.

SUPPLY,—*considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

CIVIL SERVICE SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1878-9.

CLASS III.—LAW AND JUSTICE.

(1.) £350, Wreck Commission.

(2.) £19,723, County Courts.

(3.) £426, Metropolitan Police.

(4.) £3,500, County Prisons, &c., Great Britain.

MR. SULLIVAN hoped that the right hon. Gentleman the Home Secretary, or the Under Secretary, would be able to say what progress was being made in remedying the present defective arrangements as to the appointment of Catholic Chaplains to all prisons. He (Mr. Sullivan) moved the other day for a Return showing what prisons in this country, having 50 Catholic prisoners and upwards, had Catholic Chaplains attached to them. Unfortunately, at the present moment, he had not that information in his possession, and he had not the remotest idea of proposing that this Vote should be postponed on that account, although he thought that if he had to make that application, it would not be an unreasonable one. He should like the Under Secretary to be able to state, as far as he knew at present, what would be the answer contained in the Return he (Mr. Sullivan) had moved for. In Ireland, if there were even five prisoners belonging to the Dissenting or Church of England denomination there was a Chaplain of their particular persuasion attached to the prison in which they were confined. In no part of Ireland was such a thing known as a prison being without a Chaplain of the various religious denominations. In England that was not so, for there were many prisons in England in which there were upwards of 50 Catholic prisoners, to which no salary was provided for a Catholic Chaplain, if he was correctly informed. He had had to do with the government of prisons in which they had not even one Dissenter or Presbyterian for over three months together; nevertheless, at the end of every half-year that he sat as a member of that governing board he voted in favour of a salary for a Presbyterian Chaplain for those prisons. He thought it very hard when he crossed the Channel that he should find that the same measure of justice was not meted out to his co-religionists. He did not wish to raise a lengthy discussion upon the question at the present time, because he hoped he should have the opportunity of raising the question at a subsequent period. But he did feel that Her Majesty's Government should endeavour to provide that the same measure of justice should be meted out on each side of the Channel. If he was correctly informed, there were many prisons throughout the country in which there was no religious equality, and where there was no due regard for the conscientious convictions of one section of the prisoners.

SIR MATTHEW WHITE RIDLEY could not give the hon. and learned Gentleman (Mr. Sullivan) the figures he required respecting the number of Catholic Chaplains attached to the prisons of the country. The subject, however, had received the careful consideration of the right hon. Gentleman the Home Secretary, and he believed he was right in saying that some recommendation had, within the past few days, been made to the Treasury in the matter. He hoped that when the Vote came on for the ensuing year, both the Return asked for by the hon. and learned Gentleman and a proposal with regard to the appointment of Catholic Chaplains would be in the possession of the House.

Vote *agreed to.*

(5.) £8,004, Reformatory and Industrial Schools, Great Britain.

MR. O'REILLY wished to call the attention of the Under Secretary to the Treasury, and of the House, to a remarkable difference in the treatment, and, consequently, in the Estimates, with regard to the industrial and reformatory schools in Ireland and in England. The question might very opportunely be raised on this Supplementary Estimate. The Acts of Parliament in both countries—in fact, in the three countries of England, Ireland, and Scotland—were alike, for they stated that the "Treasury may grant such sums to these institutions as they shall approve." The words, of course, were the same in all similar cases—"the Treasury may," and those words were generally understood, as pointed out by the Chief Justice in Court the other day, in general cases to be obligatory, except there be reason for the contrary. In the Acts of Parliament there was no limitation as to the number of children that should be placed in reformatory or industrial schools; but the magistrates or the other committing authorities, in the exercise of their own discretion, committed children to such schools, and then the payment for such children upon a regulated scale became practically obligatory upon the Treasury. Consequently, the Treasury made an estimate as to the number of children that was likely to be committed annually, and then came down with a proposal that a certain sum should be voted towards the expenses of the schools. If it turned out, as it had done this year, that the sum taken was insufficient—that the number of children committed was larger than was expected, a Supplementary Estimate such as the present was taken. What had been the course pursued in Ireland? He at once wished to state frankly what he knew to be the real meaning of it. It was considered that the number of children committed to industrial and reformatory schools in Ireland was increasing very largely. Certainly, there was an increase, and there was also an increase in England; and it was stated by the Gentlemen representing the Irish Government that an increased amount would be required to be voted. It was then considered how the number of children could be checked. The Government had no power to interfere with the discretion of the magistrates in committing children to the schools,, but another course was found. It was determined not to allow any more children to be committed to industrial and reformatory schools, and the course was taken of refusing to certify any additional schools, or any additional accommodation, unless the Government wished to apply to Parliament for a corresponding increase in the amount of the Vote. The consequence was, that he put a series of Questions to the Chief Secretary for Ireland last year, and, in the shape of replies, obtained a good deal of useful information. Unfortunately, he had not got those answers in his possession at the present time, for he had not expected that this Vote would be taken to-night; but it was perfectly clear from those answers, that an Inspector would not certify a school unless the Government approved that some additional accommodation should be certified. The result of the present state of affairs had been that the number of children committed to industrial and reformatory schools in Ireland was, what he ventured to call, arbitrarily limited, while it was not so in England. That was a matter which required explanation at the hands of the Government. He always wished to be perfectly frank with the House, and, therefore, never concealed any knowledge he had in his possession. He wished at once to say that there was something, as there generally was, to be said on the other side. The fact was this—The rate of payment for children, which was originally fixed upon by the Treasury to be paid in England, was 5*s.* per head per week. The same rate was subsequently fixed upon for Ireland. When the number was found to be largely increasing in England, and it was considered doubtful whether Parliament would be willing to meet so large a demand, Parliament agreed to reduce the rate, he thought, to 3*s.* 6*d.* per head per week. Then the question arose, whether the action of the Treasury should be the same in Ireland as in England, and whether a similar reduction should take place? He did not exactly know what the decision had been. He rather thought that in England the case stood thus—That children committed previous to the reduction were still paid at the rate of 5*s.* per head, and that recent committals were paid at the rate of 3*s.* 6*d.* per head. Whether such applied to Ireland he did not know. He believed that the rate there continued at 5*s.*, and that this was given as a reason why a different system was applied in Ireland than in England. Whatever might be the opinion of others, he at once frankly argued that it was not a sound or constitutional principle to act upon. He did not say now that the rate in Ireland should be reduced, because it had been reduced in England; but he did say that it was an unsound and unconstitutional doctrine that it should depend upon the discretion of the Government whether an Act of Parliament was to be put in force so that a totally different system should be applied in Ireland to England. He wished to point out to hon. Gentlemen the objection to such a system prevailing. It ended—whatever were the good intentions of the Government—it ended in the objectional form of personal government. New schools were not to be certified, and no new children admitted, unless the consent of the Government, in a formal and regular manner, was previously obtained—unless the consent of the Irish Government, or, in other words, that of the Chief Secretary for Ireland, was obtained. What did this lead to? If in England an industrial school was desired, the parties came forward and the money was supplied. In Ireland it was a matter of favour. Persons came up from the locality to urge upon the authorities the necessity of establishing a school in the district from which they came. He did not say that political influence had anything to do with it, but, as a matter of fact, Members of Parliament were asked to exert themselves; and it became a question of personal influence whether such a school was to be sanctioned or not. He thought English Members would sympathize with him when he said that this was not the way an Act of Parliament should be administered. A rule should be laid down which should apply impartially, and the same system should be put in force in the two countries. What he wished the Secretary to the Treasury to tell him was, whether, in substance, what he had stated was correct; and, if so, whether it was by the direction of the Treasury, or by that of the Lord Lieutenant, or, in fact, by whose direction it was that a different system was applied in Ireland to that in England?

SIR HENRY SELWIN-IBBETSON admitted that the distinction, which the hon. Member (Mr. O'Reilly) had pointed out, did, in the main, exist between the mode of dealing with industrial schools in this country and in Ireland. The payments to industrial schools in this country, previous to 1872, were laid in the following rates:—For children from 6 to 10 years of age, 3*s.* per head per week was paid; for children from 10 to 15 years, 5*s.* per head per week; and then for any children over 15 years of age, if they had been four years in the school, there was payment made at the reduced rate of 3*s.* per head per week. After 1872, the middle payment was reduced, as the hon. Member had stated, from 5*s.* to 3*s.* 6*d.*; and at the present moment the rates of payment were 3*s.* for the first class of children, 3*s.* 6*d.* for the second class, and 3*s.* as before for those over 15 years, having been in the school four years. Now, with regard to Ireland, there was no distinction made between the different classes of children, for each child certified as in the school was paid for at the rate of 5*s.* per head per week. A difference, however, existed in the mode of receiving applications for the establishment of industrial schools. In England the voluntary effort was very general, and in most cases local effort started those schools. An application for a new school must be made to the Treasury. An Inspector of the Home Office was sent down to the district from whence the application proceeded, and his duty was to certify as to the efficiency of the proposed school, and upon that the Government contribution was paid according to the usual rate. In respect to Ireland, where the amount was larger, a very different system prevailed. In that country, up to the present time, it had been the practice for each school to be sanctioned only on the authority of the Chief Secretary for Ireland, with the consent of the Treasury, and he could only imagine that the power was reserved in order to limit the number of children. As to the limitation of the number of schools, the effect of the reduction in the rate of payment in England had practically been to check the increase of industrial schools, and for several years after 1872, the hon. Member (Mr. O'Reilly) would find that the increase of these schools was practically *nil.* The practical result in both countries was about the same; the reduction in the contribution for children between 10 and 15 years of age having checked the increase in the number of industrial schools in England in pretty much the same way as the official veto in Ireland. He confessed that, individually, he would like to see the industrial schools in the two countries placed on the same basis. He believed that the object of these industrial schools being a reduction of our criminal population especially, it was undesirable on the part of Parliament to throw undue impediments in the way of the establishments of such schools whenever there was a proper demand for them. At the same time, he must point out that they found that they did not always get that class of children who were certainly fit and proper subjects for them. It had been a little too much the practice, especially since school boards had been established, to treat almost all children as waifs and strays, and send them to industrial schools. In England there was always an endeavour to see that the State assistance was properly supplemented by local effort. Local effort was a good criterion of the necessity of such establishments, and when it came in in sufficient amount it showed that the locality was properly exerting itself in the interest of the reformation of these children, and the result was very salutary. He should be glad to consider with his right hon. Friend the Chief Secretary for Ireland any proposal for placing the industrial schools in Ireland on the same footing as they were treated in the sister country. At the same time, he believed that the State had already undertaken sufficient obligation in respect to these institutions. If local effort accomplished as much, proportionately speaking, in Ireland as in England, he should see no reason for the limitation of which the hon. Member complained.

Mr. MACARTNEY observed, that if the result of the hon. Member's (Mr. O'Reilly's) intervention in the matter was the assimilation of the system adopted in respect to industrial schools in the two countries, he hoped that great care would be taken that encouragement would not be given to a certain class of persons to have their children educated at the expense of the public. In many places, he saw that this practice had been carried out very extensively, and it had proved dangerous to the country and to society. A great deal of interest was excited on this subject, and in Belfast complaints had been very properly made concerning the course taken by some people. He recommended that the grants should not be such as to induce people to cause their children to be sent to industrial and reformatory schools, so that they might receive their education at the expense of the public.

Mr. A. MOORE wished to say a word or two as to the arbitrary manner in which this money was given or withheld by the Irish Goverment. He remembered on one occasion when a boy was ordered to be sent to an industrial school there was not to be found a single school in Ireland to take him in. The Government money was exhausted, and the schools could take no more children. On the one hand, there were the magistrates sending children to the schools, and on the other hand, there were the schools unable to receive them. The law was thus brought to a dead-lock; but he was bound to add that, through the courtesy of the present Chief Secretary for Ireland, whose attention he personally called to the case, and who took compassion upon it, the child was ultimately got into a school, because the right hon. Gentleman ordered him to be received. But still, he thought it was a most strange dead-lock, that the Treasury should come into collision with the Act of Parliament in this way, and prevent its being carried out. Now, with regard to the cutting down of the resources of these schools in the shape of the Government grant. He thought that it was most desirable that people should be accustomed to meet the Treasury grants with local contributions. That was perfectly right and just, and, he should like to see the practice in this respect assimilated in both countries. But the Committee must remember that unless they assimilated the law of England and Ireland on that point, they could not get the children kept in Ireland out of a Treasury grant of 3*s.* 6*d.* In this country they gave the Treasury grant to that amount, and they also empowered three or four local bodies to vote money in assistance of that Treasury grant; but there was no such power in Ireland. When a Bill was brought in last year, which would have enabled Boards of Guardians to make some contribution, as was done in England, it was blocked in the most effectual manner, and thus that opportunity was lost of giving aid to the repression of juvenile crime.

Mr. SULLIVAN said, he had heard the observation made that these institutions ought not to be so nursed and cherished. He would remind the Committee that there was a power under the Act to compel the parents to contribute, and, therefore, if that was neglected to be enforced by the parish to which the child belonged, surely it was not the fault of the Act of Parliament?

Mr. O'REILLY wished to have an explanation as to the part of the Act of Parliament under which this discretion was supposed to be exercised. So far as he could see, the wording of the two Acts for the two countries was identically the same, and he had never been able to understand what was the difference. He was quite aware that both Acts ran with the word "may," and he should like to know what necessary difference there was between them? He thought the hon. Member for Clonmel (Mr. A. Moore) had furnished the House with a perfect example of the evils to which he (Mr. O'Reilly) had previously alluded, when he told them that he had to make the admission of a child a personal matter with the Chief Secretary. Attempts were made long ago to exercise this discretion. Instructions were given to the magistrates not to send children to reformatory schools, unless those schools were certified; but, fortunately, that broke down. He really wished, in the first place, to have this arbitrary power on the part of the Treasury done away with. He knew it was very difficult to establish a perfect assimilation of practice; but nothing was more indefensible than the great difference of practice which at present existed. Would it not be possible to say they should receive the old rate of five shillings?

Sir HENRY SELWIN-IBBETSON said, there was this distinction between the two countries, that in the case of the Irish schools the grants were made at the same high rate as formerly, and the change which took place in 1872 only affected the middle class of ages. At the same time, he would consider the suggestions which had been made.

Colonel COLTHURST pointed out, that there was no local body in Ireland who were empowered to give grants for building purposes, as in England. It had hitherto been usual for Grand Juries to give an increased payment to the schools, on the ground that they had been left entirely to their own resources, and were entitled to be recouped, some, at least, of their expenditure; but he was sorry to say that, during the last few years, there had been attempts made on the part of nearly every Grand Jury in Ireland to very much reduce these grants, and some Grand Juries had refused to give anything at all. Therefore, the managers of industrial schools in Ireland were at a great disadvantage, and he hoped the right hon. Gentleman would take that matter into his consideration.

Mr. J. LOWTHER said, he thought the county which the hon. and gallant Member (Colonel Colthurst) represented was one of those to which he had referred as refusing the grant. With regard to the remarks of the hon. Member for Longford (Mr. O'Reilly), he must remind him that the discretion which was exercised under the Act with respect to the certifying of these schools had no connection with the financial branch of the subject. He understood, moreover, that there was no Irish Vote before the Committee, so that he believed they were out of Order in continuing the discussion.

Mr. HIBBERT said, he wished to call attention to a difficulty which Boards of Guardians had experienced in consequence of the working of the Prisons Act, and it was this—There was considerable doubt as to whether they could legally pay for the maintenance of children who were sent to reformatory schools. He wished to know, whether the Home Office had taken any legal opinion on that matter, which had previously been mentioned in the House; and, if an opinion had been obtained, he should be glad to learn what it was? If the Secretary of State could enlighten the Committee upon the subject, he believed it would satisfy the local authorities of the country upon the question. For his own part, he did not see much difference between a boy or girl who was sent to a reformatory, and a prisoner who was sent to one of Her Majesty's prisons; but it appeared that a boy or girl who was sent to prison for a month, and then to a reformatory for three or four years, would be paid for by the State during the month he or she was imprisoned, and then the moment he went to a reformatory part of the cost of maintenance was paid by the State and part by the local authority. Well, it seemed to him that if there were any doubt upon the question as to whether the State should not pay the whole expense, it was very desirable that that doubt should be set at rest.

Sir MATTHEW WHITE RIDLEY said, the opinion of the Law Officers had been taken upon the subject. That was, he believed, to the effect that the local authorities were liable for the maintenance of children in reformatory schools. There were one or two other points concerned, and if the hon. Member would make a detailed inquiry on the Report, he would be ready to give him a definite answer.

Mr. BIGGAR said, there was one matter which he wished to mention to the Government. The manager of an industrial school in Belfast made a very great complaint of the way in which he was curtailed by the Chief Secretary as to his capacity for getting his school filled properly. The complaint was this—There was an enormous demand for admission into that place, and the manager did not like to turn any children away if he could avoid doing so. The consequence was that he received a very much larger number than he got a grant for, and he (Mr. Biggar) thought it was a question which might be very fairly asked of the Government as to what extent and under what conditions they would give a grant for every child who was admitted, instead of limiting the number, and then they might lower the rate, perhaps, to a level. Because, the practical result of the present system was this—that the small number which the Government would allow in the Vote was far less than it ought to be. He thought these schools ought to be enabled to maintain themselves a little above the standard of the workhouse, inasmuch as children required a special training, and ought to have a chance given them of making a good start in the world. On the other hand, if the grant were made too high, there would be a tendency on the part of the Grand Juries to cut down the number, which they had the power to do, and to make the admission more or less a matter of privilege; and thus special privileges would be given to special parents, and the class which needed it the most would not, in a great many cases, get admission into these schools. He would really press upon the Government the desirability of not limiting the number of children who should be admitted into those reformatories, and of giving the managers an opportunity of giving the advantage of that education to all who required it. He thought it would be a good thing to make a claim upon the Board of Guardians for a small proportion of the support of the children; and in that way the practical result would be, that instead of living a life of pure idleness in workhouses, if they went into a reformatory for three years, and were trained as he knew they were trained in those institutions, the children would prove decent members of society, and would not be half so likely to become permanent burdens upon the ratepayers.

Vote *agreed to.*

(6). £10,000, Magistrates and Miscellaneous Legal Charges, Ireland.

Mr. WHITWELL said, he wished to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, if he could inform the Committee whether this present amount was the normal amount of the grant, and would be the same in future? He knew that, in conquence of the alteration in the law, there must be a large supplementary addition on this occasion; but he hoped that part of it was only temporary, and that the sum total of £15,920 would not all be required in future. Perhaps the hon. Gentleman would inform the Committee how the matter stood?

Sir HENRY SELWIN-IBBETSON said, he could hardly hold out to the hon. Member any hope that there would be any diminution in the number and expenses included in this Vote—expenses which, as the hon. Member was aware, had come into operation in consequence of a recent Act of Parliament. In addition, however, he would remind the Committee, that the receipts for fees would in general more than cover expenses; and, therefore, they might look forward in Ireland, as they might in similar cases in this country, to a satisfactory working of this particular Act. The effect of it would be, that the receipts for fees would more than cover the salaries paid.

Mr. BIGGAR remarked, that he now saw the right hon. and learned Gentleman the Attorney General for Ireland in his place, and he should like to ask him a question connected with the Vote. He had two or three questions to mention in connection with the Vote. The first question was as to the very large increase in the payments to the Clerks of the Peace and the other officials in that department. It seemed to be three times as much, or, at any rate, twice as much, as in the original Estimates. The next question was with regard to registrars. The sum estimated for registrars was *nil*, but in the Supplementary Vote there were two classes of registrars. There appeared in the entries, a "remuneration registrar" and "allowance registrar," and he begged to know what was the difference between them? Another thing he should like to know was, upon what principle those gentlemen were paid, because he believed that in the County Courts Bill last Session an arrangement was made as to what compensation should be given to the registrars? He wished to put that question to the Government, and there was some curiosity on the part of the Irish public as to how those gentlemen were paid, and how much each one received.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (MR. GIBSON) said, he could very readily explain the two points which had been referred to by the hon. Member for Cavan. These Votes were really part of a series of Votes which would have to be taken to carry into effect a very useful Act of Parliament, passed in the year 1877, and called the County Officers and Courts Bill. That Act provided, amongst other things, that the two offices, which were previously held in each county in Ireland of Clerk of the Crown and Clerk of the Peace, should be united. These two officers used to be paid under an old, rather vicious system of fees, and they also used to be allowed to appoint deputies. A very substantial reform had, however, been established, and it had been provided that there should be no new officers appointed whenever vacancies occured; that these offices should be united; and that, instead of there being two officers in each county, there should be only one office, to be called the United Office of Clerk of the Crown and Peace; that that officer, instead of receiving fees, should receive a certain fixed salary, which should be paid out of the Votes, and that the Exchequer should receive the benefit of the fees; so that for the first time, whenever an office of this kind fell vacant, and was filled up in pursuance of the provision in the Act of Parliament, it came upon the Votes, but the Treasury would receive concurrently the fees that used to be received by these officers. At the commencement of last year there were only two of these offices united, but up to the present time there had, he believed, occurred nine or ten vacancies, so that, as he had already pointed out, the more the Estimates appeared to increase, it might be taken that there was a greater gain to the country, because the fees received by the country were far in excess of the salaries which appeared on the Votes. With regard to the allowance for registrars, they were entirely new officers who were appointed in pursuance of an unanimous and stringent recommendation of a Select Committee, which was composed mainly of Irish Members. They insisted that the County Court Judges in Ireland, to whom had been given an enlarged jurisdiction, should have the assistance of registrars; but at the commencement of the last financial year none of these officers had been appointed, and no provision had been made for their payment. To begin with, a temporary arrangement was made in the course of the year that these officers should be appointed, and, as the amount of their labours was not clearly ascertained, that they should be paid provisionally two guineas for every day they were obliged to attend in Court during the sitting of the County Court Judge, with an additional guinea a-day for their travelling expenses. That was the answer to the Questions which had been put to him by the hon. Member.

GENERAL SIR GEORGE BALFOUR said, the fees received were not shown in the Estimates. The Chief Secretary for Ireland said that the fees would be very large, and would cover all the expenses of the Courts; but he could not find these expenses set down in the Estimates.

SIR HENRY SELWIN-IBBETSON said, the new Rule had only just come into force, and, therefore, last year, they were not able to calculate what amount of fees they would receive.

MR. BIGGAR asked, who appointed the registrars? Formerly, the duties now performed by the registrars, was performed by the Clerk of the Peace or the County Clerk, so that in reality, though they were said to have two offices amalgamated, they had a new office created. Formerly, he believed, the Lord Lieutenant had the appointment.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. GIBSON) replied, that the whole provision with reference to the appointment of registrars, their duties, and qualifications was contained in the 10th section of the Act. It was there stated that the appointment of registrar should be made by the Chairman, or the County Court Judge, subject to the approval of the Lord Chancellor; and then there was a very distinct sub-section, which stated that every person so appointed should be an attorney or solicitor, and so on.

Vote *agreed to.*

CLASS IV.—EDUCATION, SCIENCE, AND ART.

(7.) £106,000, Public Education, England and Wales.

MR. CHAMBERLAIN observed, that he did not rise to oppose the Vote, for he thought it must be a matter of satisfaction to the country that the number of children under education, and entitled to receive the grant, had considerably exceeded the estimate. He wanted to call the attention of the Vice President of the Council to the determination that had been come to with reference to the Birmingham School Board. That Board had been informed that the grant would be withdrawn, unless the female teachers in the young boys' school were replaced by male teachers. These female teachers had been employed hitherto as an experiment, which had answered very well. In Birmingham they found considerable difficulty in obtaining sufficient qualified male teachers for their schools, and as their expenses were very rapidly increasing, therefore, they were anxious to try the effect of substituting female teachers, who were paid at a lower rate. They had been tried in the best schools in the United States, and on the Continent, and had succeeded. He did not know on what ground the discretion of the Board had been thus rudely interfered with. It was only one of the many attempts to exercise local discretion which seemed to be resented by the Education Department. The Council in London was apparently actuated by a desire to cut them all down to one length, the effect of which would shortly be that they would have a system giving them as little discretion as that in Prussia.

LORD GEORGE HAMILTON said, he did not know this question was going to be raised, or he would have brought down the correspondence on the subject; but, so far as he remembered, the Birmingham School Board asked leave to try the experiment of substituting a certain number of female teachers for male teachers in the boys' schools. The Education Department objected, as there was a strong objection to the employment of female teachers in boys' schools. ["Why?"] The objection was not a very pleasant one to state; but, as a rule, these teachers were young, and they were brought into connection with the master, and were under his sole control. There had been more than one case brought under the notice of the Department in which immorality had resulted. Therefore, he thought the Education Department had acted wisely in the way they had done. He was aware that many school boards complained of the way in which the Education Department interpreted the Code of the Rules; but they were bound to see that those Rules were adhered to, or else they were surcharged by the Audit Department. The particular case of the Birmingham School Board was very carefully considered, though he was aware that that Board did not concur in the validity of the objections raised. The Council had not the least desire to discourage the appointment of women as teachers in infants, girls, or mixed schools.

MR. MUNDELLA considered the answer of the noble Lord eminently unsatisfactory. Throughout the whole of the United States, and in Switzerland, the younger boys, and some of even rather mature growth, were admirably taught by females. It was found that they taught boys up to 10 or 11 even better than young men, the labour, of course, being performed at about one-half the rate. Birmingham was, therefore, doing very great service by trying this experiment, and he thought the Education Department was far too rigid, and far too much given to discountenancing anything in the way of improvement. He hoped the noble Lord would permit Birmingham to try the experiment on behalf of the country, and if it succeeded, would let it be tried elsewhere. The school boards were trying everywhere to get the best education at the smallest possible rate; and to discourage this experiment, at a time when there was so many complaints of the cost of education, seemed to him to be most unwise.

MR. A. MILLS knew something about the United States, and he should not like to see our educational standard lowered to their level. Though he admitted that we had much to learn, in regard to the quality of the teachers, yet he should be sorry to think that the education given at the London School Board was not very considerably superior to the average elementary teaching in the United States. He believed the tendency now-a-days was to extend the employment of female teachers rather than to restrict it, and he hoped that would not be carried too far. If any alteration were made, he hoped care would be taken to reduce the undue strain at present placed in too many instances on young female pupil teachers.

MR. M'LAREN said this employment of female teachers for young boys was spoken of as though it were an experiment; but he might mention to the House that the system had been in operation in the most successful school in the United Kingdom—that was to say, the best school measured by the test of results. It obtained the largest amount of grants, and he did not know any better test than that. In Gillespie's school in Edinburgh, belonging to the Merchant Company, there were over 1,300 pupils, and the grant earned last year was over £1,000, and it had been so for some years. That school was mainly taught by young women. Nine-tenths of the teachers were women, and the children were certainly well taught. Now, if that was the result of the working of the system in the most successful school in the Kingdom, why should this red-tapeism be applied to Birmingham to prevent the employment of female teachers? He was surprised to hear an hon. Gentleman opposite, a member of the London School Board, say that they would bring the education in this country down to the level of the United States. Some time ago, a gentleman was sent to America by the Government to report upon the state of the schools there. That gentleman was Dr. Fraser, now the Bishop of Manchester, and the Report he wrote was published as a Blue Book. Bishop Fraser there stated that the schools in America were mainly taught by women, and that, in his opinion, the teaching given in that country was equal to any given in this country, and in many cases was much better.

COLONEL BARNE said, as a rural ratepayer, he thought the education given to the labourers' children was rather too high. He hoped the Government would do all in their power to keep down the expenses of the school boards. At present, they were advancing by leaps and bounds; and if they went much further, the time would come, especially under the present depressed condition of agriculture, when the ratepayers would be unable to pay the rates at all. In the rural districts, also, they had great difficulty in obtaining mistresses, and though they offered very high wages, were sometimes unable to get one for months at a time. In consequence, they lost the school grants. He wished to ask the noble Lord, whether there was any chance of the supply equalling the demand?

MR. R. E. PLUNKETT said, he had paid great attention to this subject, and he did not think it would be satisfactorily settled until they imported three or four hundred of these American teachers. He hoped the Department would do nothing, but would allow the experiment of employing properly-trained women teachers to be applied in any part of the country. If they adopted the system pursued in America of training girls from their earliest years in the normal schools, where they learnt to teach as they were themselves being educated, and thus acquired the habit of authority, much advantage would result. He must say, he certainly never heard there of any such difficulty about immorality as the noble Lord had suggested.

MR. DILLWYN understood the noble Lord to speak of immorality only in cases where the boys were taught alone. He did not see, however, that there was any great difference between the two systems, and he hoped the noble Lord would reconsider his statement.

MR. CHAMBERLAIN also hoped the noble Lord would re-consider the matter. It was, in his opinion, most unsatisfactory to insist upon this absolute rigidity in the Rules. The Birmingham School Board had been overruled by the Department on technical, and he would venture to say on unreasonable, grounds. Unless he was mistaken also, at the time the correspondence took place, the Department did not put forward this possible immorality as a ground for refusing their sanction, but simply said that the female teachers should not be employed in the boys' school. They had been given an unreasonable answer, and he did not think that of the noble Lord was much more reasonable. Although it might be true that there had been some cases of immorality, yet he might point out to the noble Lord that in all probability they were not entirely due to the fact that men and women taught together in the day-time in a large building called a school. If it were to be laid down as an inexorable rule in all legislation that the sexes were to be entirely separated, how did the noble Lord explain the fact that they were allowed to work together in the Post Office and Telegraph Departments? He believed that no imputations of immorality were made against that branch of the Civil Service, and he could not understand why a mixture of the sexes which have been allowed there should not be allowed in the case of board schools.

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON replied, that the correspondence on this particular subject took place three or four months ago, and as he was not aware the subject was going to be brought up that evening, he was not prepared to go into all the details on the subject. But if the hon. Gentleman would call at the Education Office, he would be very glad to talk the matter over with him. The Birmingham School Board proposed to try young female teachers in boys' schools, and it was felt that it would not be wise to allow that, especially as they would be entirely under the control of a man, who might not be a married man. As to the supply of teachers, the number of persons passing through the training colleges was annually increasing, and he hoped that in the course of time that increase would be found useful.

Vote *agreed to.*

(8.) £210, London University.

(9.) £16,984, Paris International Exhibition.

Sir JULIAN GOLDSMID said, last year, when this Vote was before the Committee, they had some conversation about it, and he asked his right hon. Friend (Mr. Lyon Playfair), whether he thought the amount then stated to be required would be very largely exceeded? He pointed out at that time, and it was admitted by the Government, that the amounts voted for previous Exhibitions had been enormously exceeded, and that such a practice was not conducive to economy or to carefulness in management. His right hon. Friend then replied, that every care would be taken by the Committee, of which he was the head, to see that the expenditure was properly regulated. He (Sir Julian Goldsmid) found that the total expenditure was £66,980, which was nearly £17,000 in excess of the amount originally intended to be spent. He was aware that the Commission, on getting to work in Paris, learnt that the French Government did not intend to pay for several things which had been supplied on other occasions by the country where the Exhibition was held. As far as he was able to say, the general management of the English section gave satisfaction to both the exhibitors and the public; but, at the same time, he thought it was well that the right hon. Gentleman should give the Committee some details with regard to exactly how the expenditure was incurred, and also, if he could do so without inconvenience, some account of the general results of the Exhibition, so far as the Commission was concerned.

Sir ROBERT PEEL thought this was a matter which required the serious consideration of the Government. Two or three years ago, when this Vote was asked for, a distinct and definite pledge was given by the Government that £50,000 would be the extreme limit of the expense incurred. In 1876-7, £800 was voted; in 1877-8, the bulk of the money; and now they were asked to vote nearly £17,000 more. The Chancellor of the Exchequer was invited to become the Chairman of the Finance Committee, but that, of course, was impossible with his numerous duties in the House. However he undertook, though he declined to act as Chairman, that the Treasury should keep the Commission within the bounds of the Vote. Later on the Government were asked if the Vote would be exceeded, and they replied that there was no need for it to be exceeded. Last year they were told that out of the funds the Commission had granted £100 to assist English artizans to visit the Exhibition; but the Irish Members, when they asked about the subject, were told, in reference to Irish artizans, that the amount expended could not be increased, owing to the limited sum of money voted to them. Therefore, and on that ground, the Royal Commission declined to advance any money to assist Irish artizans to visit the Exhibition. Yet they had had now nearly £17,000 asked for in excess on account of this Exhibition. If the Government knew there was going to be this excess, they ought to have told them so last year. What did they find this money was chiefly expended upon?—the rent of offices, and the construction of premises within the area, as he supposed, of the Exhibition itself. He did wish to impress upon the Government the necessity of making some explanation of this Vote.

MR. LYON PLAYFAIR quite agreed that an explanation was required, and that the Committee was entitled to ask for it. The House would recollect that the Finance Committee was formed of persons of great experience, including the hon. Baronet the Member for Aylesbury (Sir Nathanial de Rothschild), and the hon. Baronet the Member for Lisburn (Sir Richard Wallace), besides other gentlemen outside the House, who were eminent as financiers, including Sir John Rose, Mr. Rivers Wilson, and other gentlemen. He had the honour of being Chairman of the Committee, and when the Government proposed a grant of £50,000, as the full estimate for the Exhibition, he thought it was a moderate sum, but hoped, from his experience of past Exhibitions, it would be enough for the purpose. They found that at Philadelphia 187,000 square feet was all the space that was required by British exhibitors, and almost the same amount at Vienna. Therefore, estimating that about the same space would be required at Paris, they thought that the amount voted was sufficient, and that £50,000 might with economy be a sufficient sum to ask for. But when they came to have a Royal President in the person of His Royal Highness the Prince of Wales, who acted most admirably throughout the Exhibition, throwing his great influence into the management, the demands of exhibitors increased enormously. Five times as many exhibitors asked for space as could be accommodated, and 383,000 square feet were allotted to the fifth of the number of would-be contributors. The Commissioners were obliged, in consequence, to build new sheds and large annexes. In doing this, the exhibitors gave great help, and without their aid it would have been impossible to bring this matter to a successful issue. He would give one illustration in proof of that aid which had consequently enabled the Commission to carry out the arrangements with such moderation and economy. Part of the scheme of the Exhibition was to have an international street, and, unfortunately for herself, England was obliged to build three houses. All the nations spent money very vigorously in erecting characteristic houses. Belgium, for instance, spent £8,000 on her representative national house. We spent no less than £25,000 upon ours; but of that sum the exhibitors gave over £23,000, and only £1,800 was required to make up the amount from the national funds. In other countries also, at other Exhibitions, the Government had supplied the labour for packing and unpacking; in Philadelphia, for instance, the American Government bore the whole expense. But in France that was not so, and, in consequence, the Commissioners were obliged to employ a large number of workmen, the item for labour being no inconsiderable one in their accounts. Again, the Fine Arts Department became, owing to the stimulus given to the Exhibition by the hearty co-operation of the Prince of Wales, of the greatest importance, and it was necessary to spend £3,300 to insure the valuable collection of pictures. That outlay had not been anticipated. Mentioning these facts, he would leave the House to decide whether they had not been most careful in their expenditure. He had had some experience of these Commissions, for he had acted on nearly all of them. In the French Exhibition of 1867 the arrangements were carried out under direct Ministerial responsibility, the Board of Trade carrying out the administrative details, while the Treasury looked very carefully after the items. At that time £123,000 was spent in an Exhibition which was acknowledged to be far inferior to that of 1878. Had that Exhibition been on the same scale as the present one, the cost in the same ratio would have been £170,000. The recent Exhibition had produced results which were most creditable to the nation, and most satisfactory to the exhibitors, and had also produced a feeling of unanimity and harmony between the two nations which was quite remarkable, with an expenditure of only £67,000. He thought, after the explanation he had given, it would be seen, that without the active co-operation of His Royal Highness the Prince of Wales, and the vigour with which he inspired the exhibitors by the energy which he threw into the work himself, they could not have produced so great a result, and that the expenditure they had incurred was really very small indeed.

Mr. SAMPSON LLOYD said, it was always unsatisfactory when an Estimate was exceeded; but, in this case, he thought the circumstances stated ought to make the House well content to vote this money, remembering the great results which had been achieved. No one, he was sure, who had seen former Exhibitions, and who carefully examined the arrangements of this one, could fail to be convinced that this one was better managed, better organized, and far more likely to produce beneficial results in the direction intended—the benefit of civilization and art. It must be remembered that all the jurors in this instance paid their own expenses, and that a great deal of gratuitous labour was given in the Exhibition. In particular, His Royal Highness the President gave an enormous amount of time to the case, and he thought the greatest credit was due to him for labour which made the Exhibition so productive to the exhibitors, and produced an amount of enthusiasm which otherwise would never have been evoked. Another point was, that the Secretary to the Committee was paid much less than on former occasions. In 1867 the Secretary received half as much annual salary again as was paid to the present Secretary, and yet he also received, during the four years he was in office, he did not say that he did not deserve it, £3,000 for extra labour. Sir Philip Owen had received only £300 extra for all the hospitality and personal expenses incidental to this work, and, considering the great amount of time he devoted to the matter, he was sure that was no great amount of extravagance.

Mr. MUNDELLA said, £100 was voted to send artizans to the Exhibition, but a much larger sum of money was furnished by voluntary subscription, and Ireland had her full share of the total amount raised. He himself had the pleasure of nominating some of the Irishmen who were sent to Paris, and he could assure the House that no favour was shown to anyone, and that they knew no distinction so long as the men were representative artizans. He should like to add that he thought the French Exhibition was one of the most creditable things to us, as an industrial nation, that had taken place for many many years. At a time when there was a good deal of croaking, and when people were everywhere saying fallacious things about the decline of England, it never was more clearly necessary that Englishmen should show their power still to hold their own against the world. There never was so much voluntary effort as on this occasion, and the amount of self-sacrifice on all hands was more than could have been expected. Every Commissioner, for instance, paid all his own expenses, and did not have so much as a biscuit at the expense of the Committee. The Jurors also staid for a month or five weeks in Paris, and received nothing whatever but the letter of thanks which His Royal Highness the Prince of Wales sent to each. England never did anything so cheap, and she never did anything so well, as she had done at this Exhibition. This was due mainly to the energy and spirit which His Royal Highness threw into the matter. He must say that, though he did not want to pay compliments where everybody was complimenting, everyone who went there could see the effect the influence of the Prince of Wales had in bringing about a thorough good understanding between the two nations. They all knew the recognition which his heartiness and *bon-hommie* received from the French exhibitors and the French merchants. He believed the money laid out at the Exhibition was well spent, quite apart from the high position England took as a manufacturing country. What would have been the result, if England had taken a bad position at the Exhibition, at a time when they were closely run by other nations, and every country was claiming that it could do things better than England?

The thing was done well, it was done cheap, and the whole affair was creditable to everybody.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: It is not in the least necessary, after what has been said by the right hon. Gentleman opposite (Mr. Lyon Playfair) and others, to add any testimony as to the extremely satisfactory way in which the work of the Exhibition was carried out. That is a matter of absolute notoriety, and it is really quite unnecessary for me to say one word on the subject. What I rather rose to say is, that I can bear my own personal testimony, not only to the zeal of His Royal Highness the Prince of Wales and the efficient manner in which he conducted the work, but also to the extreme desire he displayed from the first to keep down the expenditure. At the commencement, His Royal Highness expected that £60,000 would be sufficient, and it was his ardent desire to keep the expenditure within that sum. It was only in consequence of circumstances, which could not have been foreseen at the outset, that the Commission was obliged to ask for some excess. I know, from repeated personal communications with His Royal Highness, how extremely unwilling he was to make that request; but, as he himself put it to myself and the Treasury, it was quite impossible to avoid it. There was also another circumstance, to which the right hon. Gentleman opposite has not alluded, as increasing the expenditure, and that was the unexpected prolongation of the Exhibition beyond the date originally fixed, which not only involved additional expenditure for wages and salaries, but the re-hiring of the buildings, and the re-assurance of valuable works of art which had been lent to the Commission. Other matters also arose out of the prolongation, which could not have been foreseen. I will not say anything of the way in which the whole affair was conducted; but I should be wanting in my duty as a Finance Minister, if I did not bear my very sincere and earnest testimony to the great zeal with which everyone concerned had endeavoured to keep down the expenses, first to His Royal Highness, next to my right hon. Friend, who had worked very hard as Chairman of the Committee, and also to Sir Philip Owen, who conducted the work he had to discharge to the greatest possible success. I think the country feels that a great debt of gratitude was due to all concerned.

SIR JULIAN GOLDSMID thought the explanations given perfectly satisfactory. He wished to draw one moral from what they had heard. This Exhibition, in which England was better represented than she had ever been before, and at one-half the cost, was managed throughout by a private body of gentlemen, under the guidance of the first Gentleman in the Kingdom. It was, undoubtedly, far better to encourage private effort than to have Government management.

Vote *agreed to.*

(10.) £8,746, Public Education, Ireland.

CLASS V.

COLONIAL, CONSULAR, AND OTHER FOREIGN SERVICES.

(11.) £22,810, Diplomatic Services.

MR. BOURKE said, there was a Motion on the Notice Paper of the hon. Member for Frome (Mr. H. Samuelson) for the reduction of the Vote by the amount of the expenses of the Inquiry into the murder of Mr. Ogle. It would, perhaps, save the time of the hon. Member, if he (Mr. Bourke) were to state that those expenses had been paid out of the Estimates of last year.

MR. H. SAMUELSON said, he should be glad if the hon. Gentleman would explain what was the amount paid, and under what head it was voted?

MR. BOURKE said, he could not state the precise amount of that particular Inquiry; it was included with the sums paid for other Inquiries.

MR. H. SAMUELSON asked, Whether, under present circumstances, he could raise the question of the murder of Mr. Ogle?

THE CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member can only raise upon this Vote a question relating to the sum proposed by the Vote, and as he is assured that it is not intended to apply any part of the money asked for in this Vote, he would not be in Order to go into that question.

MR. H. SAMUELSON said, he should move a *pro formâ* reduction on the question of salaries, in which case he believed he should be in Order.

SIR JULIAN GOLDSMID ventured to express his belief that the sum of

£4,000, asked for the Eastern Roumelian Commission, would be of very little service, a fact which might be gathered from the ordinary sources of information; at the same time, he desired to know something of the opinion which the Government entertained with regard to the results of that Commission, for, as far as he had been able to ascertain, they were but "confusion worse confounded," one Commissioner having, as it was supposed, lost his life in the service; while the population declined to admit the validity of the Commission. He inquired, therefore, whether the labours of the hon. Member for Christchurch (Sir H. Drummond Wolff) had been more successful than those of his colleagues? He (Sir Julian Goldsmid) imagined that the hon. Member for Christchurch would have been of more service in the House than on this Commission, which it appeared was not at all likely to be successful, and he was very anxious to know whether the sum of £4,000 in question would cover the whole expenditure, or whether a further sum might not hereafter be asked for? Again, he would like to know how long the Commission, which, in his opinion, was a futile one, would continue; because he thought that it was an interference in the internal arrangements of another country that could only be justified upon very strong grounds. They had already seen indications that all the results of the Treaty of Berlin were not so satisfactory as they had been led to expect; but, at the present moment, they were only concerned with one particular result, and that was the Eastern Roumelian Commission. On these grounds, therefore, he thought that some information should be afforded by the Government, both with regard to the present and past expenditure of the money required.

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER: I think, Sir, the hon. Baronet (Sir Julian Goldsmid) takes rather an unusual opportunity for, I will not say criticizing, but denouncing the Treaty of Berlin, and the manner in which it is being carried into execution. No doubt, it is a very large question how far the arrangements of that Treaty, and the particular arrangement with regard to the Eastern Roumelian Commission, have been successful. But the time for that discussion has not arrived, inasmuch as the results are not yet complete, and are therefore not before the House. It will be remembered that the time allowed for the execution of the Treaty of Berlin has not yet elapsed, and will not do so until May; and that work is in progress which was deliberately undertaken at the Congress. When that work is complete, I am bound to say that I think it will be found that the hon. Member for Christchurch (Sir H. Drummond Wolff) has been doing excellent service to the country; and that when these results are known, they will reflect great credit upon my hon. Friend. It is quite impossible for us to enter into a discussion as to the results of the Eastern Roumelian Commission, or to speculate upon what they may be. The hon. Member says he has read a great many things about this subject, of which, of course, some may be correct and some not; but whether they are or are not correct, the work in hand is of that vast character that, until a final conclusion is reached, no judgment respecting it can possibly be formed; and to attempt this would be like looking at a scientific painting when the work of the artist is but three-parts finished, and which, although at that stage it does not promise a successful result, might be found on completion to be perfectly satisfactory. I hope the upshot of the work which is now being done by the Commission will be of a satisfactory character; but I would rather adjourn the consideration of that point to the time, which must soon arrive, when we shall be able to lay before Parliament the whole story of what has passed, and be in a position to discuss the question upon its merits. The hon. Baronet has asked whether this Vote of £4,000 will cover the whole expense to be incurred on account of the Commission? We have not, at the present moment, the means of saying what the whole cost will be. The Estimate is but a rough one, designed to cover what we suppose to be the expenditure up to the end of the present financial year; and, of course, there will be some addition for the expenses which may be incurred by the Commission from that period until the time when it comes to an end—probably about the beginning of May. I presume, however, the charge will not be of a very formidable character. I hope the Committee will not think the present a convenient season for entering into any discussion as to whether the Commission has or has not been successful.

MR. W. H. JAMES said, he was quite prepared to wait for the fulfilment of the favourable anticipations of the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer, which he trusted would be realized. He had to make an inquiry of the hon. Gentleman the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Mr. Bourke); and, with regard to the item of £3,000 included under letter A, desired to know whether it was a special grant to be made to Her Majesty's Ambassadors at Paris and Constantinople, and why the precise sum paid in each particular case was not stated? He had also asked a Question last Session concerning Paper 47, and would be glad to know if the right hon. Gentleman could state why that document had not been presented?

MR. BOURKE said, that if the hon. Member would call his attention to Paper No. 47 on the following day, he would afford him every information in his power. In reply to the other Question, £2,000 had been granted to Lord Lyons, for the purpose of meeting the additional expenses incurred on account of the Embassy in connection with the Paris Exhibition; and the remaining sum of £1,000 had been divided amongst the secretaries and employés of the Embassy at Constantinople, in consequence of the rise which had taken place in prices during the war with Russia.

SIR JULIAN GOLDSMID complained that, inasmuch as he had expressly stated that it was not his desire to raise the general issue, he had been treated with unfairness by the Chancellor of the Exchequer in the replies given to his inquiries by the right hon. Gentleman. But he had observed that such a course was often followed by Ministers in the House of Commons, where a Member of the Government often rose to say that such or such matter could not be discussed at a particular time, because it was incomplete; while if any hon. Member deferred his Motion to another period, in obedience to that suggestion, he was told it was too late to raise objection, as the whole matter was concluded. He had seen that happen many times in the course of the last 12 years; and he would mention that he had intentionally come down to the House for the purpose of calling attention to the expenditure then going on, and which he understood to be but a small portion of what was contemplated for the Eastern Roumelian Commission. The right hon. Gentleman, he repeated, had, in his opinion, not acted quite fairly towards him, and should bear in mind that his answer was of the unsatisfactory kind given by so many Ministers on former occasions. If he could see that any benefit would be derived by the populations affected by the Commission, he would have been willing that the money should be spent; but, as he understood, upon good authority, that they did not wish for that Commission, he felt himself justified in speaking of it as futile, and objecting to the expenditure in question.

MR. H. SAMUELSON expressed his surprise at the answer given by the hon. Gentleman the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs on the subject of the mission of Captain Sing to inquire into certain alleged outrages in Thessaly. He had put a Question to the hon. Gentleman, and endeavoured to elicit from him an answer which he could understand. And the answer received was that no such officer had been sent out. If the hon. Gentleman would refer to *Hansard*, he would see that he (Mr. H. Samuelson) was correct in his statement.

MR. BOURKE said, he had a perfectly accurate recollection of the circumstances referred to, and of the answer given, which was to the effect that Captain Sing was not employed on the mission in question, but that he had been employed in various other capacities.

Vote *agreed to.*

(12.) £3,000, Consular Services.

MR. SHAW LEFEVRE said, that perhaps the hon. Gentleman the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs would state what further inquiry was contemplated with regard to the murder of Mr. Ogle. The subject had been introduced by the hon. Member for Frome last year, who had furnished upon that occasion many arguments to show that the inquiry which at that time had taken place was both unsatisfactory and incomplete. He was of opinion that anybody who heard the speech of the hon. Member upon that occasion could come to but one conclusion, which was that the inquiry was incomplete, and that fact had been admitted by the Chancellor of the Exchequer, who promised that another inquiry should take place as soon as the country in which the unfortunate event had occurred was in a sufficiently settled state. But there had been no further inquiry, although the district in question was in as settled a condition as the districts under Turkish rule usually were. There could, therefore, be no reason why the further inquiry should not take place, and the sooner the better, as more and more difficulty would be met with, and if it were not instituted within a reasonable time the country might never know the causes which led to the death of Mr. Ogle. He would be glad to be informed when it was contemplated to go further into the matter?

MR. H. SAMUELSON said, that after referring to *Hansard*, he found that he was perfectly correct in his statement with regard to Captain Sing. He had asked the hon. Gentleman, "If it is not true that Captain Sing has been sent out as a Commissioner?"—[3 *Hansard*, ccxlii. 1950-1.] Upon that point, he (Mr. Samuelson) happened to have some information which, although it was not necessary to state the source from which it was derived, as far as accuracy was concerned, need not be doubted. The hon. Gentleman had replied, that "All he could say was that he knew of no such Commissioner being sent." He contended that that answer was sufficient to lead him to believe that Captain Sing had not been sent out on that mission. Before quitting the subject, he begged to say that nothing could be further from his intention than to impute anything like intentional inaccuracy to the hon. Gentleman; but he was bound to say that, in putting Questions to him, he had not always been met with quite such straightforward replies as he thought himself entitled to.

MR. BOURKE would not delay for a moment to give his denial to the allegation made by the hon. Member. He had not the slightest right to make such a statement as that just put forward by him. He (Mr. Bourke) challenged the hon. Member, or anyone else, to contrast any Question asked upon the subject of Captain Sing's mission with the answer returned by him. He appealed to the House, as to whether the quotation of the hon. Member did not substantially bear out the reply which he had given to his Question, "Whether Captain Sing was going to be employed on this particular commission?"—namely, that "he knew of no such appointment." That statement was absolutely true. Captain Sing was not employed in the service to which the hon. Member referred. He had made that statement, and he distinctly repeated it now. It was, therefore, a matter of surprise that the hon. Member had thought it his duty to make the statement of which he complained, and which was absolutely contradicted by facts.

MR. H. SAMUELSON: Will the hon. Gentleman state to what commission Captain Sing was appointed, and in what part of the world?

MR. BOURKE said, that was another point entirely, and whatever answer might be given to it did not affect the question between him and the hon. Member. Captain Sing had been employed by the Government since that time on several occasions; but the Question now asked had nothing whatever to do with the controversy, and he must decline to answer it.

MR. H. SAMUELSON said, he had no wish to impute to the hon. Member any motives inconsistent with his character as a Minister of the Crown, and, if by accident, he had made use of any strong expression, it was that at the moment a more suitable one did not present itself. He freely withdrew the words "not straightforward." Perhaps he should rather have said that the hon. Member's answers were not always strictly categorical. He was, however, willing to leave the whole question between himself and the hon. Gentleman to be judged of by the country. The Motion made by him (Mr. H. Samuelson) in August, 1878, was to the effect—

> "That, in the opinion of this House, Mr. Consul General Fawcett's Report upon Mr. C. C. Ogle's death is inconclusive, and that a fresh Commission of Inquiry ought to be instituted, composed of Englishmen only, who should be specially empowered to assure the witnesses of the protection of Her Majesty's Government."

By the advice of his right hon. Friend the Member for Bradford (Mr. W. E. Forster) he had withdrawn the words "composed of Englishmen only." In the course of the debate, he had shown that the inquiry over which Mr. Consul General Fawcett presided was absolutely inconclusive, and he had also cleared the character of Mr. Ogle from imputations unjustly cast upon it by Turkish and English officials. Great care was taken by him not to say anything which might be considered an attack upon Her Majesty's Government for the action taken by them in the matter; at the same time, he had quoted the opinion of an impartial observer, the correspondent of *The Standard* newspaper, who said that—

> "The impression upon himself, obliged to be present at the inquiry, was painful, for he felt that a prostitution of the British name was going on. It would have been better that no inquiry at all should have taken place."—[3 *Hansard,* ccxlii. 1980.]

Again, he had shown that the depositions taken by Mr. Blunt were, with one exception, not given upon oath; that a great part of them were untrustworthy, and much irrelevant, and he had disproved the allegations against Mr. Ogle. He also showed that at least one witness, upon his own evidence, was suborned, while he assured the House of his belief in the existence of a mass of fresh evidence which carried conviction to his own mind, inasmuch as every part of it was corroborated by the other. He had further stated that Mr. Consul General Fawcett did not take the evidence of a single witness, and made clear, by quotations from the Blue Book, the animus existing against Mr. Ogle on the part of the Turkish officials. He had likewise pointed out that the guarantee which was considered to be necessary by numerous authorities had been refused by Mr. Fawcett, and that evidence which had been tendered had not been received; he had quoted the three findings of Mr. Fawcett—

> "1. That C. C. Ogle met his death by a gun shot or bayonet wound, on Friday afternoon, the 29th of March, whilst retreating with the insurgents after the second battle of Macrinitza. 2. That he was afterwards, mutilated, his head being cut off by Turkish soldiers. 3. That his great imprudence made it extremely probable that some casualty would happen to him."—[*Ibid.* 1976.]

Further, he had challenged the production of any evidence to show that Mr. Ogle met his death on the 29th of March while retreating with the insurgents, and had, on the contrary, stated that there were witnesses who saw him on the morning after the battle, when he could not be accused of taking part with the insurgents, or being guilty of any imprudence. It seemed to him, that in asking that the evidence should be sifted by a proper Commission, he was but making a very reasonable request, and he had understood the Chancellor of the Exchequer to promise that a fresh inquiry should take place as soon as possible without waiting until everything was "entirely quiet and peaceable in the country,"—[3 *Hansard,* ccxlii. 2003,]—and that the witnesses who gave evidence should be assured of the protection of Her Majesty's Government, and afterwards, if necessary, taken to a place of safety. As he had said before, he had touched as little as possible upon the conduct of Her Majesty's Government, and merely stated that

> "If they allow a murder of this kind to be neglected, as I believe I shall be able to prove it has been; if they allow it to remain not only practically uninvestigated, but coloured and distorted by a prejudiced statement of facts; if they allow the guilty to remain undesignated, I think the House will agree with me that upon them will rest the very grave responsibility of rendering more insecure in the future than in the past the safety, honour, and welfare of our citizens abroad."—[*Ibid.* 1958.]

His object in making the Motion had been to give the Government the opportunity of relieving themselves from that very heavy responsibility. Since the murder of Mr. Ogle, there had taken place the murder of another British subject in one of the Turkish Islands—he referred to that of Mr. Anderson, in Crete, and he should be very glad to know what means had been taken by Her Majesty's Government for eliciting the truth, and punishing the guilty in that case also? As far as he (Mr. H. Samuelson) knew, no person had been punished, and no inquiry had taken place. The murder of Mr. Ogle occurred on the 30th of March, 1878, or, according to Mr. Consul General Fawcett, on on the 29th of that month. They had now reached the 20th of March, 1879; another year had elapsed, and nothing had been done. They were extending their ægis over Turkey and making themselves responsible to a great extent for her good government, and yet they had done nothing to show the Turks that the blood of British subjects could not be shed with impunity. He said nothing of the omission on the part of the Government to fulfil the promise which they had given, although he was sure that the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of Exchequer, upon the day on which the Motion was made, did believe that there existed a *primâ facie* ground for another inquiry and fully meant every word he said. It might be that questions of policy had arisen in the meantime upon which he was uninformed; but it was not for want of continual pressure upon Her Majesty's Government upon his part, that this very important matter had been left uninvestigated. In again drawing attention to the circumstance of the murder of Mr. Ogle, he had only endeavoured to obtain what he thought they had a right to expect—namely, a further investigation into the brutal murder of a British subject. He was sorry to have detained the House, although he had not fully gone upon that occasion into the merits of the case. The delay that had taken place was very much to be regretted; for, as the hon. Member for Reading (Mr. Shaw Lefevre) had pointed out, it could not but prejudice the chance of success of a future inquiry. Owing to that unfortunate delay he was now driven to make another public appeal. Only yesterday he had received a letter from the father of the young man who was so brutally murdered. The writer, who was not aware that it was his intention to bring the subject before the House that evening, stated that he "still lay under the shadow of last year," that he began to despair of obtaining justice in England, while he pointed as a contrast to the fact that the people of Volo intended to solemnize the day of Charles Ogle's death with some sacred rite. The day of his death was nearly upon them now, and he only hoped that before its arrival they would receive from the Government some assurance that the memory of Charles Ogle was really to be vindicated and justice done upon his murderers.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: I feel, as I am sure all the Members of this House felt last year, the very powerful and touching manner in which the hon. Member for Frome (Mr. H. Samuelson) brought forward his case. He has spoken again to-day with the same feeling which so creditably animated him upon the former occasion. At the same time, I ask the House to bear in mind that there are other points of view from which we may regard this question. With regard to what took place last year, although the hon. Member is within his right in saying that he had established, to his own satisfaction, a case for inquiry, on the ground that the investigation which had been made into Mr. Ogle's death had failed to arrive at the truth; still, the admissions we were able to make on the part of the Government, did not amount to the full acceptance of his position. What I maintained, and what I think I was justified, upon the evidence before us, in maintaining, was this—that so far as the case was investigated, and so far as the evidence before Mr. Consul General Fawcett went, there was the probability, though not the certain conclusion, to be drawn, that Mr. Ogle met his death in the pursuit on the day on which the fight occurred. But, having stated that, I will add that the Government believed that Mr. Fawcett had done his best to get at the truth of the matter, and that if he failed, it was because evidence had not been forthcoming. When the hon. Gentleman stated that he had evidence which would upset the story accepted by Mr. Fawcett, and could show that Mr. Ogle's death occurred on a subsequent day, I admitted that there was really a case in which further investigation should have taken place, and that the evidence should be placed fully before a tribunal which might be invited to see if it were possible to arrive at a different and more accurate conclusion. The promise given was, that an inquiry should take place when the position of the country should admit of that being done. I stated, I think, myself, that we did not mean to say that we must wait until the country was absolutely quiet, but until it was in such a state that the inquiry could be effectually prosecuted, and the Greek witnesses could come forward with a tolerable assurance of safety. Undoubtedly, at that time, we looked forward to being enabled to conduct that inquiry at a very much earlier period than we shall be able to do. Again, we had then reason to hope that the settlement of the boundaries between Turkey and Greece would have made more rapid progress than it has made, and, undoubtedly, it is one element to be taken into consideration, that this particular district may be regarded as certain to fall to Greece. Favourable arrangements had fallen through, or, no doubt, the inquiry would have taken place with very much greater advantage. The hon. Gentleman is aware, from communications which have passed between himself and the Members of the Government, that the subject has not been out of our minds, although we have not been able to do that which we hoped to do. They had at one time considered the names of gentlemen to undertake the inquiry, but I will not now mention them. I have communicated again with Lord Salisbury, and my noble Friend still remains of the opinion which he expressed in August last—he still believes that a better opportunity would occur for the inquiry when this settlement has been effected. The matter is one that has more than once been considered by us, and I do hope that some opportunity may be given for bringing the circumstances of which the hon. Member has spoken to the test of examination. With regard to Mr. Consul General Fawcett, I am bound to say, upon the evidence presented to him, I think the House will consider that he came to a not unreasonable conclusion. If the evidence was not conclusive, I do not think anything has occurred that would justify the imputations such as I have observed have been cast upon him. It is not only natural that there should be deep sympathy expressed on account of Mr. Ogle, who was undoubtedly a man of most estimable character, but it is also natural that his relatives should entertain some feeling of dissatisfaction, which, as far as Mr. Fawcett is concerned, is hardly to be justified.

MR. SHAW LEFEVRE said, that even now it was impossible, from the speech of the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer, to know whether the inquiry would be made within a reasonable time. If they were really to wait until the boundary question between Greece and Turkey was settled, and if no more pressure was to be exerted upon Turkey by the Government, he was afraid that they must wait for the inquiry until the Greek Kalends. He wanted to know, whether any inquiry would take place within any reasonable time, or whether we were going to wait until the boundary question was settled? They had a right to ask whether that inquiry was to be held at once, or whether it was to be put off for an indefinite period? If they were to go on month after month the evidence would disappear, and the inquiry would be quite useless. He was sure that if any further delay took place, no real inquiry could be held, and we should never know under what circumstances Charles Ogle lost his life.

MR. RAMSAY felt some interest in the case of Charles Ogle, and could not help expressing his regret that the right hon. Gentleman had not seen fit to give some assurance that a satisfactory investigation of the whole circumstances connected with his death should be made at an early date. The right hon. Gentleman was aware that one point of the case was that Mr. Consul General Fawcett came to a conclusion which was not warranted by the evidence which came before him; and he had also been objected to as not an impartial investigator. He (Mr. Ramsay) inquired at what time they might expect to have the investigation entered upon, in order to satisfy the just expectation of the public; and he could not but feel that the right hon. Gentleman himself must sympathize with hon. Members who had to press upon the Government the investigation of the murder of a British subject under circumstances of such atrocity. It was to be hoped that some assurance would be given by Her Majesty's Government that the inquiry should take place within a short time. It was not enough to tell them they must wait until the Turkish boundary was settled; that was, no doubt, a matter of consequence; but he must express a hope that Her Majesty's Government would feel some impulse to press upon the Sultan a circumstance which occurred in a part of his territories expected very soon to be separated from the rest of his dominions. In his opinion, also, Her Majesty's Ministers might very well point out to the Turkish Government that the murder of a British subject was one that demanded immediate attention.

MR. H. SAMUELSON said, after what had been stated on behalf of the Government, he should feel it to be his duty, if no inquiry were made within a reasonable time, again to bring the subject before the House, although it would be painful for him to go over the whole case again. In that event, he would certainly take a Division. On the former occasion, not one hon. Member had spoken against his Motion, and he had been put off with fair promises, for which reason he did not Divide; but, had he done so, he believed he would have gained the day. The House would not expect him, after a lapse of 12 months from the time when the murder took place, to guarantee the continued existence of the testimony which he had then declared to exist. He firmly believed in it at the time, and he firmly believed in it now; but, in his opinion, the chances of a successful inquiry being held would be seriously diminished if a much longer period of time were allowed to elapse before it took place.

MR. SHAW-LEFEVRE said, he would like to have some answer to his Question as to whether it was intended to postpone this inquiry until the conclusion of the negotiations with Greece, or whether the inquiry would be held within a reasonable time?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER said, he was not in a position to answer that Question at the moment; but perhaps he should be able to give the hon. Member the information shortly.

MR. BIGGAR said, that though Mr. Consul General Fawcett seemed to be a gentleman thoroughly impartial, yet he pressed upon the Government, if possible, to get some gentleman of character whose report would have some influence.

Vote *agreed to.*

(13.) £19,246, Treasury Chest.

MR. WHITWELL said, he should like to know the amount of these large sums, and the number of transactions?

SIR HENRY SELWIN-IBBETSON said, he was afraid he could not give the hon. Member the number of the transactions, but he believed the net amount was £1,000,000. It was to make up for the deficiencies arising from the depreciation of silver.

Vote *agreed to.*

CLASS VI.—SUPERANNUATION AND RETIRED ALLOWANCES AND GRATUITIES FOR CHARITABLE AND OTHER PURPOSES.

(14.) £1,750, Relief of Distressed British Seamen Abroad.

(15.) £534, Pauper Lunatics, Scotland.

CLASS VII.—MISCELLANEOUS, SPECIAL AND TEMPORARY PURPOSES.

(16.) £4,960, Temporary Commissions.

MR. BIGGAR said, he should be glad to know if the hon. Gentleman would give any information as to the Irish Poor Law Commission and the Commission on the Municipal Boundaries of the Irish Towns?

SIR HENRY SELWIN-IBBETSON said, as to the Poor Law in Ireland, the Commission was appointed in March, 1877, the office of the Commissioners being to inquire into what was alleged to be excessive accommodation in Irish workhouses, and to report as to the dissolution or amalgamation of the existing Unions. That body was called the Poor Law (Ireland) Commission, and that was completed at the present moment. That Commission also inquired into the system of taking lunatics as well. With regard to the other Commission on the Taxation of Cities and Towns in Ireland, it would be remembered that a Parliamentary Committee sat in 1878, and that Committee found that further inquiry was necessary, and the condition of some towns, as regarded their municipal boundaries, was not satisfactory, and they recommended that a Commission should be appointed to investigate the subject in its detail. To carry out the recommendations of that Committee this Select Commission was appointed—in the first instance for six months—but when it was found that the work could not be got through, it was reappointed.

MR. BIGGAR thought the explanation in reference to the Poor Law Unions was perfectly satisfactory, for they knew perfectly well that the accommodation for paupers in certain parts of Ireland was much in excess of what was required. With regard to the Commission to inquire into the Municipal Boundaries of Irish Towns, of course, the Government were perfectly justified in nominating it, if the large Committee reported in its favour; but he could not help thinking that the recommendations of the Committee were nothing of the sort. In all the towns which he knew, there was no intention to increase the boundaries, but rather the reverse.

Vote *agreed to.*

(17.) £7,200, Mediterranean Extension Telegraph Company (Guarantee).

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE asked where the Red Sea Cable, referred to in the Estimates, started?

SIR HENRY SELWIN-IBBETSON said, he was sorry to say this was the unfortunate cable for which the Government of the day had made a contract to pay interest for the amount expended on it, and it had never been in working order since. They had, therefore, been saddled with this amount in years in which no profit had been made. This year, they had had to take the whole guarantee. He believed the cable ran to the Red Sea; but he was not informed of the exact spot where it started. He would ascertain, however, and let the hon. Baronet know.

Vote *agreed to.*

(18.) £520, Epping Forest Commission.

(19.) £6,656, Civil Contingencies Fund.

MR. WHITWELL said, he was afraid the unfortunate page of Miscellaneous Payments was always accumulating. There they had accounts long deferred from 1868, Expenses charged now on the public for the maintenance of the Prince of Abyssinia, and other payments equally strange and remarkable. He hoped that next year they would cease to see such evidence of neglectful book-keeping as was here afforded. There was an item down of £3,040 5*s.* 2*d.* for the supply of Land Force to the Sultan of Zanzibar; but he was not aware that there was any original Estimate for that, but they found it amongst the "Miscellaneous Expenditure," in a lump sum. They all knew, no doubt, that that amount was spent in assisting the Sultan of Zanzibar to put down the Slave Trade, in which the people of this country were so much interested; but here the expenditure was found as if nothing had gone before it.

SIR HENRY SELWIN-IBBETSON said, he was quite as anxious as the hon. Member to get rid of the system to which he objected, and to avoid, as far as possible, the way of accounting for expenditure. At the same time, the hon. Member was quite aware that it was not so easy to do. With regard to the sum spent on supplying the Land Force to the Sultan of Zanzibar, the explanation of that amount appearing there was that it came in after the Estimates were made up, and as the money had to be paid at once, it had been classified as it stood.

MR. MACDONALD said, there was an item of £36 which he should wish explained? It was paid to *The Journal of the Geological Society* for copies of an article contained in it.

SIR HENRY SELWIN-IBBETSON said, he was not able to answer the question fully. He believed that amount was given in aid of the publication, giving the results of recent naval expeditions. It was thought that the public took sufficient interest in these results, and the Government thought it prudent, as he imagined, to encourage that interest.

MR. BIGGAR asked, that as the Irish Church was disestablished and disendowed, he would like an explanation of the payment made to the incumbent of St. Paul's Portarlington, page 33?

SIR HENRY SELWIN-IBBETSON said, the payment to this reverend gentleman was originally made under an Act of George III., charging upon the Consolidated Fund the stipend to the clergyman of the place, whoever he might be, for services rendered to the French community at Portarlington. He ascertained last year that there was now no French community at Portarlington, and that no service was performed. He felt, under these circumstances, that it was not proper to continue this charge to the Consolidated Fund, but as the clergyman in question had accepted the living with this payment as a part of his income, it was felt that they could not deprive him of it. Therefore, it had been determined to include this stipend amongst the Miscellaneous Charges. He asked the Committee to sanction the payment of that amount to the present holder so long as he occupied the position.

MR. BIGGAR asked whether the hon. Gentleman would say if the reverend incumbent had obtained compensation under the Irish Church Act? If he did, it would be clearly the duty of the Committee to object to the Vote.

SIR HENRY SELWIN-IBBETSON: It was not taken into account at the time.

Vote *agreed to.*

REVENUE DEPARTMENTS.

(20.) £34,500, Inland Revenue.

(21.) That a sum, not exceeding £17,899 1*s.* 2*d.*, be granted to Her Majesty, to make good Excesses on certain Grants for Civil Services, for the year ended on the 31st day of March 1878, viz.:—

CLASS II.—SALARIES AND EXPENSES OF PUBLIC DEPARTMENTS.

	£	*s.*	*d.*
House of Commons Offices	1	19	3

CLASS III.—LAW AND JUSTICE.

Criminal Prosecutions, &c.,	450	14	4
County Courts	16,733	13	0
Land Registry Office ..	22	3	5
Convict Establishments, England and the Colonies	77	12	4
Registry of Judgments, Ireland	51	2	5

CLASS V.—COLONIAL, CONSULAR, AND OTHER FOREIGN SERVICES.

Treasury Chest	4	4	11

CLASS VII.—MISCELLANEOUS, SPECIAL AND TEMPORARY PURPOSES.

Temporary Commissions ..	557	11	6
Total amount Voted for Civil Services	£17,899	1	2

House *resumed.*

Resolutions to be reported *To-morrow;* Committee to sit again *To-morrow.*

PARLIAMENTARY ELECTIONS AND CORRUPT PRACTICES BILL.

(*Mr. Attorney General, Mr. Asshèton Cross, Mr. Solicitor General.*)

[BILL 78.] SECOND READING.

Order for Second Reading read.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Sir JOHN HOLKER), on rising to move that the Bill be now read a second time, said, that, not having had an opportunity of explaining its provisions when he introduced it, it might be for the advantage of the House that he should now briefly do so. For some time past it had been felt that the law with regard to corrupt practices at Elections and also with regard to the trial of Election Petitions was in not altogether a satisfactory state. The matter had several times been brought under the notice of the House, and in 1875 a Committee was appointed to consider it. That Committee, after taking a great deal of evidence, had made certain recommendations, some of which, though not all, for reasons which he would explain, were embodied in the Bill now before the House. The first recommendation of the Committee was that every Election Petition alleging corrupt practices against a sitting Member or his agents, should be tried by a tribunal consisting of two Judges of the Superior Courts. That recommendation was one of great importance, raising questions of much nicety and difficulty, and, with the permission of the House, he would postpone consideration of it for a moment or two. The Committee, in the next place, recommended that immediately after the decision of the Judges had been pronounced upon an Election Petition, or as soon thereafter as might be, all persons who appeared to have been guilty of bribery, treating, or the exercise of undue influence, should be brought before the Election Judges and summarily tried for such offence, for which they should be liable, if convicted, to imprisonment for a term not exceeding three months, with or without hard labour. Another recommendation of the Committee was, that in order to the due trial of such persons, the Attorney General should appoint some person to attend the trial of every Election Petition, and take care that they were brought before the Election Judges and summarily dealt with in the manner described. Now, the Government had not been able to adopt these two recommendations. They thought, in the first place, that if they were adopted, the trial of Election Petitions would be unduly prolonged; and, in the second, they were not sure that the Election Judges, who had investigated the matter, and, therefore, must necessarily have already arrived at conclusions of their own respecting the conduct of the persons before them, would form the best possible tribunal for the trial of such persons. Moreover, the Government did not see why such persons should be deprived of their ordinary right to be tried by a jury of their own countrymen. No doubt the course recommended by the Committee of bringing them before a possibly irate Judge who had full knowledge of their delinquencies, would be a very easy one of getting rid of offenders, but the Government did not think it advisable to adopt it for the reasons stated. The fourth recommendation of the Committee was one which the Government had adopted—namely, that with the consent of the parties to a Petition, the Judges should order the trial to be held in the metropolitan town of the part of the United Kingdom to which the Petition related, or any other convenient place. A further recommendation of the Committee had reference to the throwing away of votes, and it was that—

> "When disqualification arises from the candidate having been guilty of corrupt practices, no vote shall be deemed to be thrown away, unless the person for whom such vote is given has been declared guilty of corrupt practices by a tribunal having jurisdiction to entertain and determine the question."

On this point, the law did not appear to be uniform in England, Scotland, and Ireland. In the Galway Election, some time ago, if he remembered rightly, a decision was given to this effect—If it were notorious that a candidate had been guilty of corrupt practices, though he might not have been convicted of the offence, all votes given for him must be regarded as futile. Whether that was a sound decision, he did not now ask the House to say, but the question had been raised whether, under the circumstances stated, votes ought to be regarded as thrown away. The Committee recommended that they should not be regarded as thrown away, and their recommendation was embodied in the Bill. Coupled with this, there was a recommendation that no vote should be deemed to be thrown away, unless the alleged disqualification was so notorious as to lead to the presumption that the voters had given their votes wilfully and perversely to a candidate incapable of being elected. The Government, however, had not adopted that suggestion, simply because the law was already in accordance with it, and therefore it was unnecessary to introduce any provision on the subject. The next recommendation was an important one. It was, that an addition should be made to Clause 11, Section 14, of the Act of 1868—the Election Petitions Act—providing that in the event of the Judges being of opinion that the inquiry into the circumstances of an Election had been rendered incomplete by the action of either of the parties to the Petition, and that further inquiry was necessary, the House of Commons on receiving such report, might order a second inquiry to be made forthwith before one of the Judges forming the tribunal, which inquiry should be conducted by an Officer appointed by the Attorney General. The recommendation further provided that the Judge should give his certificate whether he was of opinion that the inquiry had been rendered incomplete by the action of either party. It very often happened that one of the candidates, finding he had been compromised by an indiscreet or unscrupulous agent bribing, rashly, foolishly, and wrongly, right and left, and that it was quite hopeless for him to defend his seat, set to work with the parties petitioning to discover whether the borough or county, as the case might be, could not be preserved. It became, in fact, the object of both parties to shield the iniquitous borough or county as much as they could, and the whole thing, to use a common and intelligible expression, was "squared." There could be no doubt that by such contrivances a great number of corrupt practices could be kept from the knowledge of the Judge who had to try the Petition, from the House of Commons, and from the knowledge of the country generally. That was not as it ought to be, and therefore Her Majesty's Government had concurred in and adopted the suggestions that if inquiry had been stifled or rendered incomplete by such means, further inquiry was needed. The Government were, however, of opinion that the Judge, having made his Report, it would not be wise to have immediately a fresh inquiry before the Election Judge conducted by the Attorney General; but to provide that the Election Judge should make a Report, as in the case of the Election Act of 1852, and that it should have the same effect, and be dealt with in the same manner, as if it were a Report of a Committee of the House of Commons appointed to inquire into the existence of corrupt practices in a particular case. On such a Report by a Committee of the House, Commissioners would be appointed to go down and inquire whether corrupt practices were prevalent in the borough or county, and if they reported in the affirmative, the result would probably be that the delinquent constituency would be disfranchised. That was the course now proposed to be followed, so that, practically, the suggestion of the Committee had been adopted. The next suggestion of the Committee was that in every case where the Election Judge reported that corrupt practices had prevailed, every person scheduled by the Judge to have been guilty of any corrupt practices within the Act of 1854 should be disqualified from voting for the borough or county in which the same had been proved to have occurred—should be deprived of his right of voting for seven years from the date of the report made against him. Now, it struck him, that that was an exceedingly harsh and severe suggestion. It did not follow that because a man had been reported to be guilty of corrupt practices, therefore he was guilty; and it would be hard, without giving him an opportunity of being heard in his own defence, to deprive him of the privilege of voting for seven years. He did not think that such a provision would meet with the approval of the House, which was always disposed to see fair play carried out between all parties. Under the present law, a man reported to have been guilty of corrupt practices, and who had had an opportunity of being heard on his own behalf, should be liable to that and to other consequences. It was one thing, however, to punish a man who had had an opportunity of defending himself; it was quite another in the case of a man who had not been heard, and who had been merely reported to have been guilty of corrupt practices; and, that being so, Her Majesty's Government had not been able to embody that suggestion in the Bill. The further suggestion with reference to the tribunal before which a candidate found guilty of personal corruption should be tried was an extremely important one, and so also was the last, in which the Committee had had their attention drawn to the provision of the existing Act which forbade the payment of any money for the conveyance of voters in boroughs to the polls, except in certain cases which the Act specified. The Committee stated in their Report that the law had in some instances been broken, and they were of opinion that the polling-places in boroughs might be so selected as that conveyance of voters would be altogether unnecessary, and should be the subject of some penalty if resorted to. Now, the hon. Member for Chelsea (Sir Charles Dilke) and the hon. Member for Glasgow (Mr. Anderson) founded some opposition to the Bill on the ground that a penalty should be and had not been provided, the Bill proposing to leave the law in that respect in its present condition. The present law fixed the penalty for conveying voters to the poll in boroughs, in hired vehicles at 40*s*. There were, he might observe, three views taken of the question. One was, that conveyance of voters in hired vehicles was not merely an illegal act, but that it should avoid the seat; another was, that the law as it stood should not be altered; and the third was, that the law should be repealed, and that, it should be made legal to convey voters to the poll in hired vehicles. He had hardly been able to make up his mind upon the point. In his opinion, it would be very hard to make such conveyance of voters a ground for avoiding the seat. A Member—say, a working man's candidate—would be unseated for hiring a number of cabs to convey voters, while the seat of an opulent Member who had accepted the offer of a number of carriages from his friends for a like purpose would be quite safe. But it was said that the provision in the existing Act on this subject ought to be repealed. If, as had been urged, it was a law which was not put in force, which was practically a dead letter, he should not object to let it go; but he thought that it was of some use, and that possibly the idea that a disregard for it might have something to do with avoiding an Election would lead to a less frequent hiring of cabs and carriages to convey voters to the poll. His mind, however, was quite open on the subject, and if he were not convinced to the contrary, he would remain of the opinion that it would be better to allow the law to remain as it then was. He would now come to the question to which he had before alluded, as to whether the tribunal for the trial of Election Petitions should consist of two Judges, as recommended by a majority of the Committee who reported that, in their opinion, no Member should be unseated or declared guilty of corrupt practices except on the unanimous report of two Judges of the Superior Courts. For his part, he confessed he thought that, except in an exceptional case, one Judge of the Superior Courts constituted a very good tribunal, and was very satisfactory. He would bring to the inquiry into an Election Petition a knowledge of the law which had been already settled, and a mind trained to the investigation and sifting of evidence. No man was more accustomed to investigate facts, and to arrive at conclusions, than a Judge of the Superior Courts. He could quite understand that it was possible to have a more satisfactory tribunal — one which very likely would command the confidence of the general public more—as in the case of a tribunal of three Judges; but he did not see how the case would be very much bettered by having a tribunal of two Judges. If there was an unanimous decision in a Court with two Judges it might be all very well, but, supposing that the House were to adopt the suggestion of the Committee, and that in a case where corrupt practices were alleged against a candidate, the tribunal happened to be divided, what, he would like to know, would be the position of the unhappy candidate? He would be allowed to sit in the House of Commons, it was true, but he would necessarily sit under all the stigma and disgrace which would attach to a man who had failed to be acquitted by the tribunal. The adoption of the suggestion made by the Committee would lead to disastrous consequences, as the tribunal of two might not come to a decision, and, in such a case, would not acquit a man of the misdeeds alleged against him. It might be said, "If you approve a tribunal of three, why do not you elect such a tribunal?" The answer was an easy one. A tribunal of three could not be constituted, because the country did not possess sufficient judicial power. The requisite number of Judges could not be spared. At the General Election which might be held before very long, a good deal of bribery and corruption would probably be alleged in many cases, and from where was the country to get three Judges to try the Election Petitions that would follow? They could not be found anywhere, unless a stop was to be put to the ordinary business of the Courts, or unless a vast number of Judges were to be created simply for the purpose of trying Election Petitions, for their services would not be required afterwards. For the reasons which he had adduced, the Government had come to the conclusion that such a tribunal could not be had, and that, therefore, the suggestion of the Committee was not an admissible one. If the Government could afford a tribunal of three Judges, they would be willing to provide one; but, after carefully considering the matter, they had come to the conclusion that the appointment of such a tribunal was utterly impossible. Well, then, there was this further suggestion of the Committee, or, rather, of the Committee of 1875—

> "That, whatever may be the ultimate decision of Parliament as to the composition of the tribunal which is to try Election Petitions, it is, in the judgment of this Committee, most advisable that the Law should be altered in reference to the penalties imposed by the 43rd section of the Act of 1868, by providing that they shall not be incurred, except on the conviction of the offender after trial in due course of law or by the decision at least of two Judges.'

He did not think the suggestion was very happily expressed, but its meaning was, that the offender should not be convicted except on the decision of two Judges. Certainly the case of a candidate who was reported guilty of personal bribery, was a very exceptional one. Perhaps the House would allow him to remind it of the provisions of the Act of 1868 in regard to this matter. The 43rd section of that Act contained the following:—

> "When it is found, by the Report of the Judge upon an Election Petition under this Act, that bribery has been committed by or with the knowledge or consent of any candidate at an Election, such candidate shall be deemed to have been personally guilty of bribery at such Election, and his election shall be void, and he shall be incapable of being elected to or of sitting in Parliament for a space of seven years, and he shall further be incapable of being registered a voter, and of voting at any election, and of holding any office under 5 and 6 Will. IV., or 3 and 4 Vic., or of holding any municipal or judical office, or of being appointed and acting as a justice of the peace."

The penalties, imposed upon a candidate who was found by the report of the Judge to be guilty of what he might call personal corruption were, therefore enormous, and it might well be that terror was excited in the minds of candidates when they thought of the penalties that might be imposed upon them. It had been felt, and felt very strongly, that it was harsh that decisions involving such severe consequences should be arrived at by a single Judge, especially as no appeal was allowed. The Government had considered the matter, and had come to the conclusion that the recommendations of the Committee were of the greatest importance; but, instead of enacting that the trial should be before two Judges, they had provided in the present Bill that, whenever a candidate was reported as personally guilty of corruption, he should have an appeal from the decision of the Election Judge to the Court of Appeal, so that, before he could be pronounced guilty, and before the very fearful consequences of guilt could be entailed upon him, he would have a right to the decision, perhaps, of four or five Judges, but, at all events, of three, of the highest standing. No more satisfactory tribunal could be found in this Kingdom or in any other than the Court of Appeal, and the provision of the Bill was, that when personal corruption was alleged, an appeal would lie just as in ordinary cases. The action would be brought before the Court in the same manner as cases were now brought before it, and if the Court came to the conclusion that the Election Judge was right, everybody would be satisfied. He had, he believed, now made known to the House all the provisions of the Bill. Hon. Gentlemen would see that to a great extent the recommendations of the Committee, most of which he considered were very excellent ones, had been adopted, and that, in those cases where they had not been adopted, there existed very good reasons for rejecting the Committee's suggestion. He concluded by moving the second reading of the Bill.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."—(*Mr. Attorney General.*)

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE, in moving, as an Amendment—

> "That no Bill to amend the Acts relating to Election Petitions and to the prevention of Corrupt Practices at Parliamentary Elections will be satisfactory to the House which leaves the Law with regard to payments for the conveyance of Voters to the poll in its present condition,"

said, he would not, on the present occasion, go generally into the subject of the hon. and learned Gentleman the Attorney General's speech, nor very widely into the Bill; but would suggest, for the sake of convenience, that the House should first take a Division on his Amendment, and then take up the major question raised by the measure. The Bill itself was a very small one upon a very large subject. With regard to the Amendment, he thought the House must be very much astonished at some observations which had fallen from the Attorney General. The hon. and learned Member, after telling the House that a law existed which was absurd, and which was almost universally broken, had proceeded to say, as the highest Legal Authority in the House, that he did not propose to do anything at all to improve matters, and that he intended to leave the law as it stood. Surely, that was a most impotent conclusion to arrive at? It being the case that the law with regard to the use of vehicles at elections was broken throughout the country, was the House of Commons going to declare that that law did not require alteration? The Attorney General knew perfectly well that if the law were left in its present condition, it would everywhere continue to be broken, and it would be broken more and more every year. In 1868, when the law against the employment of vehicles in boroughs was quite new, it was pretty generally observed; but in 1874, when people had come to know that the penalties attached to that law were never going to be put in force, it was almost universally broken; and if there still existed a few boroughs in which the law had been observed up to the present time, the day was not far distant when it would be disregarded even in those select places. The law, as it now stood, legalized the payment for vehicles to convey voters to the poll in counties and some few agricultural boroughs; but it prohibited such a payment in all other boroughs in the country under a penalty of 40*s.* At the same time, there remained behind this, the danger that it was possible a severe Election Judge might decide, under certain circumstances, that the organized commission of an illegal act on a large scale by a candidate's agents voided the election. This general terror, which had not been met by any decision yet pronounced, but which had only been hinted at in certain judicial decisions, had not been found sufficient to prevent the employment of vehicles in the way he had described. Still it was possible that a candidate who permitted the employment of vehicles at an Election might find himself subject to the adverse decision of a particularly severe Judge. He believed the penalty for the employment of vehicles at Elections had never been enforced in a single case. Surely, it could not be a satisfactory state of things that the Attorney General should be still making up his mind on this subject, or that he had made up his mind to allow matters to remain as they were? He should help the Attorney General to make up his mind by dividing the House on the Amendment he had placed on the Paper. For his own part, in common with many hon. Gentlemen on that side of the House, he would rather have the law changed in either direction than left in its present state. It would be a perfectly intelligible thing if they were to enforce such penalties as would cause the law to be generally observed, or were to declare that, being on the whole unable to enforce it, they would repeal it; but it was neither intelligible nor defensible that they should leave matters in the lax position in which they at present stood. With regard to what should be done when they got into Committee, the Attorney General had argued in advance against the idea of making the employment of vehicles at Elections a corrupt practice. At all events, if the hon. and learned Gentleman were to ask the working men's candidates at Elections what they thought of the law, they would tell him they would rather not have the employment of vehicles legalized by that House. In fact, there was nothing which tended more to limit candidatures to the rich at the present time than this payment for the conveyance of voters to the poll. On the present occasion, his position was that it was a monstrous thing for the Attorney General to tell the House that the law was universally broken, and that the hon. and learned Member should finally announce his decision to leave matters as they stood. The hon. Baronet concluded by moving the Amendment of which he had given Notice.

MR. GORST, in seconding the Amendment, said, he was glad to do so, as his hon. and learned Friend the Attorney General had invited the House to assist the Government in making up their minds upon the question. He could confirm the opinion expressed by his hon. and learned Friend, and by the hon. Baronet the Member for Chelsea (Sir Charles W. Dilke) also, that this law relating to the employment of vehicles was almost universally broken. He did not know a single part of England in which the employment of vehicles was not universally practised. He would even go farther, and say that, in any contested election, if a candidate was so virtuous or scrupulous as not to provide cabs, he would inevitably lose the election. He was not quite sure whether the employment of cabs was a violation of the law or not, as it had never been decided. The hon. Baronet, when he was speaking, used the expression, "employment of vehicles for elections;" but what was forbidden by the Act of Parliament was not the employment of vehicles for elections, but the payment of money in respect of the conveyance of a voter to the poll. Now, it might be argued that if money was paid for hiring vehicles for a day, it was not paid in respect of the conveyance of any particular voter to the poll, as the cabs might be employed for other purposes. He thought it desirable that an amendment of the law should be made so as to clear up that point. The existence of the present law was one of the most direct inducements to the employment of corrupt practices at the present time. Corruption always sprang from secret payment, and if they could only make all payments in respect of elections public there would be no corruption at all. Now, in the case of cabs there must be some arrangement by which some one, without the knowledge of the candidates, should supply a sum of money for payment of cabs. The mere history of a great deal of the corruption which took place at elections at the present time was that the money provided for the hire of vehicles was devoted by the persons to whom it was entrusted to other purposes, such as public-houses. He did not know whether the law should be more stringent or whether it should be repealed and the practice left as it was before. The tendency of his mind was towards the repeal of the law, solely on the ground of the impossibility of drawing the line defining what a corrupt employment of vehicles would be.

Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "no Bill to amend the Acts relating to Election Petitions and to the prevention of Corrupt Practices at Parliamentary Elections will be satisfactory to the House which leaves the Law with regard to payments for the conveyance of Voters to the poll in its present condition,"—(*Sir Charles W. Dilke,*)

—instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

Mr. ANDERSON, who had an Amendment on the Paper, to the effect—

> "That, in the opinion of this House, no measure will be satisfactory to the country, unless it attempts to deal with paid canvassers, conveyance of voters to the poll, and the use of faggot-votes,"

took exception to the remark that the law was universally broken. He had not broken it himself, and did not think the law was ever broken in that way in Scotland, or, if it was, it must be in very exceptional cases. But if it was broken now with impunity in England, it might soon be also broken in Scotland, and with even more impunity, for he did not think there was any penalty there. There was no such thing as a misdemeanour in Scotland. This term was not known. He disagreed with the hon. and learned Member for Chatham (Mr. Gorst) in thinking conveyances should be made legal. He would make the law stronger than at present, and forbid the employment of vehicles, and also the payment of railway fares from one end of the Kingdom to another. It might be left to the Election Judge to say whether the law had been in an organized and persistent manner broken.

Mr. ONSLOW said, he would vote for the Amendment. Under the present law, a candidate might be unjustly unseated, through unauthorized persons employing vehicles in his alleged behalf. Though the borough he represented was a very small one, on election days the voters would not go on "shank's mare," but must travel luxuriously in some vehicle or other. In large boroughs, however, it was impossible to avoid having voters conveyed to the poll, if they were to go to the poll at all. An alteration in the law was necessary. He thought it should be in the direction of removing the present prohibition against the hire of vehicles; but this was a point they could afterwards discuss.

Mr. COLMAN complained of the uncertainty of the present law, and said that the payment of the costs of conveying the voters to the poll in the counties was legal, whereas it was said, in the curious phraseology of the law, to be illegal, but not corrupt, so as to void the election in the boroughs. That was a state of the law which certainly failed to commend itself to the borough voters, and he thought that Parliament, in legislating upon the question, could not go contrary to public sentiment and feeling. It would be most difficult, indeed, to induce the borough voter to believe that he did a corrupt thing in being conveyed to the poll, when his brother voter just over the border in doing the same thing did that which was perfectly legal. He hoped the hon. and learned Gentleman the Attorney General would not consent to leave the law in such an unsatisfactory state. He (Mr. Colman) thought the law required amendment, and that the law in boroughs should be made the same as it now was in counties. He agreed that all the expenses incurred in a contested Election should be published, and he thought this should be done not merely in the locality but in a Return to Parliament, because he believed that publicity had a great tendency to check corruption. He hoped to hear a declaration from the hon. and learned Gentleman before the debate closed, that he would no longer consent to allow the law to remain in the uncertain state in which, unhappily, it was now.

Mr. GREGORY said, it seemed to be agreed that it was desirable to take the opportunity which the Bill offered of making some alteration in the law. Opinions, however, differed as to the direction in which this alteration should proceed. For his own part, he thought the law should be amended as far as possible; but he was not prepared to go the length of the hon. Baronet the Member for Chelsea (Sir Charles W. Dilke), in saying that no Bill would be satisfactory which left the law in its present condition. In fact, the hon. Baronet condemned the Bill upon a point on which it might be amended in Committee. He suggested that the hon. Baronet, having already obtained a sufficient expression of the opinion of the House, would do well to withdraw his Amendment and leave the question to be considered in Committee.

Mr. MORGAN LLOYD observed, that there was a growing tendency to increase the expense of elections; and every effort should be made by legislation to counteract such tendency. The prohibition of the payment of conveying voters to the poll in boroughs was a step in that direction; and in his opinion, it was desirable to extend the prohibition to counties, and to place the law altogether in a more definite and satisfactory state. It was not fair either to the candidates or the electors that the longest purse should have the best chance of success. The conveyance of voters to the poll was a bribe to the electors. The principle of this Bill was that every effort should be made to enable the voter to express his real opinion and to elect the candidate he preferred without the use of any indirect influence. The law ought to be made more stringent, and the payment of the expense of carrying voters to the poll declared to be a sufficient ground for avoiding the election. If that were done, and the prohibition extended to counties, voters would soon get accustomed to the idea, and would be conveyed to the poll at their own expense.

Sir GEORGE BOWYER said, he did not propose to enter upon a consideration of the question as to the conveyance of voters. He thought that that matter had already been sufficiently ventilated. What he desired to direct the attention of the House to was the broader view—the Constitutional view which ought to be taken in regard to this Bill introduced by the Government, and in regard to the law as it at present stood. As to the law as it now stood, he had always protested against it as being highly unconstitutional. According to that law, by the decision of a single Judge, a Member of the House, or a candidate for a seat in it, was subject to the most grave and formidable civil disabilities. Under the decision of a single Judge, a man might be declared incapable of occupying a seat in the Legislature. He might be declared incapable of holding any municipal office. He might be declared incapable of giving a vote—in fact, he might be placed in such a position as practically to forfeit his civil rights. He did not go so far as to say that the validity of an Election Return ought not to be decided by Judges; and, no doubt, the measure at present before the House was an improvement upon the existing condition of matters, in so far as it provided for a Court of Appeal; but he still thought that that was not sufficient to fulfil the principles of Constitutional Law of this country. In his opinion, no man ought to be subjected to civil disabilities or to penal consequences, except under conviction by a jury of his countrymen—except under legal judgment by his peers. In such a case the prosecution might be left to the Attorney General; but the decision to the jury. A Member of Parliament ought not to be subject to such punishments by any single Judge appointed by the Crown, even when there was the right of appeal to said Judges, also appointed by the Crown, but only by the judgment of his peers after a regular trial, and a regular indictment before a jury. He should, in Committee, propose an Amendment to that effect.

Mr. RATHBONE said, that anything would be better than to leave the law in its present state of entire uncertainty. It was not right that persons who were to make laws should sit in that House through any evasion or breach of the law. He trusted that the Government would see their way to give an assurance that the law in this respect should be altered during the present Session. In the absence of such an assurance, he should vote with the hon. Baronet the Member for Chelsea (Sir Charles W. Dilke). It would be easy to make the law more stringent, and he thought the most practical thing at present would be to extend the hours of polling, and, in the meantime, till that was done, make the law of borough and county elections conformable. Once they allowed one portion of the expenses to be kept back, they opened the door to all kinds of corruption.

Mr. W. S. STANHOPE said, that though the expenses of candidates in counties would be considerably lessened by making conveyance to the poll illegal, yet in large counties, and divisions of counties, such a change in the law would inflict great hardship on voters who lived at a distance. In spite of the large number of polling-places in the county he had the honour to represent, there was a large number of electors who lived five or six miles away from any polling-place. It was the desire of Parliament that the poll should be brought as closely as possible to every man's door, and since Parliament refused to allow the use of polling-papers except in the case of University elections, it was necessary, where difficulties might arise from long distances, that the present practice should be continued.

Mr. O'DONNELL said, he thought they ought to draw the line at the voluntary point. He objected to every form of influence which tended to make a voter vote for any reason except his own voluntary desire. But he thought that any gentleman might go to the poll in his own carriage, or might lend his carriage without remuneration for bringing voters to the poll. He did not think the House ought to interfere with that; but when it came to the hire of carriages for such a purpose, quite a different class of considerations arose. It had been suggested by the hon. and learned Gentleman the Attorney General that the lending of vehicles might operate severely in the case of workmen's candidates. He questioned if anything of the kind would occur. It was very unlikely when a real workman's candidate appeared—a man of real weight and influence—that the support given to him would be confined to working men. At least, he trusted that the division of classes had not yet progressed so far in this country as was suggested by the observations of the hon. and learned Gentleman. He (Mr. O'Donnell) made that statement to rebut the supposition that the lending of carriages would be all on one side. He doubted, however, whether the lending of carriages would be excessive, except where sentiment was very strong; and, in that case, it would not be the policy of the House to interfere with the strong and earnest convictions of the constituency on public matters. He quite agreed with many hon. Members who had spoken from the Liberal side of the House that the hiring of vehicles acted as a direct bribe to the voter. Unquestionably, it was a much larger bribe than the offer of refreshments. Take, for example, a case where one candidate was preferable to the other, but who was not able to provide vehicles, while the other candidate was able to say, "I will take you two or three miles on a car to the poll." Was that to be allowed when, on the other hand, the merest refreshment to the voter was forbidden? In his opinion, to present a voter with a ride of two or three miles was a far greater bribe than to give him half-a-glass of whisky. Yet, while the one was forbidden, the greater bribe was allowed; but the hiring of vehicles was a means of bribery on another account. In nearly all constituencies there was a large number of car owners, and the hiring of their vehicles would not only directly influence the car owners themselves, but the very considerable number of persons in their employment. Thus direct pecuniary considerations would affect the votes of a large number of persons in every constituency so long as they gave a rich man the power of buying up all the vehicles in a constituency for a day or a number of days. Besides that, the mere hiring of vehicles—he did not know how it applied to England or Scotland, but it certainly applied to Ireland, as many Irish Members would bear witness—might act as a most efficient means of coercion. For instance, it was within the knowledge, he was sure, of a large number of hon. Members from Ireland that, where a candidate of what he might without offence call the popular Party was opposed by a candidate in the territorial interest, and the former asked a tenant for his vote, the frequent reply was, that they must go to the poll in the master's car. The landlords' vehicles were sent for the tenantry, and the most complete preparations were made at the polling-places for carrying out the scheme under the eyes of the agents. The rural voters were gathered together at their residences, and brought into the polling-places without a chance of wandering or escaping. Arrived at the polling-place, there might be a difficulty in polling them at once, and a house with a large yard had previously been provided for their reception. The tenant-voters were taken in and effectually deposited in this pound, and retained there until the moment came for duly and effectually polling them. The existing law rendered this use of vehicles specially effectual for the purpose of coercing, because, under the existing law, personating agents and some other agents were allowed to be present in the booth where the voters were voting. The candidates also could go from booth to booth. Now, take the case of a number of illiterate voters picked up at their residences, and having no chance of escaping or hiding. These men, though they would prefer not to vote at all rather than vote against their consciences, were kept in the pound till the moment for polling arrived, and on going into the booth, being unable to make use of the ballot, because they were unable to read or write, were obliged to declare their votes aloud, with the candidate of their landlord looking on and listening. It was impossible, under such circumstances, to have a free election. Thus it was that the hiring of vehicles formed a link in the coercion chain that was cast around the Irish voter. This was a practical objection to the existing state of the law which was known to every Irish Member of Parliament. It ought to be the intention of Parliament to cultivate a sentiment of duty in the elector; but so long as they counteracted that by an accumulation of conveniences by which the richer candidates were possessed of the power to which he had referred, so long would their laws tend to lower the public spirit of the country. Referring to the general question, he had always felt that the true solution of the difficulty raised about trying Election Petitions was the ancient Constitutional one brought before the House by the hon. and learned Baronet the Member for the County of Wexford (Sir George Bowyer). It was observed that, while murder cases and such cases as that of the Glasgow Bank directors came before a jury, they declined to allow a broad question of fact, whether a candidate had obeyed the law, to be brought before a jury of his country also.

MR. RITCHIE said, he could not support the Amendment, as he was of opinion that, if it were carried, it would have the effect of throwing the Bill out. ["No, no!"] However that might be, what seemed singular to him about all these Amendments was that no objection had been taken to any of the provisions of the Bill. It was simply objected to it, that it did not contain a clause altering the law with reference to the conveyance of voters to the poll. The Government would have great difficulty in framing a clause which would satisfy all the hon. Members who had spoken on the subject; and he did not think the absence of a clause with respect to vehicles should be allowed to upset the whole Bill. He thought the proper time for moving an Amendment would be when the Bill had reached Committee. While private carriages were allowed to convey voters to the poll, it would be unfair to visit with heavy penalties the employment of cabs tendered by the friends of a candidate who were not in a position to lend him carriages.

MR. MUNTZ hoped the House would not allow itself to be led away with the idea that passing the Amendment would have the effect of throwing out the Bill, because it was not the case. It would continue unaffected in any way. He was afraid it would be impossible to draw a line beyond which no one would be allowed to convey voters to the poll; and therefore he thought they would eventually have to revert to the old plan of allowing everyone to do so. Clearly some change was required, and he thought it would be very unfortunate if they allowed this opportunity to pass over without dealing with the question raised by the hon. Baronet the Member for Chelsea. He believed all the Members of the House were agreed—even the Representative of the immaculate City of Glasgow agreed—that the law ought to be altered, for in its present shape it was anything but desirable. The hon. Baronet the Member for Chelsea only wanted some assurance that the matter should receive attention in Committee, and unless the hon. and learned Attorney General should give the House such an assurance, he (Mr. Muntz) would vote for the Amendment.

MR. M'LAREN dissented from the opinion expressed by the hon. and learned Attorney General, that the employment of cabs in elections was almost universal. He could state, from personal experience and observation, that in Scotland the employment of cabs was not a practice that was so generally resorted to. He himself had never paid, nor had any person paid for him, one shilling for the conveyance of voters at either of the four elections in which he had been concerned at Edinburgh. In Scotland they considered it would be quite competent for the Judges to give a serious interpretation to the words of the Act against the employment of cabs in burghs, and visit the candidates with serious consequences. One way of putting an end to the practice wherever it prevailed would, he thought, be by making the penalty for employing and paying for cabs for voters £50, instead of 40*s*. This would make it worth while prosecuting offenders. Another way would be by declaring the votes given by parties conveyed at the expense of the candidates to be votes thrown away. He had experience of many elections in Scotland, and only in one instance had he known of cabs being employed by the candidate's friends, and they could not venture to bring the voters to the poll, but conveyed them to the nearest election office of the candidate, and from that office the voters walked to the poll. The prohibition of conveyances would have the effect of removing a stigma from many men who would on no account wish to break the law. He hoped the Government would contrive in some way to give practical effect to the present law by making it more stringent.

Sir HENRY JAMES, in supporting the Amendment of the hon. Baronet the Member for Chelsea (Sir Charles W. Dilke), said, that all the speakers had admitted that the law was in a most unsatisfactory position, and that it ought to be altered in one direction or the other. The question was, whether the House would have the courage to vote that the law should be changed, or whether, for the sake of expediency, an unsatisfactory law should remain unchanged. Every hon. Member of that House knew that, do what he would, the law would be broken by his agent. He thought no hon. Member would wish such a state of things to continue. The word unsatisfactory was not strong enough; and he would go further and say it was a gross scandal, for the condition of the law placed at a disadvantage the man who most wished to respect and obey it, and allowed the well-doer to be defeated by the man who was willing to violate the law, because, in practice and effect, the violation was not followed by any penalty. Such a state of things could not be defended, and he hoped the Government would accept the Amendment. If the House rejected the Amendment, and said it was right to allow to exist a law which said that no carriage of voters should take place, but imposed a penalty which was no penalty—namely, 40*s*., recoverable in the County Court—he did not think they would be able to justify it. If the practice were prohibited, the prohibition ought to go to the extent of preventing it. It was useless to say that a thing should not be done if no consequence were to follow the doing of it. In that case, violation of the law would still take place with detriment to those who wished to do well, and advantage to those who wished to do evil. The future question would be whether the thing was to be permitted or prevented. As to that, a great deal might, no doubt, be said in favour of perfect freedom in the matter of conveyance of voters to the poll; but he thought that more still might, perhaps, be said to the contrary. The expenses of elections had increased until they were carried more by wealth than by merit. ["No, no!"] He was glad hon. Members opposite had any experience to the contrary. At all events, the expenses of elections were increasing. He thought if hon. Members looked into the case, they would find that the expenses had increased since 1868; but whether that were so or not, he believed they would all agree the expenses were quite large enough. Anything they could do, he thought, they ought to do, to diminish those expenses, and the prohibition to convey voters would diminish them. The point was that, by allowing the carriage of voters to the poll, they were opening the door to corrupt payments, for they were bound to keep them secret. At any rate, he thought the Amendment would have the effect of making an alteration, whereas all must allow a change was desirable. He understood that, in connection with a recent election, no less a sum than £3,000 had been expended in carriages for the conveyance of the voters. For himself, he had no sympathy with those who would drag the voter to the poll—being convinced that the votes recorded by earnest men who would take the trouble to go to the poll were politically worth more than the votes of those who would not go to the poll unless they were carried or dragged there. He sincerely hoped the House would pronounce against a state of the law which neither prohibited nor sanctioned the practice.

Sir GEORGE BOWYER, rising to Order, said, there was considerable difference of opinion as to what the effect of carrying the Amendment would be, some holding that it would defeat the Bill, and others that it would not. It would be convenient if the Speaker would state what would really be the effect of carrying the Amendment.

Mr. SPEAKER: The carrying of the Amendment would have the effect of setting aside the second reading of the Bill for the moment; but a Motion for its second reading could again, at some future time, be proposed.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: Sir, although I think the Amendment of the hon. Baronet, if carried, would not have the effect of defeating the Bill, still we ought to consider seriously whether or not it is desirable that such an Amendment should be adopted at the present time. As I gather it, the feeling of the majority of those who have expressed their intention of voting for the Amendment appears to be that the law is in an unsatisfactory state, and that it ought to be settled in one way or another in this Bill. On that point all are agreed; but there is a great diversity of opinion as to what the nature of that settlement should be. Some say that the law ought to be altered in the sense of making it more strict, and carrying to a greater extent the prohibition of paying for the conveyance of voters. Others say that the law ought to be altered in the sense of giving the right of such payment. In fact, all agree in condemning the present state of things, just as two men might agree in condemning a glass of brandy and water—the one because he objected to the brandy, and the other because he objected to the water. The difficulty that I feel in accepting such an Amendment as that of the hon. Baronet is that we should be coming to a vote which would be in itself quite as ambiguous and uncertain as the present state of the law; and if I agree that it would be desirable that the law should be so far amended as to bring about a certainty, I think we had better adjourn a decision on that point until we have before us some proposition as to what the law ought to be, and then we can decide whether the proposition before us is one that we should adopt. For that purpose it is not necessary that we should adopt the Resolution now proposed. It is perfectly open to us to pass the second reading of the Bill, and when we come into Committee we can pass a clause or clauses for the purpose of dealing with this question. Any proposal can be perfectly well made in Committee. I do not at all deny that there is great force in some of the observations that have been made as to the inconvenience in the present state of the law. It is inconvenient with regard to any law that it should be uncertain. I am quite prepared to say that if a practical proposal can be made in Committee on the Bill, which will render the law more certain than it is at present, it will deserve careful consideration; and the Government will adopt any proposition which may seem to them, on the whole, to be a fair and proper one. But I wish to call the attention of the House to the circumstances under which the Bill was introduced, and to the relation of this particular question to the Bill as a whole. In the year 1867, when we last had a complete review of the electoral system, the Government of the day made a proposal with regard to the method of voting, and the object which the Government at that time had in view was this—They were anxious to provide their constituents with the best possible means of recording their votes, without running any risk of corruption in the form of payment, nominally for the conveyance of voters, and the plan which the Government of the day proposed was the plan of voting papers. That plan was discussed in the House, and rejected on a Division by a majority of some 30 or 40 votes. Afterwards, in the House of Lords, a clause was put into the Bill to provide for the system of voting papers, and it came down to the House of Commons with that clause in it. The Government again supported it, with modifications; but were again defeated, so that the House decided against the system of voting papers. As to the mode in which voting was to be carried on in large constituencies and in large areas, that question was considered; and the result of a good deal of discussion was a compromise, by the terms of which payment for the conveyance of voters was made legal for counties and certain large agricultural boroughs, but altogether prohibited in the case of ordinary boroughs. That was the position in which the law was left by the measure of 1867. In addition to that measure, which laid down general principles, another Act was passed for the express purpose of dealing with the mode of trying charges of fraud and corruption at elections. That was a very great change in the law; for whereas before Committees of the House had always decided Election questions, it was by that measure left in the hands of a single Judge to invalidate an Election, and award penalties. It has been said that that Act gives too much power to the Judge; and other complaints have been made of such a character that it has become incumbent on the Government to invite the attention of the House to the proposed change. The Government have, therefore, introduced a Bill which we think will enable the House to deal with the question of the mode of dealing with Election Petitions and inflicting penalties upon persons guilty of corrupt practices. It has not, however, been thought necessary to revive the question of voting papers, or the question of the conveyance of voters; but there is no doubt that the question of the conveyance of voters is one that may very properly be introduced into the Bill, and it will be quite within the competence of the hon. Member for Chelsea, or any other hon. Member, to make proposals with regard to that point. Let a clause be introduced in any form which will commend itself to hon. Members, and we will deal with it; but, in the meantime, what I contend for is that we should commit an error if we declined to go on with this Bill until we had passed the abstract Resolution now proposed by the hon. Baronet the Member for Chelsea, which would only express the opinions of two bodies of Gentlemen diametrically opposed to each other. At the present moment I hope the House will not accept, and I would almost venture to hope that the hon. Baronet would withdraw, the Amendment; because, although it would not have the effect of defeating the Bill, it would certainly delay the second reading.

Mr. BIGGAR, in supporting the Amendment, said, with the permission of the House, he would narrate his personal experience of the inconvenience and injustice which the present system allowed. At one of the elections in the county for which he sat (Cavan), one of the agents of the candidates hired all the cars which were to be had in the neighbourhood, which was a manifest injustice to his opponent, who could not get any; while in other districts, where there were no cars to hire, the voters came up quite as well. He had been told that at some county elections in Ireland it was the custom for the car drivers to apply to the candidates to be allowed to bring up the voters to the poll; but that was before the present Act came into operation, and the result was a large increase in the expenses of the election.

Mr. CALLAN said, what he most objected to in the Bill was the proposal to leave the decision in the trial of an Election Petition to a single Judge. In the case of the Election for Drogheda, a Petition was presented against the return of the hon. Member who sat for that county, and, according to the custom, that Petition, which was the first lodged in Court, should have been tried by the senior Judge on the rota—Mr. Justice Lawson. But soon afterwards a bye-election took place in Galway, and by some legerdemain, which had certainly caused considerable dissatisfaction in Ireland, the senior Judge was taken from Drogheda, and sent to try the Galway Petition. The Hon. Mr. Justice Barry tried the Drogheda Petition. A serious question arose in it, and a case was given which was taken to the Court of Common Pleas; and in that Court, if the usual course had been taken, the case would have been tried by the same Judge who tried it at Drogheda. That showed the necessity of having more than one Judge; because, had the case gone on in the instance he was quoting, a very substantial injustice would have been done, and the present Member for Drogheda would, no doubt, have been unseated. He hoped the hon. Member for Sligo (Mr. O'Conor) would be enabled to go on with his Amendment.

Question put.

The House *divided*:—Ayes 138; Noes 89: Majority 49.—(Div. List, No. 50.)

Main Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."

Mr. O'CONOR, who had an Amendment on the Paper to the effect—

> "That no amendment of the Law relating to the trial of Election Petitions can be satisfactory which leaves the decision of such Petitions in the hands of a single Judge,"

thought the principle of the measure would continue what was an objectionable feature in the mode of trying Election Petitions contained in the Act of 1868. When the Act was first passed which relegated the trying of Election Petitions from that House to one Judge, it was strongly condemned by some of the most experienced Members of tha t

House, among others by Mr. Henley and Mr. Bouverie; and, finally, it had only passed as a temporary measure, which showed that the House felt a considerable amount of hesitation as to the necessity of passing it; and it was the first time in the history of the country that their dealings with such grave and serious offences were intrusted to the hands of one Judge. At that time, it might be said, they did not know how the Act would work; but when they saw it in operation in 1869, so far from any confidence being created in the new tribunals, the greatest dissatisfaction prevailed. Between 1869 and 1874 there were few Election Petitions tried of any interest, with the exception of the celebrated Galway Petition in 1872; and when, in 1873, he (Mr. O'Conor) brought the matter before the House, but very little attention was paid to it. In 1875, after the second batch of Petitions were tried in 1874, it created great interest, so much so, that he believed no less than five Members of the House of Commons endeavoured to bring the subject forward in that year. His hon. and learned Friend the Member for Dewsbury (Mr. Serjeant Simon) was fortunate in obtaining a night for a Motion on the subject. A discussion ensued, and a Committee was appointed, which held sittings and took a great deal of valuable evidence. As in this Bill it was not proposed to give any appeal, he thought it would be most desirable to strengthen the Court which was to try Election Petitions. Nearly everyone whose opinion on the subject was worth having had been examined before the Committee, and, in particular, he might mention the names of Lord Justice Bramwell, Mr. Justice Keating, Mr. Justice Hawkins, and Serjeant Ballantine. The whole weight of the evidence went to show the desirability of strengthening the Court by the appointment of a second Judge. Lord Justice Bramwell had strongly urged the establishment of an appeal from the decision of a single Judge; but, in the event of there being no appeal, admitted the necessity of strengthening the original Court. Mr. Justice Keating had expressed himself to much the same effect, and added his testimony to that of the majority of the witnesses. The Committee itself, a very large and influential one, made a recommendation to the same effect. He admitted, however, that a minority of the Committee dissented from that recommendation, and that it had been resisted mainly on two grounds by the Government of the day; but the reasons given for dissenting were very inadequate. The first was that it would be casting a slur on the Judges to increase the number of them in the Court of First Instance; but when this change was asked for by the Judges themselves, he failed to see how it could be considered disrespectful to comply with their own request. Then it was said the number of Judges was so small that more than one could not be spared to try these Petitions; but that would be an equally good argument for not referring the Petitions to the Judges at all, and for allowing them to be tried by some other tribunal. He (Mr. O'Conor) did not believe there would be any difficulty in having more than one Judge in England, if the House were really desirous of having such a tribunal. In Ireland, certainly, there would be no difficulty in the matter. Whatever might be the difference of opinion in England in regard to the question, in Ireland there was practically unanimity on the subject. The entire public opinion of Ireland—the opinion of all the men of greatest weight—was in favour of enlarging the Court of First Instance, and not allowing Petitions to be tried by a single Judge. On the Committee to which he had referred there were four Irish Members, and they were unanimous in their Report. The right hon. and learned Gentleman the present Attorney General for Ireland (Mr. Gibson) was a Member of the Committee, and he proposed a draft Report, which he did not ultimately press, in favour of three Judges. He (Mr. O'Conor) thought that would be the best possible tribunal, and in Ireland, at all events, there would not be the slightest difficulty in getting the three Judges. There was, therefore, no practical reason why they should not have what they so unanimously desired. Mr. Justice Morris, the Chief Justice of the Court of Common Pleas, was examined before the Committee; and he said, in regard to the trial by a single Judge, that such a responsibility should not be imposed upon one man. His Lordship was thereupon asked if he thought the responsibility was too heavy for one. He replied that he did, because the public were not satisfied, and the

Judge himself was not satisfied. The Chief Justice added that, so far as he knew public opinion, there was a general idea that there ought to be more than one Judge, and he believed he might say without presumption, that it was the opinion of the Judges themselves. The hon. Member for Cavan (Mr. Biggar), representing the most extreme section of Irishmen, shared the same view, for on the Irish Judicature Bill, he moved an Amendment embodying the same principle. Thus they had every class of opinion in Ireland united in favour of increasing the number of Judges to try Petitions in the first instance; and he could not, for the life of him, see why such an opinion should not be complied with. As he had said, he was personally in favour of three; but if they could not obtain three and could get two, then he would say that two were better than one. The Attorney General had asked what would be the condition of the unhappy candidate if the Judges disagreed; but, on the contrary, he considered he would be in a happy condition, because in such a case they would be obliged to give him the benefit of the doubt and allow him to retain his seat.

Mr. Serjeant SIMON said, the Committee of 1875 was appointed on his Motion for the special purpose of inquiring into the constitution of the existing Election Tribunal. Under those circumstances, it was somewhat extraordinary, and scarcely respectful, that the Bill now brought in by the Government should entirely ignore the recommendation of the Committee upon that particular point. It was unconstitutional, he thought, to visit a candidate with heavy penal consequences upon the decision of a single Judge, and without the power of appeal. If the object in the proposal to appoint three Judges was to prevent a stigma attaching to a man in the event of two Judges being divided in opinion, nothing would be gained in that respect, for the adverse dicision of one Judge would still tell against him, though he were acquitted by the other two. His own opinion was that it was wrong to transfer the jurisdiction from the House itself, and that it was highly objectionable to take the Judges from their legitimate functions for the purpose of mixing them up in political squabbles.

Mr. O'DONNELL said, he rose with a sense of very considerable responsibility to move the rejection of the Bill. He was obliged to regard it largely from an Irish point of view, and should be compelled to trouble the House with some references to Irish considerations. This, perhaps, might be imputed to him as a fault; but it was from no wish on his own part that he was obliged to take the course which he had indicated. The Bill was entitled one to "amend and continue the Acts relating to Election Petitions, and to the prevention of Corrupt Practices at Parliamentary Elections;" but he was obliged to regard it rather as a Bill to maintain and extend the abuses now existing under the present most objectionable law. The Bill did not propose to effect a change in reference to any one of the important protections demanded by the necessities of Ireland. The only changes which the Bill would introduce were either trifling, or would distinctly worsten the existing law. Before dealing with the more serious portion of the objections he had to bring against the Bill, he would refer to one or two of the less important changes which the Bill would have the effect of introducing. The hon. and learned Attorney General had told the House that under this Bill the Election Judge was to be entitled to complain of reticence or concealment of facts by parties to an Election Petition tried before him. That, he (Mr. O'Donnell) thought, raised a very important question. At present, an Election Petition took the form of a private complaint, urged for private reasons, the main reason, on the part of the petitioner, being to secure a seat in Parliament; and he would ask whether, under such circumstances, the Petitioner was bound to prove, not only as many facts as he could bring forward in support of his own side of the question, but was also to act the part of a public inquirer, and bring forward a full and true account of the entire state of the constituency which he sought to represent? If he was expected to do this, he would have laid upon him, as a private individual, a public duty, without any commensurate power, or remuneration, or protection. It would, in fact, be putting upon the promoters of Election Petitions the duties of public prosecutors, and entirely change the position in which they at present appeared before the Election Petition Judges; and, at the same time, exacting from them payment for duties, the cost of which ought to fall upon the public funds. Again, the Bill did not propose to increase the number of Election Judges, or to change the character of the Tribunal which had to decide upon charges brought against candidates who had, in the first instance, been declared successful by the Returning Officer. It would leave to single Judges in Ireland the power which they possessed at present, and which the united voice of the Irish people—as had been stated in the most moderate, careful, and temperate speech of the hon. Member for Sligo (Mr. O'Conor)—declared that they had, in several instances, and notably in some, most grievously abused. It was not through any predilection on his part, or by any will or desire of his own, that he was compelled to challenge the character of the Tribunal to which Election Petitions were referred—that was a necessity theoretically imposed upon all Members of the House, when Judges were made the final tribunal for the trial of Election cases; but Irish Members were under a special responsibility, because, under this Bill, it would be in the power of a single Judge, who had been appointed by an anti-National Government, opposed to the best interests of the Irish people, and for Party reasons, to cancel the deliberate choice of a great Irish constituency. This was not a power which should be allowed to go unchallenged by the Members of the Irish Party sitting in that House. He begged to be understood as bringing no charges against the judicial authority or the judicial function. He should not be speaking in accordance with the feelings of the Irish people, were he wilfully or wantonly to depreciate the judicial office. Old English writers upon Ireland and the Irish people had recognized the innate respect for justice and law among the Irish people. He thoroughly recognized that there must be good ground for the universal belief of Englishmen in the purity and impartiality of the British Judicial Bench; but he was, at the same time, bound to say that there was no such prevailing belief in Ireland. The Irish Judges had, again and again, and might again and again, been chosen to their office, not for their legal knowledge, or for distinction in their Profession; but because they had been partizans, and had supported—often unscrupulously—the designs of the Government of the day. They had not shrunk, in climbing up to their distinguished office, from functions and acts which must leave a permanent stain upon the judicial ermine with which they were afterwards clothed. Under this Bill, it would still be possible for a Judge, in the face of evidence, and of the universal voice of the country, to denounce, in the grossest and vilest terms, the most venerated personages in Ireland; to single out for language of insult, contumely, and obloquy, men so esteemed—not only within the Irish shores, but beyond the Atlantic Ocean, and on distant continents—as the venerable and venerated John, Archbishop of Tuam; and to treat as *quasi*-felons, as persons among the vilest of creatures, men who filled the positions of Bishops, distinguished laymen, and popular leaders in Ireland. Under this Bill, the Judge would be able not only to insult individuals, but to defraud constituencies; for he would be able, in the face of universal and official evidence, to invent stories of undue influence and intimidation, without its being possible, even in that House, to appeal against their decisions and the charges which they might choose to make. From one end of Ireland to the other the allusions which he was making would be understood, and the justice of the charges which he alleged would be universally recognized. The Bill was one to trim the balance against popular candidates in favour of the undue influence of wealth. It was not for him to impute to the Government, individually or collectively, any deliberate intention to bring in a Bill with so noxious a design; but he was entitled to suppose that men so revered for their intelligence—at least by the Members of their own Party—must have a pretty good idea of the scope and bearing of the measure which they had introduced; and when a Government, representing to a large extent the wealthy and privileged classes, brought in a Bill in favour of offences which rich men were most likely to commit, without allowing an appeal to the popular class, they must know that such a Bill would produce its natural consequences. Let him take a case in illustration of what he meant. There was, say, a constituency in which a wealthy candidate supported by able agents was opposed to a poor candidate who had little on which to rely except popular support and sympathy. The rich man was able by means of bribery to secure his election; but the friends and supporters of the poor candidate were determined, if possible, to test the return, which they knew to be unjust. With great difficulty, for wealth might not be very abundant on the popular side, they provided the necessary securities for a Petition and the funds for the conduct of the inquiry as far as their side was concerned — namely, for the fees of counsel and the maintenance of witnesses. This, however, was but the initial stage; and after a long and costly inquiry the wealthy criminal was proved to be guilty, and the just sentence was passed upon him of exclusion from a seat which he ought never to have obtained, although at the same time he was recognized as a man who, by the skilful use of the means at his hand, had very nearly bought the seat and defeated the proper aspirations of the popular branch of the constituency. He knew that although the popular conscience had judged him guilty, and although the acumen of the Judge who tried the Petition had penetrated the finesse of the schemes by which he had debauched the constituency, he was still wealthy and had another chance on a future occasion. He tried that chance, and having been found guilty before, he had a double interest in expending, if necessary, the whole of his fortune rather than fail now. Every possible effort would now be made, for he had got his second Court of Appeal, and he lavished money in order to whitewash himself. The loyal party had been drained dry, and probably exhausted, at the previous stage; and the Government proposed to give to the wealthy offender the proverbial advantage of wealth by enabling him to carry his case from tribunal to tribunal, and so to exhaust the means if he could not defeat the justice of the cause of the poorer candidate. He could only describe this Bill as a deliberate attempt to facilitate the escape of wealthy criminals—who were criminals by means of their wealth. The Government adduced the heavy penalties attaching to bribery as a reason for making the distinction; but the penalties were either too heavy, or they were too just. If they were too just, let them remain; if they were too heavy, let them be lightened; but neither the one argument nor the other was a justification for facilitating the escape of the briber. In a case of the kind he had sketched, although the injustice was notorious, although the candidate might have been heavily punished for his just ambition, and, perhaps, crippled in his means for life by an unjust judgment, and his constituents defrauded of their just and Constitutional rights, Her Majesty's Government did not propose to give any redress. The reason for this was that the Government was not on the side of popular candidates; but, judging from their proceedings in reference to this Bill, might be said to be on the side of the possible bribers. The Bill, instead of proposing to improve anything proposed, would have the effect, in most essential points, to worsten the existing law. He, therefore, felt bound to move its rejection at the present stage; and he should feel bound, as would every Member representing the popular Party in Ireland in that House, to offer to it the most unrelenting opposition which was permitted by the Forms of the House. In conclusion, he said, with a full sense of the responsibility attaching to the words he used, and in the presence of his Colleagues from Ireland that were in that House a score of Members belonging to the Irish popular Party, the confirmation of whose elections in future, if Petitions were presented against them, would depend entirely upon whether or not those Petitions were tried before certain well-known and thoroughly appreciated Judges now sitting on the Irish Bench. He begged to move that the Bill be read the second time on that day six months.

Mr. GREGORY said, he had had some difficulty in following the hon. Member opposite (Mr. O'Donnell) through the observations he had made, and in comprehending the drift of them or the point to which they were directed. It seemed to him that they consisted principally in a denunciation of the Irish Bench, which, if true, rendered that Bench totally incompetent for the administration of justice; and that, if the administration was committed to one, or to half-a-dozen Judges, it must be equally bad, and must constitute an equally incompetent tribunal [Mr. O'Donnell: No, no!] But surely if the Judges were all as bad as the hon. Member had stated, it would not be possible to get a satisfactory tribunal, though half-a-dozen sat at once. In fact, it would only be an aggravation of the evil. This was not, in his view, the proper way in which to deal with the question, which was, whether the House should or should not adopt the proposal under discussion, and relegate the trial of Election Petitions to single Judges, as was now the case, improved as the present system would be in certain cases by the operation of the Bill; or whether they should adopt the suggestion of the Committee, and relegate the trial of each Petition to two Judges. As far he knew, there was no Court of First Instance, except a Court of Petty Sessions, in which two Judges sat; but he had, in the course of his professional experience, found the inconvenience of having two Judges, even in a Court of Appeal, because it almost necessarily followed that, with two Judges, frequently there would be a difference of opinion; and in the case of a Court consisting of a strong Judge and a weak one, the weak Judge would defer to the strong one, and so bring the Court of Appeal down to a Court of one Judge, whereas, if they differed, the judgment of the Court below was imported into the case, and it was, in fact, decided by that. But if two Judges sat in a Court of First Instance and disagreed, there could be no decision at all. He admitted that a Court of three Judges to try Election Petitions would be preferable; but that would be impracticable, because, after a General Election, followed by numerous Petitions, the judicial strength of the country would be unequal to the task. The Government had, therefore, and very wisely as he thought, determined to leave matters as at present, with the addition of an appeal under certain circumstances. It seemed to him a question whether the power of appeal which was proposed should be extended, and, if so, what should be the limit, because there was a danger in widening too much the door to appeal in reference to matters in which personal feeling weighed so much as in Election Petitions. In Chancery, matters of the highest importance were tried by single Judges, and, in the majority of cases, the decisions arrived at were accepted by the parties. The hon. Member for Dungarvan had referred to the licence which was allowed to Judges when speaking from the Bench; and he (Mr. Gregory) could not see, even if his allegation was true, how any increase in the number of Judges could possibly diminish that evil. On the whole, then, the case was one of a choice between difficulties; and he thought the House would do wisely to accept the proposals which the Government had embodied in the present Bill.

MR. SHAW LEFEVRE was inclined to agree with the hon. Member who had just spoken (Mr. Gregory), when he expressed the opinion that the Government had exercised a wise discretion in declining to accept the recommendations of the Committee, and refer these matters to two Judges. No doubt, the recommendations of that Committee were entitled to great respect; but it appeared to him there were difficulties in the way of carrying out that proposal. The difficulties, for instance, which had been pointed out by the hon. and learned Attorney General he thought were unanswerable. Take one of these. Supposing the two Judges differed as to whether the Member had been personally guilty of bribery. It would be an extremely unsatisfactory thing for a Member to sit in that House under such circumstances. He certainly could not sit with any ease or confidence when one of the Judges who had tried the case was of opinion he had been personally guilty of bribery. As to the proposal that there should be three Judges, no doubt, if that could be done, it would constitute a superior tribunal; but they could not get over the difficulty that it would be impossible to spare three Judges from the ordinary judicial tribunals of the country. For his own part, he must say he was not altogether favourable to trying these cases at all by the Judges; and he was inclined to think the House would do better to revert to the old state of things, and try the cases by their own Committees. One of the main arguments for substituting Judges was that there would be a great saving of expense; but all he could say was that the expenses, instead of having been lessened, had been considerably increased, because of the high fees which had to be paid to counsel to go down to the place where the case had to be tried. Having had some experience of this matter, and having sat on Election Committees, he had arrived at the conclusion that they acted most fairly; that they were juries of a very high class; and that, upon the whole, they formed a better tribunal than the existing one. No doubt, the Judges of the High Court of Judicature gave very impartial judgments upon questions of law; but he did not think, as a rule, they were quite so competent to deal with questions of fact as a Committee composed of Members of that House. For these reasons, he thought it would be better to revert to the old plan, and let the Committees of that House deal with these matters, and not a Judge of one of the Superior Courts.

Mr. COGAN said, it was greatly to be regretted that a matter of such importance as this should have come on at a time when it could not be properly discussed, so many hours having been taken up with a matter of minor importance. He did not think it was possible to exaggerate the vast importance of the questions dealt with in the Bill, affecting, as they did, the Privileges of the House, and also touching Constitutional matters. He therefore hoped that his hon. Friend the Member for Sligo (Mr. O'Conor), who had made a most able speech, would renew the subject when the Bill got into Committee, so that it might be discussed in a manner worthy of its importance. He looked upon it as an anomalous state of things, and one that had been attended with injury, that it should form any part of the permanent legislation of the country to give such great powers to a single Judge. The hon. and learned Attorney General had been obliged to admit that it was no longer to be tolerated that great personal disabilities should attach to any individual on the ground of personal bribery merely on the decision of a single Judge. That was no longer to be allowed to continue, and there was to be a right of appeal in case of a Judge giving such a decision. He would not detain the House with any further remarks on the present occasion; but he hoped that when they arrived at the next stage of the Bill, they would be able to discuss its provisions at the length which they deserved.

Sir JOSEPH M'KENNA confessed that, although he could not say much in favour of the Bill, he thought it would do very little harm, and they might make some good out of it when they got into Committee. He agreed with some observations made in the earlier part of the evening. The question of the Privileges of that House was first raised, and its principle insisted upon, in the reign of Queen Elizabeth. Before then, the Common Pleas tried these cases like ordinary jury cases. The principle of that House being a complete Court of itself, and defending its own Privileges, led to the change, and to the substitution of Committees of that House for the settlement of these matters; and his opinion was that if they were not now to go back to the Court established by themselves, they ought to revert to the principle of trial by jury. But as a Peer was tried by his Peers, perhaps it would be better to adopt the Committees of this House to try Election Petitions, assisted by legal assessors. The hon. and learned Attorney General had said he would consider any suggestions in Committee, and, no doubt, it would be necessary to make some extensive alterations in the Bill when they got to the clauses.

Mr. CALLAN said, while it was true no stigma had been cast upon, or objections raised to, the character and decisions of the English Judges, yet in Ireland the case was different, for there they had Judges who were undeniably partizans, and they had been raised to the Bench from the political arena. The hon. Member for Drogheda owed his seat simply because Mr. Justice Lawson did not try his case. He (Mr. Callan) had the honour of being elected at the the last Election for two constituencies—Louth and Dundalk—and when he was before the electors of Louth, he urged them to elect him, because, if he was petitioned against, he knew Mr. Justice Lawson could not try both cases. He made that statement boldly at the time, because he believed it. If a Petition had been presented against his return for the borough of Dundalk, and it was to have been tried before Mr. Justice Lawson, he should not have had the temerity to defend the seat. He would have retired, and allowed another Member to come in, knowing he had another seat to fall back upon. If they would take three Judges in Ireland, he should have the most perfect confidence in their judgment. He should like to point out that there were other parties in this matter besides the Members themselves who required some consideration. In the case of the Galway Petition, the Judge sentenced the Archbishop of Tuam to what he (Mr. Callan) might term seven years' penal servitude. [*Laughter.*] He heard some hon. Gentleman laugh; but it was true; and when the case came before the present Chief Baron of the Exchequer Court in Ireland, a Judge respected by everyone who knew him, he declared that there was no case whatever to justify him in acting on behalf of the Crown, and proceeding against the Archbishop. Yet if there was an Election to-morrow for the County of Galway, that sentence of penal servitude from the exercise of the franchise would remain against one of the most respected Bishops or Archbishops of the Roman Catholic Church in Ireland. The Attorney General for Ireland, in that case, declared he could not put the Archbishop on his trial. Why should not this House give to parties placed in a similar position to that of the Archbishop of Tuam a right of appeal, in order to clear their characters from such a stigma as seven years' penal exclusion from the exercise of the franchise?

MR. BIGGAR thought there were some things connected with corrupt practices and Election Petitions to which he was justified in calling attention. He thought the Bill took an entirely wrong line in regard to the matter of appeals. It gave the right of appeal to a man who had been pronounced by the one Judge to be guilty of personal bribery; while to the man who was less guilty, but who might still lose his seat, because of the bribery of his agents, it gave no appeal. Therefore, the man who was the more guilty was to have the chance of getting his case re-heard by a Court of Appeal, and this right was to be denied to the man who had been found less guilty; but who, nevertheless, had to suffer the loss of his seat. He therefore thought, when the hon. and learned Attorney General got the Bill into Committee, he would do well to look at that branch of the case, and see if he could not extend the right of appeal. Now, as to the question of corrupt practices. In drawing a Bill of this sort, it would have been well if clauses had been introduced pointing out certain things which should be held to be bribery in cases of contested elections. There was one kind of bribery which was very common in some constituencies, and that was the employment of paid canvassers. This system gave room for an immense amount of indirect bribery; and this kind of bribery ought, if possible, to be put down, because it really demoralized a larger number of people than direct bribery did. A man would not ask for a direct payment for his vote, provided he could get employment for himself, his hangers-on, and any of his acquaintances. He would support a candidate being thus indirectly bribed for his vote. There was another kind of bribery which was also very common in some districts —namely, the bribery of attorneys. The agent who was himself a lawyer would employ other lawyers right and left, whether they were required or not, and whether they were competent to give value for their money or not. Some of the charges made by these people were most exorbitant. He had heard of one case where an attorney insisted upon a fee of 200 guineas for his services at an election, though it could not be pretended that he gave either time or money's worth to that extent; and he simply professed to have influenced a large number of people, because he belonged to a particular religious party. He thought a clause ought to be introduced to put down a fraudulent system of bribery like that. But there was a kind of bribery much worse than that of the attorneys—which was the bribery of the public Press. He had had some experience of that. He was a candidate for the City of Derry, against the present sitting Member and Mr. Pallas. On that occasion a charge was made to him of over £100 by *The Derry Journal,* and one of the items was for 15*s.* 10*d.* for some printing, which on another occasion he got a local printer to do for 1*s.* 6*d.* They threatened him with legal proceedings for the £100; but they ultimately took £30 less the account. He would give them another illustration. In the borough of Belfast, the successful candidates were supposed to be, more or less, the popular candidates. One was brought forward by the Whig Party, and the other by the Independent Orange Party. These two coalesced against the old-fashioned Conservative. *The Northern Whig* advocated the cause of the Orange candidate, Sir Thomas

M'Clure, in an article one day, which someone suggested should be printed off in slips and circulated. The result was, an order was given for a supply, and afterwards a most exorbitant charge was made for the slips, though Sir Thomas M'Clure paid the money manfully. At the General Election of 1874, this same newspaper sent him an account for £500 or £600, and he only paid £400. With such cases as these in view, he would suggest that they should put a clause into the Bill that any newspaper which furnished an account charging more than ordinary prices should be disqualified from receiving any payment whatever, and the proprietor should be liable to be prosecuted, the same as the unfortunate man was liable to be who asked for money for his vote.

Question put.

The House *divided:*—Ayes 118; Noes 6: Majority 112.—(Div. List, No. 50.)

Bill read a second time, and *committed* for *Thursday* next.

WAYS AND MEANS.

Resolutions [March 19] *reported*, and *agreed to*.

Ordered, That a Bill be brought in upon the said Resolutions; and that Mr. RAIKES, Mr. CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER, and Sir HENRY SELWIN-IBBETSON do prepare and bring it in.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time.

MOTIONS.

LUNACY LAW AMENDMENT BILL.

LEAVE. FIRST READING.

MR. DILLWYN, in moving for leave to bring in a Bill to amend the Laws relating to Lunatics, said, it was founded on the Report of the Select Committee which sat to inquire into the subject last year and the year before. They recommended that the confinement and treatment of lunatics should be hedged round by additional safeguards beyond those which were provided by the existing law, and to that, as well as to some other recommendations of the Committee, he proposed to give effect. He regretted that the subject had not been taken up by the Government, because they would probably have deemed it to be their duty to introduce a more comprehensive measure than he, as a private Member, could expect to carry. He should be glad to see them bring in a Bill to consolidate all the Lunacy Laws; but, in the absence of any such proposal, he hoped they would, at all events, support a measure which would, he believed, make a substantial improvement in the law as it now stood.

Motion *agreed to*.

Bill to amend the Laws relating to Lunatics, *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. DILLWYN, Sir GEORGE BALFOUR, and Mr. HERSCHELL.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 111.]

LAND TAX COMMISSIONERS' NAMES BILL.

On Motion of Sir HENRY SELWIN-IBBETSON, Bill to appoint additional Commissioners for executing the Acts for granting a Land Tax and other Rates and Taxes, *ordered* to be brought in by Sir HENRY SELWIN-IBBETSON and Mr. CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 109.]

GENERAL POLICE AND IMPROVEMENT (SCOTLAND) PROVISIONAL ORDER (PAISLEY) BILL.

On Motion of The LORD ADVOCATE, Bill to confirm a Provisional Order under "The General Police and Improvement (Scotland) Act, 1862," relating to the burgh of Paisley, *ordered* to be brought in by The LORD ADVOCATE and Mr. Secretary CROSS.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 110.]

House adjourned at a quarter after One o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Friday, 21*st March*, 1879.

MINUTES.]—PUBLIC BILLS—*Second Reading*—Disqualification by Medical Relief (6).

Royal Assent—Mutiny Act (Temporary) Continuance [42 *Vict*. c. 4]; Marine Mutiny Act (Temporary) Continuance [42 *Vict*. c. 5].

SOUTH AFRICA—THE ZULU WAR—SIR BARTLE FRERE.

NOTICE OF MOTION.

THE MARQUESS OF LANSDOWNE—

To *move* to resolve, That this House, while willing to support Her Majesty's Government in all necessary measures for defending the possessions of Her Majesty in South Africa, regrets that the ultimatum which was calculated to produce immediate war should have been presented to the Zulu king without authority from the responsible advisers of the Crown, and that an offensive war should have been commenced without imperative and pressing necessity or adequate preparation.

Viscount CRANBROOK: I beg to give Notice that, when the noble Marquess (the Marquess of Lansdowne) brings forward his Motion with reference to the Zulu War on Tuesday next, I shall move the Previous Question.

SPAIN—SLAVERY IN CUBA.

QUESTION. OBSERVATIONS.

Earl GRANVILLE: My Lords, I am desirous of putting a Question to the noble Marquess opposite (the Marquess of Salisbury) on a subject which occupied my attention while I was in Office, and which I have no doubt is now occupying his—I mean the subject of slavery in Cuba. As I understand the matter, the Spanish Government gave this Government the assurance that it was only the existence of the insurrection in that island that prevented them from taking steps to put an end to slavery in that territory. That assurance, I believe, was of the most specific character. I am quite aware that great consideration is required in approaching this subject, and I do not desire to press the noble Marquess to enter into details as to any steps he may have taken in the matter — I shall be perfectly satisfied to know that the question has not been overlooked by Her Majesty's Government, and that they have taken some steps to appeal to the Spanish Government to do that which not only their obligations require them to do, but which is called for in the interests of humanity.

The Marquess of SALISBURY: I believe that what the noble Earl has said in the latter portion of his observations is perfectly true—that great consideration must be given to the manner in which this question is approached. We have not, as in some other parts of the world, to deal with a people who are theoretically and practically in favour of slavery, but with a people who are in principle as much opposed to it as ourselves; but they have a heritage of difficulties. We must remember that it is a matter entirely of internal regulation, and that, but for the promises they have volunteered, we should have no right to mention the subject. We must, therefore, approach them with every consideration due to the feelings of a people yielding to none in their sensitiveness to national honour. We are as anxious as any of our predecessors that this great object should be achieved. We have very recently been in communication with Her Majesty's Representative at Madrid upon the subject; but the ordinary difficulty of giving information with respect to the intentions of a foreign Government, where that foreign Government has not officially declared them, is aggravated in the present case by the fact that there has been a change of Government in Spain which is not yet completed, and that the Prime Minister is, I believe, at this moment, on his way from Paris to Madrid. It is, therefore, naturally impossible for me to give any intelligence to the House upon this most important question. I can only say that it has reached me that the present Prime Minister is more anxious even than any of his predecessors to adopt a course of conduct in conformity with the belief of all civilized nations on this matter; and I hope that when the present difficulties attending the change of Government have passed by, he will call to mind the assurances that have been given in the past by Spanish Governments, and bring Spain into a line with all other European countries upon this most important subject.

CREMATION.

QUESTION. OBSERVATIONS.

The Earl of ONSLOW rose to call attention to the Association called "The Cremation Society of England," and to ask Her Majesty's Government, Whether the practice of cremation is in accordance with the laws of this country; and, if so, whether they intend taking any steps to regulate the disposal of dead bodies at the crematorium now in course of construction by the Society at Woking? The noble Earl said, this was a question that involved considerable danger to the public at large. The subject of cremation had been before the public for some time; but it was now, he thought, for the first time actually assuming a tangible shape, which was evidenced by a building now in course of erection at Woking —a building called a crematorium, the object of which was the destroying of the bodies of the dead by fire. The chimney, which was intended to conduct the gaseous products of cremation off was of considerable height, was commenced since the 21st of February last, and efforts were being made to press its construction forward with all possible speed. The Cremation Society was founded in 1874, and its last Report, which was published in 1877, stated that the Council was made up of noblemen and eminent professional men well known in society. He had failed to discover the names of these noblemen and eminent scientific gentlemen; but if any of their Lordships were members of that Council, he had no doubt they would come forward and claim their share of responsibility in this matter. The only name that appeared in the Report was that of Mr. Eassie, the secretary—a gentleman whose name was well known in connection with sanitary matters. The Society alleged that they had taken eminent legal advice, which satisfied them that the process of cremation was legal, and justified them in asking for subscriptions from the public. He happened to have a copy of the legal opinion referred to, which was signed by Dr. Tristram and agreed to by Mr. Meadows White. These learned persons said, among other things, that besides not having been recognized by law, the burning of the dead would, in many points, be in contravention of the Burial Acts. He thought the House would agree with him that this was hardly an opinion in favour of the process supported by the Society. A deputation had waited on the Home Secretary in connection with this subject some time ago, and he had no doubt the advice of the Law Officers of the Crown had been taken on the question. He understood that the Society had first endeavoured to obtain land in the Great Northern Cemetery for the erection of a crematorium; but that being consecrated ground the sanction of the Bishop of Rochester had to be obtained. The reply of the Bishop was that he had no power to sanction such a mode of disposing of the dead. Failing in this, the Society had gone to Woking, where they had purchased ground which was not in the same relation to ecclesiastical authority, and on this they were erecting buildings, which would speedily be completed. Apart from the nuisance that might be caused to persons in the neighbourhood by the proceedings of this Society, a question of great public importance was involved; because, after the body had been consumed by fire, it was impossible by any posthumous inquiry to ascertain what might have been the cause of death. It had been proposed that that portion of the body which was most liable to be poisoned should be separated and preserved under seal in a jar; but this safeguard would be inadequate, for there were poisons which permeated the entire body; and poisoning was not the only kind of death by violence. Moreover, the existing statistical arrangements of the country were intimately connected with the process of interment, and any disarrangement of them would cause great inconvenience. He hoped Her Majesty's Government would take steps to test the legality of the Cremation Society's proceedings upon the first occasion that offered, and to surround them, if they proved to be legal, with the same precautions as were adopted in the case of interment.

EARL BEAUCHAMP said, he thought the noble Earl, in calling attention to this question, had discharged a public duty, because the practice to which he had referred was one which ought not to be adopted without full consideration, and without receiving due sanction. In reply to the noble Earl, he thought the more convenient course would be to read to the House a letter addressed by the Secretary of State for the Home Department to the Secretary of the Cremation Society on the 21st February last, in answer to a communication from that Society. The letter had been laid before the other House. In that reply, the Secretary of State said that, without entering into the question of legality, or whether or not the system of cremation was in accordance with the public feeling, or with respect due to the dead, he must point out that the system of cremation was entirely novel in this country, and that, whether or not the law forbade it altogether, public interest required that it should not be adopted until many matters of great social importance had been duly considered and provided for. The Secretary of State went on to say,

> "Burial can be followed by exhumation, but the process of cremation is final; the result of the practice would therefore be that it would tend, in cases where death had been occasioned by violence or poison, to defeat the ends of justice. There would no longer be an opportunity for that examination, which in so many cases has led to the detection and punishment of crime. The practice of ordinary burial has become interwoven with the legislative arrangements of the country, and is closely connected with various safeguards respecting death, with the statistics of death, and with the evidence of death."

The conclusion arrived at by the Secretary of State was that he could not acquiesce in the continuance of the undertaking of the Society to carry out the practice of cremation, either at their works now in progress at Woking or elsewhere in this country, until Parliament had authorized such a practice by either a special or a general Act, and that if the undertaking was persisted in, it would be his duty either to test its legality in a Court of Law, or to apply to Parliament for an Act to prohibit it until Parliament had had an opportunity of considering the whole subject. Within the last few days the members of the Cremation Society had had an interview with the Secretary of State for the Home Department, and had promised that they would not proceed further with the works until Parliament had consulted on the matter.

LORD SELBORNE asked, Whether the Government intended to introduce a Burials Bill in the course of the present Session?

CYPRUS—THE HARBOUR OF FAMAGOUSTA.

QUESTION. OBSERVATIONS.

THE DUKE OF SOMERSET rose to call attention to the Report on Famagousta Harbour, and to inquire, Whether it is the intention of the Government to undertake the works necessary for rendering Famagousta habitable? The noble Duke said: My Lords, I do not propose to discuss any points alien to my present purpose, or to discuss the policy of Her Majesty's Government in taking possession of Cyprus; but will confine my observations to the Reports which have been laid upon the Table of the House of the Captain of the *Minotaur* and the Hydrographer of the Admiralty. The latter has prepared a very careful Report on the subject, and has had the advantage of visiting the Island in company with the First Lord of the Admiralty and the Secretary of State for War—besides having a complete knowledge of the surveys previously made. His information, therefore, may be taken as perfectly complete. Now, according to the Report of the Hydrographer, the harbours, or rather the anchorages, of Limasol and Larnaca were not found to be altogether suitable for vessels of war, and that the most convenient place was the harbour of Famagousta, of which, accordingly, the Hydrographer made a detailed Report. As regards the town of Famagousta, I must say the Report cannot be said to be very satisfactory. The town is occupied by about 500 people, 300 of whom are Turks, and the remainder Greeks; and the Hydrographer reports that all the Turks had had fever, and half of them ophthalmia as well, while many of the others had cataract and incipient blindness. That is not a very favourable account of the town. The Hydrographer also gives an account how this state of things may have arisen. He says that the various maladies may, perhaps, have arisen from imperfect drainage. The Turks, trusting to Providence, have given up the idea of draining the place; all the drains are choked, and the town is full of cesspools, which, from the nature of the soil, percolate in all directions, through the soil on which the town is built. If the drainage is unsatisfactory and imperfect, much more so is the supply of water, which is brought to the town in a conduit passing through several burial grounds; besides which, whenever the people want to wash their clothes, they simply take up a stone from the conduit and set to work. That is not a condition of things favourable to the health of the town. The Hydrographer says that he is not aware whether the bad health of the population is due to the defective water supply, and want of drainage, or to the foul emanations from the soil; but it is apparently attributable to all three causes. When he came to examine the harbour, he found that the soil consisted of the sewage of centuries, and that its character was so noxious that they were unwilling to dredge up any of it. Then, I observe that Captain Lawson says it will be very easy to dredge the harbour and fill up the lagoon; but I would suggest that the operation of filling up a lagoon with sewage would have very unwholesome results, and I trust that it will not be attempted. My Questions, however, relate to the more important recommendations of the Hydrographer—that the town should be properly drained, and that its water supply should be conveyed in proper pipes. He also recommends great works for the formation of a harbour, and the erection, as far as the outside of the rocks, of about a mile of breakwater. I have no doubt that if that work is carried out efficiently the harbour will be a very fine one, and equal even to that of Malta; but the first thing is to make the town habitable. At present, the Hydrographer says it is pestilential, and he strongly urges that something should be done. What I wish to know is, whether the Government are prepared to give effect to his recommendations, and, if so, in what way they will do so? I am aware that there is in Cyprus the system of enforced labour; but I do not know whether it is a wise method of conciliating the inhabitants, and, of course, it would require constant supervision, in order that no injustice may be done. Now, who will superintend that enforced labour? The noble Marquess, I believe, superintends generally the Island of Cyprus, and, in fact, everything from China to Peru; but will he supervise the special works undertaken in the Island? Still, supposing that you improve this town, and make it habitable, whose property is it? If we want to build military and naval storehouses, on whose land are they to be built—on our own, or on land that we shall have to buy? In short, whose land are we going to improve, and will anyone reap that unearned increment of value of which Mr. Mill used to speak? Of course, too, we shall have to build new fortifications, as the existing ones would not be at all suitable, in these days, for our purpose; and, for that purpose, we shall have to acquire property beyond the boundaries of the town. Now, is that land available, and have we the power of acquiring it? Another point that must be considered is the expense—there would be expenses connected with the harbour, the expenses connected with the tower, the expense of lighting, and, he supposed, the expense of the fortifications—all these would have to be considered. Then, how are all these works to be made—by compulsory labour, or in what other way? And how are they to be paid for—from the Revenues of the Island, or from the Imperial Exchequer, as works of Imperial necessity? I beg to ask, Whether it is the intention of the Government to undertake the works necessary for rendering Famagousta habitable?

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY: My Lords, the noble Duke has brought before our notice a subject in which both he and the Government are alike deeply interested. He has, however, somewhat enlarged on the entertainment he promised, by introducing several subjects which are not involved in the Notice he placed on the Paper. The subject of Famagousta harbour hardly includes the three questions of compulsory labour, the tenure by which we hold the Island, and the point whether or not I am the proper person to look after it. Now, as these were, so to speak, the garnishes of the dish provided for us, I will endeavour to dispose of them first. As to the question of compulsory labour, I am afraid we do not get labour in Cyprus on different terms from those anywhere else. We have to pay for any labour we employ. What has been done with regard to Cyprus is that, for works of public utility, a required poll-tax of not very great amount is imposed, sometimes realizing between 10*s*. and 15*s*. a-year—and in those cases in which a man cannot pay that amount, he must work it out, receiving 1*s*. a-day for his labour. I do not think that fairly comes under the head of compulsory labour; but, be that as it may, all that is intended to be done is to modify, in a more indulgent sense, the law which already existed in the Island, and what has been a custom in Cyprus from time immemorial. I now pass to another system of forced labour—namely, that which is imposed upon the Foreign Office in respect to this Island; and I wish we could escape it as easily as the inhabitants of Cyprus escape making roads. I think, however, the noble Duke will bear me out when I say that there is no part of the business of the country more difficult to conduct, with anything approaching to satisfaction, than that which has to pass through more than one or two Departments; and it seems to me that, under all the circumstances of the case, as there are still many questions upon which the Island must be dealt with in the Foreign Office, it is more convenient that the business connected with Cyprus should be transacted there entirely. The noble Duke knows how difficult it is to conduct the Public Business with despatch, where more than one Office has been brought into requisition; and my opinion is that, as a matter of mere internal convenience, and from no passion for work on my part, it is better that the course which we have adopted should be continued. As to the tenure of Cyprus, I do not quite see what the tenure by which we hold Cyprus has to do with the improvements the noble Duke has in contemplation. As to the Crown lands, all the Crown lands belong to the Queen, and the Agreement on the subject will shortly be laid on your Lordship's Table. Compensation will, of course, be given in the case in which lands belonging to individuals are taken for the Public Service; but lands belonging to the Crown will be made use of for that service in the same way as Crown lands are used in this country. Having referred to these matters, I will now turn to the Question included in the Notice of the noble Duke. I must say I am by no means surprised that he has called your Lordship's attention to the Report, because it deals with a matter which is of very great interest, as affecting the position of England on the South-East coast of the Mediterranean. The harbour of Famagousta has, undoubtedly, been selected, and such improvements are to be made in it as may be required to make it fit for the purposes of a great Power. I do not believe the expenditure would be a large expenditure; but, whatever it may be, of course, if Famagousta is to be made a harbour for Imperial purposes, the necessary expenditure ought to be borne out of Imperial funds. When the harbour is completed, it will, I believe, be a considerably finer harbour than that of Malta; for, if I recollect rightly, whereas the harbour of Malta can only contain nine large ships, three-quarters of a cable's length apart, that of Famagousta will be capable of containing 14 ships a cable's length apart. The position, besides, is one of very great importance in that part of the world, and is not to be overrated in a stragetical point of view. But, in reference to the expenditure, it happens that the Imperial Government has a good deal to do with its money at present; and they may, therefore, be willing to put off this particular work until they may have less expense upon their hands. Before proceeding with the construction of the harbour works, some steps must be taken towards making the place more healthy. That is one of the reasons why it seems to me to be advisable that we should not move too hastily in the matter. It has been popularly assumed that what you have to meet is the malaria in Cyprus, and it is very difficult, from the experience of last year, to come to any satisfactory conclusion on the subject; because inquiry has, undoubtedly, resulted in the establishment of the fact that throughout the whole coast of the Mediterranean there was a wonderful wave of fever, for which there is no parallel in ordinary years. Ninety per cent of the inhabitants of Tripoli have, it appears, been stricken down by fever; and in Malta, I am informed, it affected a larger portion of the population than had ever been known before. Those who were attacked in Malta were, in proportion to the number of inhabitants, greater in number than in Cyprus; and it bore the same character — sending very large numbers to the hospitals, but killing very few. It is not, therefore, easy to draw any very certain or accurate conclusions from the information which we possess. In my opinion, the unhealthiness of Famagousta is in a great measure to be attributed to the detestable sanitary arrangements. There are a series of cesspools side by side, separated only by a porous soil from the wells which the people use, and there is a constant percolation to some extent between the wells and the cesspools. The filthy habits of the people have also a good deal to answer for; but their more recent progress in cleanliness has not been without inconvenience. So long as the people did not wash their clothes at all the aqueducts at least were pure; but when they took to washing their clothes in the aqueduct the water became infected. There the inhabitants have the custom of washing their clothes in the aqueduct. The Government are trying to introduce what is known as the dry-earth system. I will not annoy your Lordships' ears by describing the process in detail; but it seems to be the most efficient way of disposing of this drainage. Sanitary work is, therefore, the first thing necessary; but there is considerable doubt whether the sanitary works could be carried out whilst 300 inhabitants are living in the place, or whether they should not be moved as soon as sufficient accommodation can be found. It would probably be found much easier to restore Famagousta to healthiness if the inhabitants went than if they remained. There is 15 feet in depth of sewage at the bottom of the harbour, and it frequently sends up noxious gases; so that, even if we could remove that deposit, the doing of it would not at the time conduce to the health of the inhabitants. The drainage of the lagoons would possibly produce more fever than already existed there, though, no doubt, it would ultimately prove of great advantage. There is, however, another remedy to which the Government of Cyprus is turning its attention. There is the historical fact that Cyprus formerly had a large population, and that it was remarkable for the density and extent of the forests that it contained. It is the removal of these forests that has affected the healthiness of Cyprus, and one of the first steps of the Government was to save the forests that remained and to renew those that had been destroyed. The Indian Government have considerable experience in this kind of work, and an Indian official has been sent for to carry out what is to be done, and has sent a valuable Report, which I hope shortly to lay before your Lordships. But all these things are questions of money. For matters of local importance, Cyprus will have to trust to its own revenue—a revenue of which about one-fifth is applicable to public works. But there are matters of more pressing importance even than sanitary works. A road to Nicosia and other places is the most pressing thing. Then the gaols are altogether inadequate to English notions of what prisons should be. Then there are post-houses, as to which it was reported that the beams are absolutely separated from the walls, and it is quite problematical when the roofs will come down. There are, therefore, very pressing demands upon the immediate surplus to be disposed of, and possibly it will not be until the next financial year that the drainage and sanitary matters can be entertained in any effective way. I chiefly wish to dispel the idea that this subject is one that has been neglected or that the importance of it is underrated. The Government think that the harbour of Famagousta is one of great importance, and that every means to adapt it to our convenience should be used as quickly as is consistent with other circumstances. The work, however, is not pressing in point of time. The Treaty of Berlin, we hope, will establish a permanent peace; but then we know that noble Lords opposite once thought that the Treaty of Paris would do the same; and when such men as Lord Palmerston were deceived, we cannot conceal from ourselves the fact that the time may arrive when England will have to look actively after her interests in that part of the world, and when she would have to give forcible effect to her policy. I hope that time is far distant, and therefore we do not wish to incur any financial extravagance for the purpose of accomplishing works of this kind with unnecessary speed. We are anxious, with respect to Cyprus, to take larger and more extended views, and, as far as it may be given to us to carry them out, the noble Duke may feel assured that that will be done.

EARL GRANVILLE: My Lords, I cannot think the answer of the noble Marquess is satisfactory—indeed, it appears to me to be insufficient. I think one point on which it is desirable some information should be given by Her Majesty's Government is the ground on which Cyprus was confided to the Foreign Office. It is also desirable to know to what Department of the Foreign Office it is confided. I quite acquit the noble Marquess of any wish to monopolize the administration of Cyprus; but, on the other hand, the reasons that he gave why its administration is confided to the Foreign Office appear to me insufficient. The noble Marquess said that in Cyprus foreigners would have to be dealt with; but do not both the Colonial Office and the India Office constantly deal with foreign questions—with slavery and fishery questions? If the argument of the noble Marquess were worth anything, it would follow that it was wrong to have put the Ionian Islands under the management of the Colonial Office. Why the administration of Cyprus should not be confided to an Office that thoroughly understands the business I cannot see. It is said that we are afraid to undertake the harbour works, lest fever should result from stirring the sewage; but this is hardly a satisfactory reason. I am glad to find that there has been no compulsory labour in the Island; but as to sanitary matters, I must say that in all the accounts that have come before me, it is difficult to conceive anything so unsatisfactory as the statement that has been made in regard to them. I cannot conceive anything more cruel than to compel persons to go on living in such a pestilential hole as Famagousta. We were told that the administration of Cyprus would not cost us anything, and that its revenues would be sufficient; but if we are to undertake Imperial works in that Island, surely that will cost us money. We were told that this year we should have a sufficient harbour for commerce; but it would seem, from the statement of the noble Marquess, that we may have to wait 15 or 20 years before the harbour is begun. While, however, money is to be spent here, the requirements of Malta are starved, and Dover harbour cannot, for reasons of economy, be carried out. The object of Imperial expenditure is to be a pestilential Island like Cyprus, whilst there is no money to spare for spending upon Imperial interests at home in our own Island. In the case of Dover harbour, a Report was presented some years ago, by which it appeared that naval and military authorities recommended in the strongest way that works should be constructed in that harbour. The Report was adopted, and a Bill on the subject was introduced in the House of Commons, the Select Committee to which it was referred reported in its favour; and then at last we were told by the Prime Minister that, though the works referred to were most desirable, at present, for reasons of economy, they could not be undertaken. I hope that the matter will be more fully gone into by the Government before any expenses are incurred.

DISQUALIFICATION BY MEDICAL RELIEF BILL.—(No. 6.)

(*The Lord Aberdare.*)

SECOND READING.

Order of the day for the Second Reading, read.

LORD ABERDARE, in moving that the Bill be now read a second time, said, it had already received the sanction of the other House. The Bill was a short one—of a single clause—and its provisions were clear. At present persons in receipt of medical relief were disqualified from voting; but it was clearly important that, in cases of infectious disease, no obstacle should be placed in the way of a man removing from a crowded neighbourhood in which he might reside, in order to receive the medical attendance of which he stood in need. The Bill, therefore, provided that no man should be disqualified for being on the register of Parliamentary or municipal electors, by reason of himself, or any of his family, having received medical treatment or relief for any infectious disease as an in-patient of any public hospital, infirmary, or other sanitary institution; but at present, if that were done, the man forfeited his right to vote. If the Government would introduce a Bill, he would be very glad; in the meantime, he hoped this Bill would pass through its second reading, which he now begged to move.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª."—(*The Lord Aberdare.*)

THE DUKE OF RICHMOND AND GORDON said, it was quite true this Bill was a short one—it consisted of one clause of 10 lines; but it was full of anomalies and mistakes, as he should take the opportunity of showing. He doubted very much whether this measure would ever have come out of the other House had it not been for the severe indisposition of the President of the Local Government Board, who was incapacitated from attending while the Bill was passing in the House of Commons. The Bill passed through that House somewhat hastily in the short Session before Christmas, when everybody's attention was called to the great matters then under discussion relating to the Afghan War. The Bill having passed in that manner, a Motion for its re-commitment was made by the hon. Member for South Leicestershire (Mr. Pell); but it was not successful. The noble Lord (Lord Aberdare), in moving the second reading of the Bill, had very wisely touched lightly on the slight infringement which he said the Bill would make on our electoral law. That was one of the main objections of the Government to this Bill—that it did touch on the electoral law, and in no slight manner. It had been the custom in this country for years past that all persons who were in receipt of relief given out of the poor rates should be disqualified from voting; that all persons receiving either medical relief or other relief should be debarred from the exercise of the franchise. That was the principle of the electoral law and the Poor Laws, and as such he confessed he was not prepared, at the present moment, to agree to any infringement of it. The only departure from that law was in the case of the Irish Poor Law; and in the Act 25 & 26 *Vict.*, c. 83, sec. 6, passed in 1862, it was provided that—

> "Every poor person admitted into the fever hospital or infirmary of a workhouse, who shall on admission claim to repay the entire cost of his or her maintenance therein, according to the full average cost thereof, as hereinbefore stated, and every poor person admitted into such fever hospital or infirmary on whose behalf the person liable by law to maintain such poor person shall claim to repay the entire cost of such maintenance therein, as aforesaid . . . and the person so relieved and the person so claiming shall not, after payment of the said charges of maintenance, be subject to any disfranchisement or disability as persons having received relief from the poor rates."

This law applied to Ireland at the present moment; and so far as that departure from the principle of the electoral law was concerned, he did not see any objection to it. And here he would point out that this Bill applied to Ireland—Ireland was not excluded from the operation of the Bill. Therefore, with this measure, in one clause it was proposed to practically override the Act 25 & 26 *Vict.*, which he had quoted. Again, supposing the noble Lord was successful in carrying this Bill into law in its present shape, it would fail to achieve the object in view. It was proposed that no person should be disqualified from voting by having received medical treatment or relief. Now, medical treatment or relief must mean medical treatment and medical relief. But when a person entered a hospital there must be what was called in-maintenance—a term familiar to all Poor Law Guardians—and there was no provision for the in-maintenance in the hospitals in this Bill; and, therefore, a person might receive medical treatment and relief in the hospital, and you would say that he would not be disqualified; but still the person would require maintenance, and he would be a pauper receiving relief out of the rates. If the Bill, then, were carried in its present form, it would not meet the object the noble Lord had in view. There was no matter about which there was so clear and distinct a line drawn as in medical relief as distinguished from other relief. If the Bill passed in its present form, and only dealt with medical relief pure and simple, leaving untouched the question of in-maintenance, it could not be regarded as satisfactory. He was astonished to hear what fell from the noble Lord on the subject of sanitary hospitals, or, rather, hospitals established by sanitary authorities; because it ought to be known that the occupants of such hospitals were not disqualified from voting in the existing state of the law. The only persons so disqualified were those to whom relief was administered from the poor rates by officials legally appointed for the purpose, and the law did not apply to the inmates of these sanitary hospitals. He, therefore, thought it would be dangerous to retain the word "sanitary" in the clause referring to this branch of the subject. And there were several other respects in which the wording of the Bill might be altered with advantage. He did not object to the principle of the Bill, but should ask leave to introduce Amendments in it when it reached the Committee stage, in order that it might be made to include, not only medical relief, but the cost of in-maintenance; that it might follow the lines of the Irish Bill of 1862; and that persons admitted to hospitals on terms similar to those of that Bill should be similarly treated. He saw no reason why the inmates of such hospitals, if they chose to pay for their maintenance while under treatment, should be disqualified from voting. He would prepare Amendments in the spirit of the remarks he had made, and move them in Committee.

Lord ABERDARE said, he was not responsible for the language of the Bill. He should be glad to give his consideration to any Amendments the noble Duke should propose.

Motion *agreed to;* Bill read 2^a accordingly, and *committed* to a Committee of the Whole House on *Thursday* next.

House adjourned at a quarter before
Seven o'clock, to Monday
next, Eleven o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Friday, 21st March, 1879.

MINUTES.]—SUPPLY—*considered in Committee*—CIVIL SERVICE SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES, 1878-9.

Resolutions [March 20] *reported.*

WAYS AND MEANS—*considered in Committee*—Supplementary, 1878-9, £299,218 1*s.* 2*d.*

PRIVATE BILLS (*by Order*)—*Second Reading*—Brentford, Isleworth, and Twickenham Tramways.

Select Committee—London and North Western Railway (Additional Powers) and Midland Railway, *nominated.*

PUBLIC BILLS—*Second Reading*—Consolidated Fund (No. 2) *.

Committee — Valuation of Property [71]—R.P.; Poor Law Amendment Act (1876) Amendment * [44]—R.P.

Considered as amended — Racecourses (Metropolis) [48].

Third Reading—Drainage and Improvement of Lands (Ireland) Provisional Order Confirmation * [94], and *passed.*

PRIVATE BUSINESS.

BRENTFORD, ISLEWORTH, AND TWICKENHAM TRAMWAYS BILL (*by Order*).

SECOND READING.

Order for Second Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."

MR. BRISTOWE said, he rose to move that the Bill be read a second time on that day six months. He did so, he hoped, upon intelligible grounds —his chief reason being that the proposal itself was really one that, upon public grounds, ought not to be allowed. They were often told, both in the House itself and in the Committee Rooms, a great deal about tramways; and he was not there to deny that tramways might be of great public advantage, provided that the locality through which the tramways were to run was fitted for the purpose. But his contention in this case was that the Bill now submitted to the House proposed to run a tramway over a locality that was utterly unfitted and unsuited for the purpose. Those who disagreed with the Bill had, he thought, some reason to complain of the course which had been adopted in regard to it. The Bill proposed to carry a tramway from the foot of Kew Bridge, through the town of Brentford, through almost the whole of Isleworth, and then through part of Twickenham—ending where? Why, at the foot of Richmond Bridge. Out of London there was, probably, no more popular thoroughfare. It was the main road leading from London through Richmond towards Hampton Court and Bushey Park, and other places of popular resort. It was, no doubt, somewhat extraordinary, but it was nevertheless the fact, that hitherto upon this road from Brentford to Twickenham no speculative or industrious individual had even thought of running a one-horse omnibus for the use of the public. If it was not thought worth while to do that, he would leave it to the House to imagine what profit the promoters of the present undertaking expected to make. As he had already stated, the Bill proposed to lay down a tramway from Kew Bridge to Isleworth and Twickenham. The House was aware that, when a tramway proposed to go through a certain district, the Standing Orders of the House required the assent of a proportion of the public authorities. Now, what was the fact here? The local authorities of Brentford dissented, the local authorities of Isleworth assented, and the local authorities of Twickenham dissented. The result was that the Standing Orders of the House were not complied with. But what did the promoters of the Bill do? They immediately gave notice that they would abandon the whole of that portion of the scheme which went through the district of Brentford, thus leaving a mutilated scheme for the consideration of the Committee. Surely the course pursued by the promoters was somewhat hard upon the public body of Isleworth, who had agreed to the scheme as a whole, but had never been asked to assent to it in its present shape. It was rather hard upon that body, to turn round upon them now and say—"You have assented to the scheme because you originally assented to it as a whole, and now that the promoters have mutilated it, and only propose to carry out a portion of it, making it end at the parish of Isleworth, whereas in its original form it went on through Brentford, you have no right to dissent now." What the public authority of

Isleworth assented to was very different from the scheme contained in the Bill as it was now submitted to the House. They had never in reality agreed to the mutilated scheme now contained in the Bill, and the scheme which, if it was allowed to go forward at all, would be presented to the Committee. Upon that point he thought the assent of the local authorities of Isleworth amounted to very little; because it was quite certain that if the promoters had adhered to their original scheme, the original scheme must have been thrown out on the Standing Orders, and would have been heard nothing of in the House itself. There were many grounds upon which he opposed the Bill. He had already mentioned one. Another strong ground of opposition was the manner in which it was proposed to carry the line on from Isleworth to Twickenham. The road throughout its entire length was altogether unsuited and impracticable for the laying down of a tramway. He might tell the House that upon a great part of the proposed line the road varied from 18 and 19 feet in width to between 14 and 15 feet. Surely the measurements of the road ought to be taken into consideration, varying, as they did, so considerably as from between 19 and 20 feet, or it might be here and there a little more—say 25 or 26 feet—narrowing down in many places to between 14, 15, and perhaps 16 feet, and so on. What was to become of the unfortunate people who wanted to travel along this road in carriages or vehicles of any description? There would be scarcely room for a wheelbarrow. And when they had a tramcar travelling along the road, any person wanting to pass it in a carriage would find it impossible to do so. In one part of the road it proposed to cross a bridge where there was no footpath at all, and upon the top of the bridge there was a station of the South-Western Railway Company. He was informed that the Railway Company were among the petitioners against the Bill, and he was certainly not surprised at it, because, if the Bill passed, the condition of things would be this — while the tramcars were passing over the bridge, any person desiring to go to the South-Western Railway station would find the greatest difficulty in getting access to it. The roadway of the bridge was only something like from 18 to 19 feet in width from parapet to parapet, and there was no footway at all. Yet that was the sort of road over which the promoters of the Bill proposed to carry their tramway. He had just presented a Petition to the House which was signed by a large number of frontagers along the proposed line, and he thought it was not unimportant that he should call the attention of the House to it. From the end of the town of Isleworth to the foot of Richmond Bridge was a distance of one mile and a-half. Along that line of road there were only 40 occupiers, and 33 of them had signed the Petition against the Bill. That was an enormous proportion of the householders upon the proposed tramway route; and it showed that, in their opinion, their interests would be seriously and materially affected by the Bill. The promoters of the scheme had circulated a statement in favour of the Bill. No doubt, they were quite within their right in doing so, and he did not object to the course they had taken. At the same time, he wished to point out that the statement itself was not altogether as plain as he should like to see it. It said that the Motion he was now making to throw out the Bill on the second reading emanated from a few of the inhabitants of Twickenham who were opposed to the proposed tramway. He had shown that the Petition he had presented against the Bill came from the majority of the frontagers on the line of the tramway. Another clause of the statement said—

> "Petitions in favour of the Bill have been signed in the district through which the proposed line is to pass by upwards of 350 frontagers."

Now, it was necessary he should tell the House what the real fact was. This was a statement made in support of the second reading of a Bill which was not the Bill originally introduced by the promoters; but a Bill in which the promoters had struck out all that part of the scheme which related to Brentford. And when he told the House that the 350 frontagers who had petitioned in favour of the Bill were frontagers at Brentford, the House would know what value to attach to this statement. In point of fact, the statement had no bearing at all upon the Bill now before the House. The petitioners referred to were petitioners whose objections had been assented to by the promoters by striking out that part of the Bill which related to them. He had now stated all the facts upon which he relied for saying that the Bill ought not to be allowed to go forward. His chief ground was that the area over which it was proposed to carry the tramway was unsuited for the purpose, and that over such a narrow road as this the parties promoting the Bill ought not to be allowed to carry a tramway. He failed to hear that any person connected with the Bill was rated in the district, or had any interest in the property there. A statement had been drawn up by the petitioners against the Bill, which he held in his hand, and in which they went fully into the measurements and distances; but as he perceived that he had already called the attention of the House accurately to the details, he would not repeat them. He would simply content himself with moving that the Bill be read a second time on that day six months.

Amendment proposed, to leave out the word "now," and at the end of the Question to add the words "upon this day six months."—(*Mr. Bristowe.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question."

MR. RAIKES said, he had rather expected that a statement would have been made by some hon. Member who was directly interested in supporting the measure. That, however, had not been done; but an explanation of the nature and object of the Bill had been lucidly given by the hon. and learned Member for Newark opposite (Mr. Bristowe). In the absence of any statement from the promoters of the Bill, he (Mr. Raikes) thought he might be allowed to offer to the House such views in regard to the Bill as had struck him after giving due consideration to the matter, and after hearing the speech which had been made by the hon. and learned Member for Newark. His hon. and learned Friend had spoken to the House in opposition to the second reading of the Bill; and he (Mr. Raikes) was sure that the statement just made by his hon. and learned Friend was well worthy of consideration. At the same time, he felt bound to point out to his hon. and learned Friend and to the House that the objections which the hon. and learned Member for Newark had taken appeared to him (Mr. Raikes) to be entirely in the nature of objections which might very fairly be raised before a Committee upon the Bill upstairs. The scheme might be a very imperfect one, and might be a very bad one; from some of the allegations which his hon. and learned Friend had made with regard to it, it was certainly open to very grave question whether such a tramway as the Bill proposed to lay down would be compatible with the public interests; but, at the same time, his hon. and learned Friend and the House were well aware that matters of this sort were most difficult to deal with in the absence of that information which was supplied by plans and maps, the arguments of counsel, and the examination of witnesses in the presence of those who had a direct interest in the question. There was one point which had been noticed by the hon. and learned Member for Newark opposite, which was, perhaps, of a somewhat more grave character, because it related to a question touching the Standing Orders of the House. As his hon. and learned Friend stated, the promoters of the Bill failed to obtain the consent of a majority of the local authorities on the line of route. The Standing Orders required that if a tramway was proposed to be made in any locality which was within the jurisdiction of one authority, the assent of that authority should be required. If it passed through the jurisdiction of more than one authority, the assent of a majority of the authorities was required. And if that assent was not obtained, the Committee on Standing Orders would hardly be asked to dispense with Standing Orders. In this case, the Twickenham and Brentford authorities dissented from, and the Isleworth authority assented to, the whole scheme; and it would have been impossible, under these circumstances, for the Bill to pass the Standing Orders of the House. The course then taken by the promoters—and it was a course that was certainly within their right—was to drop the Brentford part of the scheme, and thereby to limit the extent of their line to two parts, in regard to which one local authority was more or less favourable, while the other dissented from it. Under these circumstances, the Committee on Standing Orders thought proper to dispense with the Standing

Orders, and thus to allow the Bill to proceed. He was not there to question the soundness of the judgment of the Standing Orders Committee in the matter, because the House left it to the Committee on Standing Orders to exercise a wise and careful discretion in dealing with questions of this sort. The objection now taken by the hon. and learned Member for Newark appeared to relate to a great many issues affecting very largely the public convenience; but still it was quite possible to bring all those issues before a Committee upstairs, and the persons interested would all have a *locus standi* to be heard before the Committee to whom the Bill would be referred by the House. The Railway Company, to which reference had been made, would also have a *locus standi* that would enable them to bring their case forward. Under these circumstances, he was certainly of opinion that the matter was one which would be most satisfactorily dealt with by the ordinary tribunal of the House.

Mr. HERMON was understood to say that the hon. and learned Member for Newark opposite (Mr. Bristowe) had pointed out the unsuitableness of the locality for a tramway, and that if its construction were authorized the tram-cars would virtually obtain a monopoly of the route, because in some places the road was so narrow that it would be impossible for a cart or carriage, and almost for a wheelbarrow, to pass. He wished to point out that if the Bill were referred to a Committee upstairs, they would have no power of widening the road, and the promoters would not be able to get over the difficulty that the measure was opposed by the frontagers along the line it was intended to occupy. He failed to see what public advantage would be gained by constructing a tramway which would interfere with the interests of the frontagers, and prevent them from drawing up any vehicle by the side of their own premises. He was of opinion that the passing of the Bill would result in the obstruction of the road, and he should, therefore, vote against the second reading.

Sir EDWARD COLEBROOKE said, the Chairman of Ways and Means had referred to the fact that the promoters of the Bill had got rid of the opposition of one of the local authorities and a portion of the frontagers by dropping a part of their scheme. Although he (Sir Edward Colebrooke) was not upon the Standing Order Committee when this particular question was brought forward, he wished to say that the course taken by the Committee was one which was every day pursued. When a Bill was introduced which formed one or more parts, it was quite within the discretion of the Standing Order Committee to allow a certain portion of it to be dropped. To put the matter in another way—if, after a majority of the frontagers had raised an objection to one part of the scheme, the promoters modified their Bill and left out all that part of it which was opposed, such a proceeding would have been objectionable. But he did not consider that that was the case in this instance. The statement made was that the scheme consisted of three portions, and that one only was opposed. That portion was dropped by the promoters, and it was quite in accordance with the powers of the Standing Orders Committee to allow that course to be followed. He was not able to say what the details of the measure were. There might be great objections to the scheme; but he thought it was one that deserved to be referred to a Committee upstairs for their investigation and decision.

Mr. C. BECKETT DENISON remarked that it was only under exceptional circumstances that the House consented to reject a Bill of this nature on the second reading. What he wished to point out to the House was this—that in connection with the promotion of these schemes in the neighbourhood of London there was a large general public whose interests were not represented except upon the second reading. He spoke now as one of the general public who had no *locus standi* to go before a Committee upstairs. The frontagers could protect their rights, because they could be heard by counsel before the Committee; but he ventured to say that in the case of these schemes which had for their object the securing of a monopoly of a large portion of the public roads in the suburbs of London, it was not the frontagers alone whose interests were involved, but those of the general public as well. If it could be shown, as the hon. and learned Member for Newark opposite pointed out, that this was one of those roads largely made use of by people living in London and riding down to Twickenham, and that the proposed tramway would occupy so large a portion of the public road as to be a serious hindrance to traffic, then he thought it was one of those cases in which the general public should have a right to be heard in that House on the second reading of the Bill. He had no hesitation in saying that, as far as he himself was concerned, he should take the unusual course of voting against the second reading.

Mr. MAURICE BROOKS said, he took considerable interest in the question of tramways, and he hoped to be permitted to say that he thought the objections taken to the Bill, if they had any force at all, applied to all Tramway Bills. No doubt all tramways did interfere more or less with the comfort of carriage-driving people; but there were other classes upon whom tramways conferred inestimable advantages, and therefore he entertained the hope that the Bill would be allowed to go up to a Select Committee, where the statements made would not be of an *ex parte* character, but where there would be a full examination into the merits of the scheme. When it came down to the House, after such an examination, it could receive the impartial consideration of the House. He therefore hoped that the recommendation of the Chairman of Ways and Means would be accepted by the House, and that the Bill would be read a second time.

Question put.

The House *divided*:—Ayes 112; Noes 86: Majority 26.—(Div. List, No. 51.)

Main Question put, and *agreed to*.

Bill read a second time, and *committed.*

QUESTIONS.

BANKING LEGISLATION.—QUESTION.

Mr. HEYGATE asked Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Whether he is now in a position to name a day for the introduction of the proposed Government measure of Banking Legislation?

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER: Sir, I am afraid it will not be in my power to introduce the measure on Banking Legislation before Easter; but I hope to do so immediately after the Easter Recess.

CRIMINAL LAW—CASE OF WILLIAM HABRON, CONVICTED OF MURDER. QUESTIONS.

Mr. MITCHELL HENRY asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, To whom the telegram sent from London on Monday night to Portland Prison directing the release of William Habron was addressed, and whether he will lay a copy of it upon the Table of the House; and, whether it is true that this young man, who has received a free pardon because he is innocent of the crime for which he had been sentenced to be hanged, was handcuffed during part of his journey from Portland to London after the receipt of the aforesaid telegram from the Secretary of State; and, if true, whether he will take into consideration such conduct on the part of the prison officials?

Mr. ASSHETON CROSS: Sir, no telegram was sent directing the release of William Habron at Portland. I had received a private intimation from the master whom he had served, and from his brother, that if he was released it would be agreeable that either the master or the brother should come up in order to receive him on his release. I therefore thought it the better course not to release him at Portland, but to bring him up to London. A telegram was sent for him to be brought up, and another to the master to come up, and also to bring the brother if he chose, to receive him and to consult what was best to be done. I had thought, from the intimation I sent to Portland, that, although they were not aware that he was to be actually released, they would not have treated him in the way they did; but I am bound to say, in justice to officials, that if it had struck me for a moment that they would do so, I certainly would have given more positive directions. I can only regret what has taken place, and for the absence of those positive instructions which I ought to have given I take the entire blame on myself.

Dr. KENEALY asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether, in view of the case of Habron, wrongfully convicted of murder, and of several other persons whose sentences he has remitted as being wholly innocent, he is prepared to introduce a Bill to enable Her Majesty's Judges to grant a new trial, as a matter of right, in all criminal cases where reasonable grounds exist to challenge the verdict; to enable the Crown to grant compensation, as a matter of right, to all persons who, though innocent, have been found guilty; when their innocence has been made known to restore them to liberty, not as a matter of grace and pardon but as a matter of right also; to declare, as well, that writs of error in all criminal cases are writs of right which the Crown has no authority, by common law or statute, to refuse; and, whether he will lay upon the Table of the House a Copy of the Evidence on which he advised Her Majesty to release Habron?

Mr. ASSHETON CROSS: Sir, I hope I may be allowed to say, with regard to the last part of the Question, that it would be a most inconvenient practice to lay the evidence upon the Table of this House. With regard to the first part of the Question, I have never been able to understand why a person who is likely to lose some small portion of his property, real or personal, may have an appeal, and in another case, where he is very likely to lose his life, no appeal is granted; and I have always, been in favour of having an appeal in, at all events, certain criminal cases upon questions of fact, always of course, preserving the Prerogative of the Crown to exercise mercy untouched. But if the hon. Member will look at the Code laid upon the Table last Session, he will find that provision was then made for an appeal in certain criminal cases as to questions of fact. That Code, as the hon. Member may be aware, is at the present moment being revised by several learned Judges and other eminent persons; and I believe that it will contain practically the same provisions, although I am not at the present moment aware what alterations they may have made or suggested in its actual form. As to the question of granting compensation in all cases in which there has been a wrong trial, the House must remember that in these cases it is not through the action of the Executive Government, but through some unfortunate mistake of the country, upon whose judgment the prisoner is put to take his trial. I am not aware that in any other country in Europe compensation is granted as a matter of right. As to the case of Habron. That case, like that of Barber, is of a very exceptional character, and I am sure both the House and the country would desire that some compensation should be made. With regard to the question of writs of error, I think, if the hon. Member will refer to this Code, he will see it is proposed that writs of error in criminal cases should be abolished altogether, and other provisions with reference to them have been made.

Mr. MITCHELL HENRY: Might I ask the right hon. Gentleman, if I am to understand him as saying that the question of compensation has been settled with regard to Habron?

Mr. ASSHETON CROSS: I did not say so. I said that I had been in communication on the subject.

VACCINATION ACTS—THE BINGLEY MAGISTRATES' ORDERS.

QUESTION.

Mr. BARRAN asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether his attention has been called to the case of William Mitchell of Keighley, who was summoned before the magistrates at Bingley on the 27th of November last, and fined by them for refusing to obey a Vaccination Order; whether it is true that in the unavoidable absence of William Mitchell, the magistrates refused to hear Mr. George Kidson, who stated he was duly authorised by him to appear in his behalf under Section 11 of the Act of 1871; and, whether he will take steps to prevent the recurrence of such a case?

Mr. ASSHETON CROSS: It is true, Sir, that Mr. Kidson was authorized to represent Mr. Mitchell in his absence, and that the magistrates refused to hear the speech which that gentleman desired to make. Certainly, in my opinion, every proper opportunity of hearing any person who appears before the magistrates ought to be given if what that person desires to say really applies to the case before them. In the present instance, I understand from a letter which I have received from the magistrates, that the ground of their refusal was not that they desired to stop this gentleman from saying anything relating to the particular act of the accused; but that they refused to hear any discussion as to whether the law, in its present shape, was right or wrong.

TURKISH GUARANTEED LOAN, 1855.

QUESTIONS.

MR. DODSON asked Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, What amount of the sum of £77,448 11*s.* 2*d.*, which Her Majesty's Government were obliged to provide for interest and commission, in consequence of the default of the Turkish Government to pay the dividend due in February 1878 on the Turkish Guaranteed Loan of 1855, specially charged upon the Egyptian Tribute, has been received from the Turkish or Egyptian Government, and the date of any such payment; whether Her Majesty's Government has been called to make provision for any subsequent dividends on this Loan; and, if so, to what amount; whether the French Government has in any case paid one moiety of the sum or sums issued to make good the default of the Ottoman Government; and, whether he will lay upon the Table of the House any Correspondence with the French, Turkish, or Egyptian Governments upon the subject?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: Sir, perhaps the right hon. Gentleman will allow me to answer, without exactly following the order in which the Question is put, as the matter is rather complicated. I think I can give him information as completely in another form. The Turkish Government owes £45,604 on the dividend due on the 1st of February, 1878. Upon the dividend that fell due on the second half of last last year nothing is due. That was paid in full. But it owes £60,600 on the dividend that was due on the 1st of February, 1879, making a total arrears of £106,204. These two sums have been advanced from the Consolidated Fund, besides a small sum for expenses due to the Bank. But, though the Porte is in default by this amount, it should be added that it ordered the Khedive in February, 1878, to pay out of the tribute then due to Turkey the sum of £45,604, and that, under old standing arrangements, the sum of £36,000 should have been provided by the Khedive towards the dividend due on the 1st of February, 1879. Thus, the total sum due is £106,204, towards which the Khedive should pay £81,604. As, however, there seems no prospect of early payment, the Treasury are applying to the French Government to repay the moiety due by them under Treaty. The Correspondence is not yet in a complete state, and it would not be convenient at present to lay it on the Table of the House.

MR. DODSON: May I be allowed to ask a Question which is not on the Paper? Has the Khedive paid the interest on the Suez Canal Shares?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: I think so. If I find I am wrong, I will correct it. My impression is that he has paid.

ARMY—DEPUTY ASSISTANT QUARTERMASTER GENERAL—THE STAFF COLLEGE.—QUESTION.

LORD EDMOND FITZMAURICE asked the Secretary of State for War, If it is true that an officer has been appointed Deputy Assistant Quartermaster General at Headquarters who has not passed through the Staff College, and if this appointment is not one of those to which, under the Queen's Regulations, the Staff College officers have a prior claim; and, if he will state the reason why, in this case, the Queen's Regulations have been again evaded?

COLONEL STANLEY, in reply, said, as a matter of fact it was not the case that the appointment of Deputy Assistant Quartermaster General at head-quarters, held by Major Butler, had been filled up; but an officer had been appointed to act in his place while he was absent on active service. But even if the appointment had been made, having examined the Regulations, he was not prepared to say that such a course would have been contrary to the rules laid down, and, therefore, there had been in this case no evasion of the Regulations. If he had chosen to answer the noble Lord's Question in the form in which it had been put, he might have given another answer, because the officer appointed was a man of proved ability; and he contended, neither as regarded the letter nor spirit, had the law been violated. Major Furse served with the 42nd Highlanders in the campaign of 1857-8 against the mutineers in India, including the actions of Kudygunge and Shumsabad, siege and fall of Lucknow, and assault of the Martinière and Banks' Bungalow, attack on the fort of Rooyah, action at Allygunge, attack and capture of Bareilly (medal, with clasp). Accompanied Sir Garnet Wolseley to the Gold Coast in

September, 1873, on special service, and served throughout the Ashantee War in 1873-4. Employed at first on a recruiting mission in the settlements of the Gambia, afterwards in charge of the advanced party of Wood's regiment in the reconnaissance in force of the 27th of November, and subsequent advance to the Prah; commanded the head-quarters of Wood's regiment at the battle of Amoaful, and was present at the battle of Ordahsu and capture of Coomassie. Mentioned in despatches, Brevet-Major, medal, with clasp.

EXPENSES OF ROYAL JOURNEYS. QUESTION.

DR. KENEALY asked Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Whether the expenses of Her Majesty's journey to the Continent and of the Duke of Connaught to the Mediterranean are to be paid out of the public purse?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: No, Sir. The expenses of Her Majesty's journey will be borne by Her Majesty out of the Civil List, and the expenses of the Duke of Connaught will be paid out of the income of His Royal Highness which has been provided for him.

CUSTOMS—WINES OF SPAIN AND PORTUGAL.—QUESTION.

MR. W. CARTWRIGHT asked Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Whether he would cause to be presented to Parliament a Return for the year 1878 from the Customs, detailing the quantities and the respective alcoholic strengths of the wines imported from Spain and Portugal into this country during the course of that year?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: Sir, I have made inquiry on this subject, and find that the Return could be made out; but it would take a good deal of time, and be rather expensive. Perhaps the hon. Gentleman would allow me to confer with him privately.

ARMY — SURGEONS AT DEPOT CENTRES.—QUESTION.

MR. LEVESON GOWER asked the Secretary of State for War, Whether a considerable saving might not be effected by the employment of Militia Surgeons in the place of Army Surgeons at the Depôt Centres; and, whether such a step is not desirable in consequence of the scarcity of Army Surgeons causing Civil Surgeons to be sent abroad?

COLONEL STANLEY, in reply, said, it was found that recruits were inspected more carefully by Army medical officers than by Militia surgeons. An arrangement, however, was in contemplation for employing Army medical officers on half-pay, care being taken that they should be fit to carry out their duties.

ARMY — NEWSPAPER CORRESPONDENTS.—QUESTION.

MR. ANDERSON asked the Secretary of State for War, If he has seen the statement in the "Standard" that General Roberts had sent away the Standard's Correspondent, and had himself appointed one of his own Aides de Camp Correspondent to that newspaper, and that other members of his Staff, with his knowledge, held similar appointments for other newspapers; and, if he has taken, or will take, steps to prevent General Roberts from continuing to infringe the Army Regulation on the subject, and if he will instruct him to give the usual facilities for the presence with his Force of independent correspondents of newspapers?

MR. E. STANHOPE: Sir, with the permission of the House, I will answer the Question of the hon. Member. I have seen the statements in *The Standard* to which the hon. Member refers. I am not aware that there has been any breach of the Regulations; but if there has been, it has been on the personal responsibility of the General in command. A letter has, therefore, been despatched to General Roberts by to-day's mail, inviting him to offer such explanations as may be necessary of the statements that have been made.

POOR LAW AMENDMENT ACT (1876) AMENDMENT BILL.—QUESTION.

Mr. MELLOR asked Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Whether, if the Poor Law Amendment Act (1876) Amendment Bill, which was on the Paper for to-night, was not reached before 12.30, he would name a day, or give facilities for its earlier consideration?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: I should be sincerely glad if

I could see my way to assist my hon. Friend in bringing the Bill on; but in the present state of Government Business I do not think I should be justified in holding out any expectation of giving him a day.

PARLIAMENT — STATE OF PUBLIC BUSINESS—THE BUDGET.—QUESTION.

MR. A. MILLS asked, When it was probable that the Easter Vacation would commence?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: I should prefer to answer that Question on Monday. I believe the hon. Member for Dundee (Mr. E. Jenkins) also intended to ask me a Question. I may, therefore, take this opportunity of saying that I propose to bring forward the Financial Statement—the Budget—on Thursday, the 3rd of April. I also wish to take the present opportunity of mentioning, in order to carry through the understanding which I spoke of last night as being necessary to complete our financial arrangements before the close of the year, that the House must meet to-morrow (Saturday) for the purpose of taking the Committee on the Consolidated Fund Bill, and the Report of the Committee on Ways and Means. It will be necessary, under the Committee of the Consolidated Fund Bill, to amend that Bill so as to incorporate the Vote of Ways and Means with the Supplementary Estimates passed last night. By meeting to-morrow, we shall be able to take the consideration of the Bill as amended on Monday; and on Tuesday we shall take the third reading, in order that the measure may go up to the House of Lords. I may remark that, by an accident or an oversight, one small Vote was overlooked last night in passing the Supplementary Estimates; and when we reach the time for you, Sir, leaving the Chair, my hon. Friend near me (Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson) will move that particular Vote.

MR. DILLWYN: What time will the House meet to-morrow?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: Twelve o'clock.

PARLIAMENT—QUESTIONS—THE HON. MEMBER FOR MEATH.

NOTICE OF QUESTION.

MR. C. BECKETT DENISON: I beg to give Notice that on Monday next I shall ask the hon. Member for Meath (Mr. Parnell), Whether certain language which he is reported to have used in Glasgow is correctly given in the public journals or not?

MR. MITCHELL HENRY: In the absence of the hon. Member for Meath, I may be permitted to ask the hon. Member for the West Riding, whether he will kindly read now the language complained of, or, at all events, communicate with the hon. Member for Meath on the subject, as, otherwise, he will not know what is to be complained of until he comes down to the House on Monday?

MR. C. BECKETT DENISON: I should not think of putting such a Notice on the Paper without communicating with the hon. Member for Meath, and pointing out the special language to which I desired to call attention.

MR. MITCHELL HENRY: I now desire, Sir, to ask you, whether it is in accordance with the Rules which govern our proceedings, for one hon. Member to put a Question to another hon. Member as to statements which the latter may have been reported to have made outside of this House?

MR. SPEAKER: The Rule of the House in regard to putting Questions to hon. Members, not being Ministers of the Crown, is this—no Question can be put, except such as relates to some Bill or Motion before the House. Therefore, the Question of which Notice has been given is not regular.

ORDERS OF THE DAY.

SUPPLY.—COMMITTEE.

Order for Committee read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair."

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE.

RESOLUTION.

SIR HENRY JAMES, in rising to call attention to the deficiencies existing in the arrangements made for the administration of justice in this Country; and to move—

> "That, in the opinion of this House, it is expedient that measures should be adopted to provide a more speedy and efficient and less expensive mode of administering justice than now prevails,"

said, he had no words of censure or criticism to utter in relation to the conduct of those who bore the principal part in the administration of justice. Those Members of the Government on whom fell the responsibility of making arrangements for the administration of justice—the Lord Chancellor and the Home Secretary—had strenuously endeavoured to carry out the wishes of the Legislature; and nothing could be more unjust, in the absence of the Judges, or more inexpedient, considering the respect they entertained for the law and for those who administered it, than to make their conduct the subject of debate. The limits within which he desired to confine his observations would be in relation to the system which now prevailed in some of the Courts in which justice was administered. It seemed to him that the public might be well satisfied with the system of Appellate Jurisdiction. He thought that practice had shown that the compromise which was made in reference to the continuance of the House of Lords as the Final Court of Appeal, strengthened by the introduction of members sent into it for the purpose of sitting as Judges, had turned out wise and judicious. They might also be satisfied with the Intermediate Courts of Appeal, except that the sittings were not continuous, the result of which was that nearly 300 causes were now waiting to be heard. There was little to be said with regard to the administration of justice in the Courts of Equity. His area of discussion, therefore, was limited to matters connected with the administration of justice in the Civil Courts of Westminster, London, and upon Circuit, and to some matters connected with the administration of the Criminal Law. The main object of the Judicature Act of 1873 was the establishment of one great Court of Justice in which all causes were to be determined upon the same principles, and as nearly as possible by the same mode of procedure. Unfortunately, great latitude was shown in the attainment of this object. The three great divisions of the Common Law Courts were maintained, and the barriers so injurious to their practice still existed, in spite of efforts to remove them, which were defeated by forces summoned by the division bell. In 1876 the present Government attempted to mitigate some of the remaining evils, and passed an Act laying down a principle which he hoped to see carried further. By the Act of 1876 it was intended to abolish the Divisional Courts; and the 17th clause provided that as far as practicable causes were to be heard, determined, and disposed of by a single Judge, and motions relating to them were to be heard by the Judge before whom the trial took place. Under the Act rules had been framed which, to a great extent, rendered this legislation nugatory, and the Divisional Courts existed with all their former virtue taken out of them, and all the evils of the old system remaining. Under the rules a Judge did not hear a case right out, but, as other cases were waiting, he adjourned the arguments on a disputed point, necessitating the attendance of the parties on a future day. But this judgment did not determine the case any more than did the verdict of a jury previously, and there was an appeal to the Divisional Court in the first instance, so that a new and a useless stage had been created, adding delay, expense, and inconvenience without any benefit resulting. They were now simply halting between two systems. They had neither clung to the old system with all its benefits, nor had they the courage really to proceed with the new. They must either recede or go forward, and, following the law of forces, he knew they would have to go forward. Another matter which interfered with the administration of justice, and which was a cause of delay and expense to the suitor, was that in the conduct of every suit there were necessarily many minor or interlocutory motions, which were disposed of at Chambers, where a large crowd of persons might be seen engaged in a struggle or scramble to obtain justice, which was administered by the Masters and their assistants in a desultory and unsatisfactory manner. The matters might be small in themselves, but, unfortunately, the decisions might be appealed against—first, to the Judge sitting in Chambers, and, secondly, to the Divisional Court; and our Courts were constantly occupied by two Judges listening to appeals on these minor matters. Then, in the Divisional Courts, there was always a most unseemly squabble as to what occurred in Chambers, no one being present to clear up the matter. And after the Divisional

Courts had been occupied with discussions of these minor matters on appeal No. 2, there was an appeal No. 3 to the Intermediate Court of Appeal, where the Lords' Justices of Appeal were compelled to sit and listen to the same sort of proceedings, which might have no other object than that of running up costs or causing delay. Another of the evils of the present system, which operated disadvantageously on the public as well as on juries, was the want of continuousness in the sittings of the Courts. No one, however diligent in his inquiries, could know what Courts were about to sit and for what purposes they were about to sit. For instance, on looking to the Cause List any morning, one might see about 30 cases set down for trial at six Courts of *Nisi Prius.* It did not, however, follow that all these cases would be tried on that day, for many of them would have to stand over until the next morning, when probably there would be only one of these Courts sitting; whereas, perhaps, the day after there might be two or three, according to the disposition of the Judges. Sometimes there was a break in the sittings altogether for three weeks, so that suitors, witnesses, and jurors were kept in a state of uncertainty and put to great inconvenience from day to day. The result was that whenever a large number of cases were entered for trial, a considerable proportion of them never came to trial at all; they fell out of the Cause List like dry leaves from a tree, either being postponed for want of time to try, or abandoned by the suitors, who despaired of getting them tried. In 1875 there were set down for trial in Westminster and London 2,564 causes, of which only 861, or 33 per cent, were tried. The rest, in some way or other, took care of themselves—they assumed the character of remanets, or became dead altogether. In 1876 the number set down was 2,771, of which 1,037, or 36 per cent, were tried; in 1877, 3,131 causes were entered, and only 953, or 30 per cent, were tried. Now, the circumstances he had described were most injurious to the public interest and to every person who had to do with the administration of justice in the Courts. If this were only a transient position of affairs, it might be inexpedient to call attention to the matter; but because it was in no way due to transition, and there seemed no probability of its being altered, it was necessary that something should be done. The obvious remedy for this state of things was an increase of judicial strength. Some suggested that this should be accomplished by an addition to the number of Judges; but for his part he would regard an addition to the number of Judges as an evil in itself, which ought, if possible, to be avoided. There was another means of attaining the end in view, which, he believed, the House would find more acceptable—namely, the saving of judicial strength which was now wasted. That there was at present a vast waste of judicial strength no one who was acquainted with the subject could doubt. It was not the fault of the Judges, but of the system; and what he had to suggest was, first, that Parliament should insist that the legislation of 1876 should be carried into effect, and that each Judge in the Common Law Courts should take upon himself the same responsibility as was now individually borne by the Judges in Equity. He was not in any way attempting to detract from the position of the Common Law Judges. On the contrary, he assumed that they were fit for the discharge of duties from which they now appeared to shrink; and his suggestion was really only a simple acknowledgment of the learning and ability which they undoubtedly possessed. If they were placed on the footing of the Equity Judges, a great saving of judicial time would at once be effected. Secondly, if, in minor affairs, the waste of judicial strength could be stopped, a great saving of time and of money would be effected. For instance, the Divisional Courts were occupied one or two days each week hearing appeals from the inferior Courts; but it was strange that, while in the case of an appeal from a County Court, which in matters of Equity had jurisdiction to the extent of £500, the appeal was to one Equity Judge, in the case of an appeal in a Common Law case, where the County Court had jurisdiction to the extent of £50 only, the appeal must be heard and decided by two Judges. Thirdly, the appeals from the decisions of the Masters in Chambers should be made direct to one Judge sitting in open Court, and should go no further—thus saving the time of the Divisional and Appeal Courts. A still greater opportunity of economizing judicial time he had yet to refer to, and it related to the administration of criminal and civil cases on the Circuits. The error that had too long been committed was that no distinction had been drawn between the exigencies of the administration of justice in criminal and in civil cases. In respect of these a great distinction should be drawn. It was a benefit that criminal justice should be administered within narrow limits—at least, within the county where the crime was committed. It was well that the young and the ignorant should be impressed by witnessing the solemn administration of the law, and that all classes of the community should have the advantage of seeing Judges of a High Court perform their duty. But still they had to face the fact that untried prisoners should not be kept in custody for any long time—certainly not longer than three months. In that respect a great advance had been made of late years, for prisoners might have remained in custody untried only a few years ago for six or even eight months. That great scandal had, however, been removed. He called it a great scandal, because if they had heard that an English subject in some foreign country had been arrested and allowed to remain eight months in prison because there was not a Judge to try him, they could all conceive the outcry that would have been raised. The right hon. Gentleman the Home Secretary had loyally accepted the principle of speedy trial, and they could not go back from it; but must assume that, for the purposes of the administration of justice in criminal cases, there must be Circuits four times a-year. If prisoners were taken to be tried a long way from the place of committal, there was great risk that injustice would be done them. They would be deprived of the opportunity of calling their witnesses, and they would lose the benefit of consulting the professional adviser they had originally engaged; and, indeed, everyone who had had practice in Assize Courts was aware of instances—almost cruel instances—of injustice done by a carrying out to a too great extent the principle of centralization. When, however, they came to deal with the administration of justice in civil causes, a different view presented itself. In that respect they were following, with but little alteration, the system which prevailed in the time of Edward I. They had taken no heed to the greatly increased means of conveyance which existed now, or to the fact that agricultural districts had become great centres of population; and as they acted centuries ago, so they acted now, without relation to the changes that had taken place. There was certainly no necessity for two Judges visiting each county for the purpose of trying civil causes. The Judges had at least a month before the Circuits commenced to fix the time they would remain in each county, and that without any knowledge of the number of causes to be tried in any one of them. They had, in fact, to take the average number, going back for some years; and it frequently happened that very few causes were to be tried in one county, in which case the Judge, greatly against his will, would be compelled to remain idling his time in a country town, while a larger number of causes than usual were awaiting trial in the adjoining county, some of which, perhaps, from want of time to try them, would necessarily be postponed till the next Assizes. Would the House believe that in 20 Assize towns in England and Wales the number of civil causes tried in the year 1877 at the two Circuits was 48; the number in the following year in the same towns being 49, or one cause and one-fifth of a cause in each town at each Assize? In the case of many Assize towns, it sometimes happened that no cause whatever was to be tried. In the great centres of industry the case was very different, for he found that in the year 1877, of 1,413 Assize causes entered for the whole country, 590, or 41 per cent, were for trial in Lancashire and Yorkshire; and that in the following year, of 1,172 causes entered, 431, or 36 per cent, were for trial in those two counties alone. The effect of this state of things was that many cases entered for trial in the centres to which he had drawn attention never obtained a hearing. He found that upon the Northern Circuit, out of 282 causes entered for trial—264 of them being entered at Liverpool and Manchester—only 144, or 50 per cent, were tried; and that on the North-Eastern Circuit, out of 237 causes entered, only 128 were tried. A different state of things, however, existed in the smaller counties; and on the Western Circuit, which was the smallest Circuit in England, out of 114 cases, 96 were tried. When a great number of cases awaited trial, a large percentage always failed to be tried. In North Wales, where only 25 cases were set down for trial, 24 were disposed of, and in the South Wales Circuit the percentage was nearly the same. The reason why in Liverpool and Manchester only 50 per cent of the cases were tried, while 96 per cent obtained a hearing in the two small Circuits to which he had referred, would be found to lie in the great and unequal pressure placed upon the Judges. The effect of the present system was that cases that ought to be tried were not tried, and that there was, at the same time, a waste of judicial strength. He hoped the House would understand to what extent cases were tried on Circuit. In 1876, the number of cases so tried amounted to 903, and only 195 of them were for the recovery of sums above £200, or for the trial of any right, or for the recovery of land. In the next year, 905 cases were tried, only 171 of them involving sums above the figure which he had just mentioned. In such circumstances, was it right they should preserve the present system regulating Circuits, merely because it had existed for centuries? Were they to go on without the institution of constant Assizes and not to make allowance for the increased facilities of conveyance, by which a person could, with the greatest convenience, be brought to any town where a Judge might be? Anyone who objected to centralization on the ground that suitors ought not to be brought into centres should remember that every equity cause, except those tried in the County Palatine, was tried in London, and that no complaints were made against that system. All Probate and Divorce cases were also so tried. Persons also brought their cases to London for trial in the Civil Courts, and no complaint was made. The fact was that the suitor did not object to travelling as long as his case was tried at the appointed time. What he did object to was being kept waiting in an Assize town a certain number of days, and then having his case left untried. The House would see that a great saving of judicial strength would be caused, and that much convenience to suitors would result if the system of centralization were introduced in different parts of the country. He was asking simply that the system which was followed in equity, and which existed to a great extent in London, and which it had been attempted to introduce in a minor degree by the establishment of registries throughout the land, should be extended a little further. If Courts were constantly open in Manchester, Liverpool, Leeds, and some towns of the Midland counties, presided over by Judges of the Superior Courts, the results would be most beneficial. It would be found, taking the legal year of 210 days, that the average number of cases tried per annum—namely, 800—would be tried in half the time they occupied at present. The Judges, having decided these cases, would then have half their time, or some 110 days, at their disposal, in which to try the prisoners in the counties in the neighbourhood of their centres. Whereas now some Judges were absent from London for about four and a-half months, no Judge, if his suggestions were adopted, would be away for so long a time. The Judges would not have to travel about so much, and there would be a total saving of the time that was lost in those places where the Cause List was small. On the one hand, the Judges' time would be economized, and, on the other, the suitor would be given a certain and known day on which his case would be heard. He had now placed before the House the views which he entertained in regard to the waste of judicial strength, and the remedies which he proposed. He hoped the House would pardon him if he explained the reasons which had led him to bring the matter to the notice of hon. Members. The fact was that it was difficult for the question to attract public notice. If a member of the public endeavoured to bring it forward, unfortunately, or rather, perhaps, fortunately, for him, he possessed but little of the requisite technical knowledge, and, as a matter of fact, very few of the public cared to bestir themselves in the cause of legal reform. As had been said, one might as well expect a man who had had one leg cut off to devote his time to the improvement of the instrument with which the operation had been carried out, as to hope for assistance in the improvement of legal matters from the general public. The Government also, unless they proposed measures for the adoption of Parliament and bore the responsibility of them, could raise no discussion on the subject of legal reforms. It appeared to him that there was only one class who could very well interest themselves in the matter which he had brought to the notice of the House—namely, those independent Members who had given their attention to the administration of the law. It was for the interest of the public, as well as for the interest of the Profession to which they belonged, that those who were versed in the law should deeply consider the proposals which he had made. He was certain that lawyers would best consult their own welfare by adapting themselves to the changes demanded from them by the public. He had constantly to hear complaints from suitors against the existing state of things; and it appeared to him that it was almost a very fault to remain silent and make no attempt to see if some changes, not of a destructive character, could not by common consent be introduced. It was in this spirit, and for the purpose of raising discussion, that he had called attention to the questions which he had placed before the House; and he trusted he should not be considered presumptuous if he moved the Resolution of which he had given Notice.

Mr. GREGORY, in seconding the Motion, said, he might refer to the manner in which business was conducted in the Court of Chancery as illustrating the system which he thought might well be applied, to a great extent, to the other tribunals of this country. He had examined the judicial statistics for the year 1876-7, and, taking it that practically there were only four Judges in the Court of Chancery in that year, he found that those Judges disposed of 2,266 causes, and motions in the nature of causes. In addition to that, they dealt with 1,600 petitions, some of which might, indeed, be of a formal character, yet many of them involved points of considerable importance. In the Registrar's Office of the Court there were over 17,000 orders drawn up. That large amount of business was got through by continuous sittings in one place. The Vice Chancellors sat from day to day, and it was known when they would sit and what business would come before them. The Judges were all members of one tribunal; they were not split up into divisions, and a cause could thus be readily transferred from one Judge to another. If one Judge had exhausted his Cause List, he might take causes from another, so that no Judge should be overburdened with work as regarded the Chamber business. The staff of each Judge consisted of a chief clerk and some assistants; and the number of attendances in Chambers before those gentlemen in the year 1876-8 was 97,000. By this means a large mass of interlocutory and administrative business was disposed of. Each solicitor knew when his case would come on, the day being divided into distinct parts. The case went before the clerk in the first instance, and if the party was not satisfied with the clerk's judgment, he would go before the Judge, who sat two days a-week after his other business had been done in Court to hear applications, and these might be conducted by the solicitors who appeared before the Chief Clerk, or might on their application be adjourned into Court and argued formally by counsel. In all cases the Judge in Chancery sat alone and disposed of the whole matter, being Judge both of the law and the fact. That was a system worthy of imitation as far as it could be carried out in the other tribunals of the country. It was to be regretted that when they were dealing with the Judicature Act, the Common Law Judges were not brought into one great division, as the Vice Chancellors were. If that had been done, much complaint might have been avoided; but they had now the three divisions of the Queen's Bench, the Common Pleas, and the Exchequer, with but little connection between them. He concurred with the hon. and learned Member for Taunton (Sir Henry James) as to the evils of the want of continuity in the sittings of the Common Law Judges. It was now very difficult for solicitors to know the time and the place at which their causes would be tried. That might be partially corrected when the new and more commodious buildings for the Law Courts were completed; but, in the meantime, the faults of the system ought not to remain unremedied. He was glad that the hon. and learned Member for Taunton did not propose to disturb the arrangement for having four

Circuits in the year for criminal business; but in respect to civil business he went very much with the hon. and learned Member. There was no doubt that much of the civil business on the Circuits was of the most trumpery character, and that the time of the Judges was taken up, in many instances, where their presence was not required. He did not say that the commercial centres did not require the presence of the Judges for their civil business, and sittings should be held there from time to time by the Judges of the Superior Courts for the disposal of it; but he thought the way would be considerably cleared in that respect when they had some extension of the jurisdiction of the County Courts. No doubt, the importance of a case did not always depend on the magnitude of the claim on which it was founded, and the parties could not and ought not to be precluded from trying their causes if they chose in the Superior Courts; but there was no reason for putting in motion all the machinery connected with the sending down of the Judges to the extent to which that was now done in places where there was little or no civil business. If the parties in such districts preferred to have their cases dealt with by the Superior Courts, there was no great hardship in bringing them to one of the great commercial centres or to London. In fact, notwithstanding all the facilities afforded for the conduct of business in the country, there was a tendency to bring business to the Metropolis. One reason of this was that all the principal railways had termini in London, and parties engaged in litigation often found it more convenient to come up here than to any of the great provincial towns. In London, too, they could obtain first-rate professional assistance at a less cost than they could procure it in the country. It was a great satisfaction to him that he had been requested to second his hon. and learned Friend's Motion, as he was always glad to advance and facilitate the administration of justice; and he sincerely trusted that before long something would be accomplished in that direction.

Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "in the opinion of this House, it is expedient that measures should be adopted to provide a more speedy and efficient and less expensive mode of administering justice than now prevails,"—(*Sir Henry James*,)

—instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

MR. OSBORNE MORGAN agreed with his hon. and learned Friend the Member for Taunton in the propriety of assimilating the practice of the Common Law Courts with that of the Equity Courts in regard to the hearing of cases by a single Judge. He never could see why, if one Judge could try a mixed question of fact and law at Lincoln's Inn, two or three Judges should be required to try a simple question of law at Westminster. Before hon. Members committed themselves to the new plan shadowed forth by his hon. and learned Friend, they ought to consider the fact that the Judicature Act had never yet had fair play. If they did not take care, it might become a great reform spoilt in its administration; and it would be a national misfortune if so vast a scheme were shipwrecked for want of energy and forethought in carrying it out. Two years ago he called the attention of the House to the circumstance that that Act had much increased the business of the Chancery Division of the High Court of Justice. In consequence of the discussion which was raised by that Motion, Mr. Justice Fry was appointed a Judge in the Equity Division. Everything was going on very well, when, unfortunately, one day it was thought necessary to send Mr. Justice Fry to try prisoners on the Northern Circuit, and he did not return to Lincoln's Inn till the middle of February. Whether or not it was necessary to have four Circuits a-year for the trial of prisoners, certain it was that the holding of those four Circuits would completely paralyze the Central Administration of Justice in London. When the Judicature Act was in course of discussion, one of the things which everybody insisted upon was that there should always be two Courts of Appeal sitting in London, one at Westminster and the other at Lincoln's Inn, in order to try to get through that most important part of the judicial business of the country. Well, during the whole of January and February last, with the exception of three days in February, no Court of Appeal was sitting at Westminster at all, as the Lords Justices were on Circuit. Although it was, of course, necessary to have regular Assizes for gaol delivery, the House was bound to consider whether they could not be held without the present waste of judicial power. Recently, Lord Justice Thesiger had to go down to Denbighshire to try three or four trumpery cases, which might as well have been heard at Quarter Sessions; and during the learned Judge's absence in Wales, the proceedings of the Court of Appeal in London were stopped for three or four days. He did not say that these persons should not be tried as soon as possible; but was there no other way of doing it? He did not say it was necessary to add to our judicial strength, but something must be done. Even when Judges were not on Circuit, it was by no means easy to find in London a sufficient judicial staff to constitute two Courts of Appeal. Last week the case of "Martin *v.* Mackonochie" was being tried, involving the somewhat curious question whether a clergyman was entitled to break the law with impunity. The Court of Appeal did not find itself strong enough to deal with that case, so it had to borrow Lord Justice James. The Court of Appeal in Lincoln's Inn was then left incomplete, and it was obliged to borrow a Judge from the Rolls Court. The result was that the Rolls Court could not sit, as the Master of the Rolls had to go away. Then the Court of Appeal caught Lord Justice Baggallay; but as, through an unfortunate accident, Vice Chancellor Malins was obliged to be absent, Lord Justice Baggallay had to go off from the Court of Appeal, and for more than a week the Court of Appeal in Lincoln's Inn could not sit at all. Ought they to localize the administration of justice more than they did at present? The effect of his hon. and learned Friend's proposal in that respect would be absolutely to destroy the Bar; and as Judges were taken from the Bar, if they destroyed the Bar they would destroy the Bench. But the whole matter ought to be discussed and sifted, as the present state of things was most unsatisfactory to the suitors, and was certainly not creditable to those who had the control of the administration of justice. He hoped, therefore, before the debate closed, the House would hear what the hon. Member for Hull (Mr. Norwood), and the hon. Member for Berkshire (Mr. Walter), and others, had to say. Until public opinion outside the Profession could be roused, they should never get the momentum necessary for the judicial reforms which the country required.

Mr. MARTEN said, it was impossible to come to a satisfactory decision upon a Resolution expressed in such vague terms as that proposed by the hon. and learned Gentleman, whom he would have cordially supported if he had brought forward a definite proposal of a character likely to serve as a basis for a substantial improvement in the administration of the law. The Resolution spoke certainly of the need of reform; but it did not shadow forth what kind of reform was likely to be most effectual. For that reason, he hoped the hon. and learned Gentleman would not press it to a Division. But, at the same time, these matters, which affected the practical working of the Courts of Law, deserved the greatest consideration. In his opinion, the Divisional Courts at Westminster ought to be abolished. He would have preferred three Judges, in the first instance, to try actions; but that was not agreed to, and the country was irrevocably committed to the present system of trial in Courts of First Instance before a single Judge. It was a matter beyond dispute that they ought to insist that the Act of 1873 should be fully carried into effect, and that a Judge who tried a case should try it throughout, and give final judgment upon it. With regard to motions for a new trial, in the first instance the proper course would be that the motion should be made before the Judge who tried the case. If he were dissatisfied with the verdict, it would be a proper case for a new trial. But where both the Judge who had tried the case and the jury were satisfied, the proper course would be to apply to a Court of Appeal. He should certainly object to the abolition of appeals upon interlocutory applications. The Courts of Chancery had always allowed those appeals, and to get rid of them would lead to very considerable confusion; besides, the suitors were protected against frivolous appeals by the power of the Courts to award costs. The facility of appeal, moreover, tended very much to create a feeling of satisfaction with the administration of justice by the Judges of First Instance. With regard to the continuity of sittings in London and Middlesex, he did not see why the system adopted in Equity of continuous sittings by the same Judge should not be carried out in London and Middlesex. With regard to Circuits, he would suggest, in order to facilitate the administration of justice, that there should be the clearest separation between civil and criminal business, and the criminal business of the Circuit should be taken by a Judge sitting in connection with the Court of Quarter Sessions, on the principle of the attendance of the Judges at the Central Criminal Court; and the civil business should be taken by a Judge who should sit at each place till he had finished the business there before going to another place; so that, according to the requirements of the business, one Judge should go from place to place, and dispose of the whole of the civil business of the Circuit; and that the absurd practice of fixing the dates and places of the Circuits for Civil business weeks before it could be known what amount of business there would be at each place, should be abolished. The concentration of business might, perhaps, be carried too far. Prisoners from Cambridge were lately tried at Norwich, but they might be tried in London with almost equal, if not greater, convenience; and it was a hardship upon prisoners—especially as regarded the difficulty of obtaining the attendance of their witnesses — that they should be tried at a distance from their own county. On the other hand, local courts and the adoption of centres for civil business would not have a great tendency to withdraw business from London—which experience and the choice of suitors showed to be the most convenient place of trial in the majority of cases—but would, in his opinion, involve an unnecessary interference with the system of Circuits, and a great increase of cost in our judicial establishments without any corresponding advantage.

MR. NORWOOD said, on behalf of the lay element in the community, he must express his thanks to the hon. and learned Member for Taunton (Sir Henry James) for the able and lucid way in which he had brought forward a question of so much interest to the commercial classes. So far as regarded the Common Law Courts, the state of things was most unsatisfactory. Too much had not been said as to the constant loss and vexation caused by the uncertainty which now existed as to when and where a case would be tried, either in the Provinces or the Metropolis. The experience of the Judicature Act had been disappointing. The expectation that there would be a fusion of Law and Equity, continuous sittings, and order and regularity in the conduct of the legal business of the country, had not been realized. Whilst agreeing with many of the suggestions of the hon. and learned Member, he thought sufficient stress had not been laid upon the possible extension of the County Court jurisdiction. He (Mr. Norwood) felt sanguine that, at no distant date, without depriving the Superior Courts of important business, the jurisdiction of the County Courts might be increased, so as to relieve the superior Courts of matters that were scarcely of sufficient importance to engage their attention. He agreed that while there ought to be gaol deliveries in every Assize town, as at present, a well-considered scheme of Centres in the Provinces for the trial of causes might be useful; but, in many instances, it would be more convenient for suitors to go to London than to go to such a local centre. The Bar would not be of the same importance at the local centres as in London, and it would cost more to bring the highest forensic skill to such centres than to secure it in London. If all the suggestions that had been made were acted upon, there would still, in his opinion, be something required to put our legal machinery in order, for a state of chaos and anarchy prevailed in the Common Law Divisions. He would be the last to say a word unfairly criticizing the Judges; but still duty compelled him to state that the operations of the Judicature Act did not appear to have been sufficiently assisted by certain of the Judges, who—whatever their private opinions might have been—ought to have endeavoured to carry out the views of the Legislature as soon as changes had been determined upon. There ought to be some direct responsibility for control over judicial arrangements—someone in the position of a Minister of Justice, who could prescribe, within certain limits, the course and order of procedure in our Courts, and the mode in which the Judges were to serve the country. It might be said there was some Constitutional difficulty in placing such a power in the hands of a political officer or a Member of the Government; but, be that as it might, it was a scandal that there appeared to be no regularity, no order, no proper control with reference to the duties of the Judges. Laymen had recently been scandalized by the attacks of one Judge upon another, which had almost become epidemic; and it was a great pity if, as currently reported, there was not the harmony between members of the Judicial Bench—that desire to facilitate business—that there ought to be. He trusted that means might be found of putting an end to all these scandals. Difficulties did not occur in Chancery, where the Judges appeared to work harmoniously together, and to assist each other; but in the Common Law, in spite of the new Act, there were still the three Divisions, and there was not that harmony they had reason to expect. Whether it was possible to invest the Lord Chancellor or the Lord Chief Justice with a regulating power he did not know; but he trusted that means would be devised for putting an end to the difficulties that were now experienced.

Mr. BULWER denied that there was any want of harmony amongst the Judges in carrying out their duties, or reluctance on their part to facilitate business, and he regretted that any reference had been made to personal controversies that were irrelevant to this Motion. The Motion had one inconvenience, that it raised no definite issue; but the subject was introduced with ability and moderation. As to the Act of 1873 introducing uniformity of principle and practice, he always thought it was too grand a scheme, and that it was destined to end in comparative failure. The evils which at that time required a remedy could have been cured by an Act of Parliament of half-a-dozen sections. The idea was very good in theory; but they could not abolish the distinction between Law and Equity except by establishing a Code. Division of labour was always the result of advancing civilization; and so long as the distinction between Law and Equity existed, it was desirable to have persons eminent in both branches to administer the law. It was not desirable that our Judges should be like Maitre Jacques in Molière's *L'Avare*, who performed the duties of both cook and coachman, and when called for desired to know in which capacity he was required and in which dress he was to appear. It was not to be expected that the Judicature Act would be a great success, and it was only astonishing that they had succeeded as well as they had. It was an ambitious scheme, but the reforms that were really required might have been effected by an extension of the Common Law Procedure Acts of 1852 and 1854. It was not desirable that the system of appeals in interlocutory applications from Masters in Chambers should be encouraged; but it was absolutely essential that certain questions which, though of detail, were of great importance, arising under the new law, should be settled, and even now the appeals were diminishing from day to day. It had been asked by the hon. and learned Member for Denbighshire (Mr. Osborne Morgan), why, if the single Judge system worked well in the Chancery Division, it should not work equally well in the Common Law Divisions. In the first place, the business in the Court of Chancery differed so materially from the business in the Courts of Common Law, that a system which worked well in the one case could by no means be assumed to work well in the other. In the second place, it did not follow, because one Court of Appeal could successfully dispose of cases coming from only six Courts as in Chancery, that another similarly constituted could, with equal success, dispose of cases coming from 15; and it would follow still less if appeals were allowed, as they must be, from the decisions of single Judges in those cases which were now decided by Divisional Courts consisting of two or more Judges. If the 15 Common Law Judges were sitting in as many different Courts, the present Court of Appeal would be utterly unable to cope with the business; and, as the hon. and learned Member for Taunton (Sir Henry James) and others objected to increasing the number of Judges, how would the Court of Appeal be reinforced except by promoting some of the Judges from the three Divisions, and thus reducing the number of Courts of First Instance? As to criminal trials, there was nothing to be said now. It had been decided that there should be four Assizes in the year, though, for his own part, he had not been greatly impressed with the plea put in favour of the so-called innocent prisoners, inasmuch as of the numbers he had seen acquitted in his time 99 per cent in his humble judgment ought to have been convicted. The proposal of the hon. and learned Member for Cambridge (Mr. Marten) that one List of Causes should be made for the whole Circuit was, if he might be allowed to say so, altogether crude. With regard to the suggestion that there should be Courts sitting continuously at some of the great centres, though not necessarily with the same Judge, the proposition had come upon him somewhat by surprise, and he was not exactly prepared to express a definite opinion upon the subject; but he was afraid it would have one evil effect which the hon. and learned Member for Taunton had perhaps not sufficiently considered. It would tend to localize the Bar, and this, he could not help thinking, would be a great misfortune not only to the Profession itself, but to the public. The spirit of discipline now animating the Bar would be impaired; and suitors in one part of the country would have additional difficulty in obtaining the services of particular counsel whom they might wish to engage and who were employed elsewhere.

MR. COLE said, he was strongly opposed to the Divisional Court being abolished, for if that Court in its present form were done away with, it would be necessary to go to the Court of Appeal for new trials, and the Court of Appeal would consequently be overwhelmed with work. He thought, however, it would be a great advantage if the distribution of the business of the Courts were placed in the hands of a competent manager, who would make arrangements by which the Judges would know in the morning what Court they were going to sit in, and what business they were to be engaged on. He also thought that when once the List of Causes to be taken by each Judge was arranged, it should be kept separate and never be tampered with. No cause should be removed out of its List and taken in another Court without the consent of the parties on both sides. With respect to appeals from the inferior Courts, a considerable economy of judicial strength might be secured. He could not see why such appeals could not be heard and disposed of by one Judge, as one Judge now heard and determined complicated questions of law arising on the argument of demurrers. He could not agree with his hon. and learned Friend the Member for Taunton (Sir Henry James) that there were at present a sufficient number of Judges. In his opinion, the Judicial Bench was considerably undermanned. There was a certain amount of work to be done; that amount could be approximately ascertained; and he had no doubt in his mind that there was not at present a sufficient number of Judges to cope with it in the manner the suitors had a right to expect their causes should be dealt with. They might take a lesson from the Courts of Chancery in making provision for a List of short causes in the Courts of Common Law. Many short causes were indefinitely postponed by long causes, some of which lasted several days in hearing, standing before them in the List. It had been said that the number of Circuits should be increased to four instead of two; but in that proposal he could not concur. The necessity of such a step had not been shown. He also thought that judicial strength on Circuits might be much economised. He could state from his own knowledge that at the last Assizes two Judges went to Bodmin. They found that there were but three prisoners to try and no cause, and yet no fewer than 105 jurors had been summoned to attend. Of the three prisoners, one pleaded guilty, another, being insane, could not plead, and the trial of the third lasted just half an hour. It would, therefore, he believed, be a great convenience if counties were grouped on Circuits, not only for criminal cases as was now sometimes the case, but also for the trial of civil causes. He considered that in the case of grouped counties, as now arranged for the trial of prisoners, it was very unfair that the jurymen and grand jurymen should be taken as at present from one county, and it was also unjust that the Sheriff of the county in which the Assizes were held should be put to the extra expense. If local centres were established as suggested, and Judges were to remain in them all the legal year, the Judges being changed every three months as suggested, what would they do in all the spare time that they would have? In the more important centres, such as

Liverpool and Manchester, the plan of periodical sittings might be adopted; but that would entail a local Bar, a result which would be far from desirable for reasons which had already been pointed out. If the jurisdiction of the County Courts were extended, it would be necessary to increase the fees of the Judges, as recommended by the Committee, as a better class of Judges would be required than existed at the present time. He was, however, quite willing to admit that some of the Judges were most able men, as good, indeed, as could be found even in Westminster, but others were quite the reverse; and some appointments had been recently made from barristers who never even had a brief. The extension of the jurisdiction of the County Courts would very soon lead to a block of business in those Courts, and then the help of the Registrars would be resorted to, a course which the public might not completely approve. He thought, therefore, it would be a very great mistake to increase the jurisdiction of the County Courts. They were excellent Courts for the recovery of small debts, and that was their proper sphere. He was very glad that the whole subject had been brought before the House by the hon. and learned Member for Taunton (Sir Henry James), and hoped that some scheme might be devised which would cause the business to be carried on in a regular manner in our Courts of Law. If some governing head were appointed to arrange the work in the Courts, such as one of the chiefs of the Courts, a great deal of valuable time might be saved by attorneys, counsel, and others engaged in legal business.

Mr. GRANTHAM observed, that the public, the patient who was supposed to be suffering, did not, from the scanty attendance in the House that night, appear to feel acutely this grievance which was said to be so great; and if they did feel it, it was but a poor consolation to them to find that no two doctors agreed as to what the remedy ought to be. He ventured to say that there was a great misapprehension in the minds of hon. Members and the public generally in the idea that there was such a great block in the judicial system at the present time, or that there was an undue delay in the trial of causes. If they looked back during the past two years, they would no doubt find that there had been a great block, which was caused by the attempted fusion of Law and Equity, but that had been to a great extent removed, and there was at present very little cause for complaint; still he believed that there must always be a certain amonnt of difficulty and uncertainty in reference to the trial of Common Law causes. He thought they had derived many advantages from the new system, and there had been a considerable dispatch of business; and, in his opinion, whatever delay existed now arose not from the Judges not doing their work, but in consequence of the alteration in the system of pleading, which gave more opportunities for fighting out small cases at Chambers, and more opportunities for multiplying interlocutory proceedings at Chambers, thereby enormously increasing the expense of litigation, and postponing the period by several weeks when the cause would be ready for trial. A remedy, therefore, should be found in an alteration of that system. Causes when ripe for trial were tried as rapidly again in the Common Law Courts as in the Courts of Chancery. In the latter, the Judges got rid of their long causes by remitting them to Chambers. It was in the offices of the chief clerks that delay arose, and this was owing to the system adopted, and not to any remissness on the part of these gentlemen. There was, moreover, no parallel between Chancery and Common Law cases. Matters that could be tried by affidavit, as most Chancery causes were, might be tried equally well in London or elsewhere; but with the Common Law system, where evidence was always taken orally in Court, the great desideratum was to bring justice home to the doors of the suitors. It was desirable, therefore, to keep up the Circuits. The suitors were the persons whom the law was designed to benefit, and it was their convenience which had to be consulted. His own experience of the last South Eastern Circuit was that on an average the causes tried there were fully as important as those tried in town, and that the expenses, as a rule, were much less than they would have been if the cases had been removed from the Assizes. It was clear that the expense and inconvenience caused by the removal of a trial, and the consequent necessity of bringing witnesses from a distance, were very considerable. Another great difference between Common Law and Chancery was the far greater variety of the work done by the former than the latter, and which would, to a certain extent, always prevent that complete fusion which some so desired to see carried out. As a matter of fact, all the confusion that had lately been noticeable was due to the abandonment of the old system in one particular, and that was in having order and regularity in the work done by the respective Judges; and until there was a return to the old idea in that respect of having three Courts, there would always be confusion. They had now 16 Common Law Judges of one Court—as the old Divisions were supposed to be abolished—to four Chancery Judges, each having his own Court; yet there was no directing head over them to plot out their work. There was no confusion when they had the Chief Judge of each Court who was responsible for the work of that Court, and who could with the four or five Judges under him plot out for a month in advance all the work to be done during that period. Now they went about from day to day in different Courts, and neither counsel nor attorneys could arrange their work beforehand. The Judges themselves were anxious to have some plan by which they might know their own Courts and arrange their plans previous to coming into Court, instead of being kept in ignorance as to which Court they were to be attached. What was wanted was a controlling power—not a Minister of Justice, but a Judge on whom should rest the responsibility for the work of his Court. It would be better to go back to the old system, and let the Chiefs have the regulating of the business in their respective Divisions. By doing so, an immense amount of trouble and inconvenience would be saved the Bench and the Bar, and it would be more economical and convenient for suitors, while all the other advantages of the present system might be retained. It was a matter of great annoyance to the Judges, not knowing the work they had to do, and how they could conduct it. He ventured to say again, however, there was no real block in the trial of causes, and that when the Long Vacation arrived very few cases would be left to be tried.

MR. SERJEANT SIMON expressed his regret that when a question so directly affecting the commercial interests of the country was before the House, there was not a single Member of the mercantile class present to assist them by their countenance and support, except his hon. Friend the Member for Hull (Mr. Norwood). At the time the Judicature Act of 1872 was under discussion, there was a great deal said about the fusion of Law and Equity. Everyone acquainted with the subject knew that the so-called fusion was impossible. They were not only different in form and procedure, but were founded upon principles wholly distinct from one another, and often opposed to one another; and so they had now those same two different systems of jurisprudence in force the same as before, whilst in the Common Law Divisions they had the same three distinctive jurisdictions of the Queen's Bench, Common Pleas, and Exchequer, perpetuated under a mere change of names. That there should be confusion and waste of judicial strength was not astonishing, since the Judges had to do the work of Divisional Courts, and were, at the same time, bandied about from Court to Court to sit separately, no Judge knowing, from day to day, where he was to sit, or what duties he might be called upon to perform. This, of course, was a serious evil for the suitors. His hon. and learned Friend (Sir Henry James) had done good service in bringing the subject before the House; but he (Mr. Serjeant Simon) could not altogether concur in the remedy he proposed. He thought that time should be given to see how the changes in the Circuits would work. The object of the Circuits, as was the object of Justices in Eyre in the olden time, was to bring justice home, as it were, to every man's door. In this object he concurred; but he was opposed to what was commonly called localizing justice. If the present system of Circuits did not meet the requirements of modern times, he would say, reconstruct them. He approved of the system of grouping, which had been commenced for the purposes of the Criminal Assizes, and sending Judges alternately into one county and another in the group; but he was wholly opposed to any plan which would have the tendency, as he thought the plan of his hon. and learned Friend (Sir Henry James) would, of localizing Judges—that was, of placing Judges permanently in any one place. He objected to it in the interest of the suitors and of the public generally. The effect of localizing Judges, he thought, would be to lower the tone and the dignity of both the Bench and the Bar; for in this country they could not touch the one without affecting the other, and the result would be disastrous. Englishmen were justly proud of their Judges, and no foreigner ever entered our Courts without being impressed with the ability, the dignity, and, above all, the impartiality, of our Judges. These qualities were the necessary result of long training and experience at the Bar, at which they had made their way, and of the independence of their position. In Continental countries, the Judges were educated as a caste, as mere State officials, having no community of feeling or of interest with the Bar, or the public. They were essentially, and above all, servants of the State. With us, our Judges were a part of the people, and they belonged to the people no less than to the State which appointed them. In their professional career they had been in close contact with the people, counselling them as to their rights and liberties, and pleading for those rights and those liberties. Our administration of justice, moreover, was essentially popular. All classes of the community, from the squire, the merchant, and the banker, down to the petty tradesman, all were called to take part in it. The people watched it with interest, and popular opinion was brought to bear upon it. The criticism of the Bar was also a powerful influence. Every Judge on the Bench felt the force of that criticism, for every Judge had in his time, when at the Bar, been a critic of the conduct, the learning, and the ability of the Judges. To place a Judge in a provincial town and create a local Bar there, as a necessary consequence, would be to strike at the foundation of those qualities which had given to both the high place they enjoyed in public esteem and confidence. A local Judge, whatever his ability or his learning, would in time degenerate. He would either hold himself superior to a public opinion which he regarded as inferior or unimportant, and which he would not respect, or he would become its creature. He would be indifferent to the criticism of a Bar among whom, however able some might be, he would not recognize equals in abilities and learning. Local influences, moreover, social connections, which were inevitable in provincial communities, would have a lowering and a narrowing effect. He (Mr. Serjeant Simon) remembered an instance of an able and accomplished man, who, after filling for many years the office of a local Judge, came to regard himself not so much as Judge between party and party, but as one whose special function it was to watch over the interests of the town in which he was called upon to administer the law. Whenever there was a case before him touching a local interest, he was sure conscientiously to consider himself bound to keep the local interest in view. In the interests of the public, then, he said, let them not transform the Judges of our High Court into local Judges, as he feared would be the case if the proposal of his hon. and learned Friend were carried into effect. With respect to the proposed increase of the jurisdiction of the County Courts, he did not say that some increase might not be desirable; but he protested against such an increase as would change their character from the poor man's courts in order to furnish cheap law for rich suitors. His hon. Friend the Member for Hull (Mr. Norwood) had said that there ought to be a Minister of Justice. He (Mr. Serjeant Simon) thought so too. In every country in Europe, he believed, there was a Minister of Justice. In England the duties of that Minister were a sort of semi-official work unattached, and it was divided between the Lord Chancellor and his right hon. Friend the Home Secretary. He thought that a Minister responsible to Parliament—especially for all judicial and magisterial appointments — would strengthen our judicial system, and help the administration of the law.

Mr. RIDLEY observed, that in former times the Court of Queen's Bench, the Court of Common Pleas, and the Court of Exchequer were not only Courts of the First Instance, but also Courts of Appeal. An improvement was made, by which the Court of Appeal was substituted for the Exchequer Chamber, and made separate from the Court of First Instance. But it should be remembered that that improvement relieved the Superior Court, which was now called the High Court of Justice, from a good part of its work; and he thought that preperly to carry out the system now in force, and which he hoped would continue to be in force, the High Court of Appeal ought to be strengthened, even though the Court of First Instance were to lose some of its strength. It seemed unnecessary to have two Chief Justices and one Chief Baron belonging to the High Court of Justice, while in the High Court of Appeal they had not got any Lord Chief Justice at all. He thought the Lord Chief Justice of England ought to be made President of the High Court of Appeal. He thought he was right in saying that, suppose they established in England a local centre where civil business would be administered by a stationary Judge, and provided at the same time a travelling Court for the trial of criminal cases, they would be doing exactly that which was done in France now. It must be remembered that the present system in France dated no further back than the time of the Great Revolution; but in our case we had to deal with a system which had been in operation for very many centuries. If the proposal to make local centres were adopted, it would of necessity tend to localize the Bar; and he could not help thinking that such a course would cause the Bar to deteriorate, mainly because it would put members of the Bar in too close a connection with the other branches of the Profession. He thought the difficulty which frequently arose from the Judges going Circuit not knowing the dates at which to fix the commission days in particular towns, by reason of the fact that beforehand they had no adequate idea as to the business to be done, would be removed to a great extent by allowing provincial solicitors to enter their causes at the Associates' offices in London before the commencement of the Circuits.

DR. KENEALY: Sir, I did not intend to take any part in this discussion; but the speech of the hon. and learned Member for Taunton (Sir Henry James), to which I listened with pain, with shame—not with surprise, but certainly with contempt—has been followed up by such a general chorus from the Common Law side, more especially from the hon. and learned Member for Dewsbury (Mr. Serjeant Simon), who never addresses the House on a legal question without holding up the Judges as being the perfection of human nature, and without running down everybody else—these effusions have been such, that I really cannot resist giving expression to my opinion upon this utterly degraded episode in our debates. When I read the hon. and learned Member's Resolution, I hoped we should have a discussion in which a large-minded view of the law and its defects might be presented. But in place of that, we have had only small suggestions; and these have been rendered still more trifling by the fulsome, loathsome sycophancy with which the hon. and learned Member adulated the Judges, as if they were infallible men—when we know that there is no public body less worthy of the name. All these praises come, no doubt, from very "disinterested" sources; and, strange to say, they come only from the Common Law Members, as not a word of this crawling nature has been uttered by any of the Equity Lawyers, who seem to have too much self-respect to abase themselves before the Bench. This thing seems to have grown of late into a sort of system; and it is upheld by those who are assuredly not the most independent members of the Bar—although, if we credit them, the Bar contains nothing but independence. I, for one, protest against this style. But there are others who dislike it, though they may remain silent. I do not wonder that they are mute; for anyone who has the courage to express an honest and an independent opinion is saluted with an outcry, no matter how truthfully he speaks. This slavishness is derogatory to the character of the House, whose functions embrace the right as well as the duty of criticizing every person, from the highest to the lowest, who is in the Public Service of the country; and to say that anyone shall be exempt from remark in his public character is not only cowardice, but is a sort of treason to the rights and privileges of those who send us here. I, Sir, do not deny that there are some honourable men on the Bench—I should be sorry to think there were not, though I wish there were more—but I entirely secede from the hallelujahs of the hon. and learned Member for Taunton, who prostrates himself before all the Judges with a species of Oriental adulation which I hope will meet with its reward. But how severe was the censure which he really passed upon them, without seeing it, by some of his statements! He speaks of the business done at Chambers by the Masters; and of the scenes where two attorneys' clerks fight and wrangle about little or nothing. And he says that this is followed up almost invariably by an appeal to a Judge; and that there is again an appeal from him to the Appellate Tribunal. All this is true; and it is a great evil. But why are the rulings of the Masters always appealed from? Because in any matter of the least difficulty they are hardly ever right. These gentlemen are appointed by the Chief Judge in each Court—not for merit, that is a thing that no one ever heard of—but under the influence of a nepotism the most scandalous. They are nearly all connections, or henchmen, or flatterers of the Judges—this is their sole recommendation; not learning or ability. Hence their decisions at Chambers are distrusted and despised; hence there are appeals which cost suitors heavily; hence the innumerable instances where their decisions are reversed, but which are carefully kept from public view. Is there one hon. Gentleman here who can contradict these facts? No. The whole Bar with one voice denounces the fashion of their nomination. The hon. and learned Member for Taunton knows it as well as anybody. But in his suggestions of law reform does he offer any cure of this sore? Does he propose to take away the nomination of those Masters from the Judges, who so abuse their patronage? If he had done that, he would have cleared our Courts of officers who bring scandal and disrepute upon them. But he makes no such proposition. He cannot embrace that measure of reform, because it would not suit the Judges, of whom he is so passionate an admirer. His regard for the public interest is great, if we believe himself; but he has no desire to see a real measure of reform. These appointments ought to be in the hands of some Public Minister, directly responsible to Parliament for his nominations. At present no one is responsible; and such abuses prevail as I have named. The hon. and learned Member has drawn a pathetic picture of a Judge in the Assize town, who discovers to his grief that he has only a cause or two to try, who rises at mid-day, and almost weeps in his lodgings because he has no work to do; who thinks with sympathy and sadness of the many suitors who are waiting for him elsewhere. If we are to believe the hon. and learned Member for Taunton, the tears almost run down the Judge's cheeks as he contemplates this state of things. Nothing can be more absurd or farcical than this. It is almost to mock the House to present it. All around us are hon. Gentlemen who know how the Judge chuckles and rubs his hands with pleasure when he finds he has nothing to do. Instead of pining and weeping alone, as is suggested, he is off to some pleasant county family, with whom he stays until he has to go to the next town. Instead of being reduced to despair, as is pretended, he is uplifted to rapture. And this is the sort of delusion that is practised upon those who are outside, and who have no real experience of what goes on. None but very ardent supporters of the Judges would resort to it. The hon. and learned Member for Taunton professed a wish in his Resolution to make law less expensive; but he has pointed out no practical road to economy. But economy in law is become an absolute necessity. Before the passing of the Judicature Acts we heard that they were the great means by which law would be made cheap and almost perfect. Unfortunately for these predictions, law has become doubly, trebly, quadruply more expensive than it was before; and there is more doubt now about the law than ever. There is a larger number of new trials, and there is a great increase in the reversal of decisions. This, of course, suits the lawyers and barristers whose fees are quadrupled under the present system; and if the hon. and learned Member were in earnest he would endeavour at reform. But I have heard nothing but peddling proposals. We are asked to send a Judge to the country for three months, to sit and try causes every day during that period. How absurd the idea! Perhaps in Liverpool or Manchester, or a united Bradford and Leeds, business might be found to occupy the Judge, though of that I am by no means sure; but of this I am certain—that it would be impossible to group any other three or four, or even ten, Assize towns in England which would give employment to any Judge for anything like three months. This proposition, therefore, I regard as absurdity itself. We have then a criticism on County Courts; and we have oblique and covert hints as to the Lord Chancellor—whom they do not openly name—glances, as it were, at him, as the man above all others who has lately filled the Bench with an inferior class of Judges of those Courts, and who is responsible for much of the dissatisfaction which prevails in the public mind. I am no advocate for the Lord Chancellor; I have no reason to be, but rather the reverse. But right is right, and truth is truth; and there are plenty of men in this House who know that the present Chancellor is not the first who set the evil example of appointing inferior men as County Court Judges. Ever since these Courts were established by those who call themselves "Liberals," it is notorious that they have been made pleasant nests and holes and corners for jobbing politicians. The Liberals are always boasting about their purity—about their extraordinary virtues; they are perpetually crowing and flapping their wings, and making loud noises in this direction; and the poor Tories get frightened and sit silent, and invariably allow themselves to be put down when these amazing claims to political perfection are put forward. I am no Tory, but I am for truth; and I hope I may be allowed to give them a word of advice; and that is, for the future not to give in, as they are generally accustomed to do, but to meet their assailants with weapons like their own. One of the main sources of expense in our present system is the constant granting of new trials. This is a practice of comparatively recent growth. It was not until the middle of the last century that Lord Mansfield almost began the practice. . Since then it has grown into a common nuisance. In nearly half the cases tried there are motions and rules for new trials. Sometimes there are as many as three, and there have been known to be even four, trials of the same case. This, of course, enriches counsel and attorney, and reduces to ruin the wretched suitors; but as it puts money in their purse, none of these law reformers, like the hon. and learned Members for Taunton and Dewsbury, have a word to say for its abolition. For my own part, I am entirely opposed to them. Hardly one case in 50 requires a new trial. There is no intricacy or perplexity in the majority of cases tried. There is nothing to puzzle 12 men of common sense and honesty. Exceptions there are, doubtless; but, as a rule, the cases tried are simple enough, and easy of comprehension—generally of contract, with few facts. I would like to see new trials in such simple cases absolutely forbidden by law. But how is it now? Cases involving few facts are tried at the Assizes, and decided by 12 plain men in the neighbourhood, who probably know a good deal themselves about the parties to the suit, and even some of the real circumstances connected with it. A new trial is applied for, and three or four Judges, sitting in London, who can have no real insight into the case, and have not watched the witnesses, led away by affidavits that are false, and speeches of counsel that are not always correct—I do not like to characterize them, as I might, in plainer and stronger language—take upon themselves to upset what has already been decided. This is a crying evil. But not a word is breathed against it. It tends to swell the emoluments of these honourable gentlemen, whose praises have been loudly sung to-night; but, while it is sport to them, it is death to the suitors. Surely any honest and sensible Judge can, if he likes, keep his jury right; can prevent them from being led astray; can keep them in the true groove, and help them to find a verdict that is just! And, if he is incompetent to do this, he is unfit for his office. If the right hon. Gentleman the Home Secretary means to introduce any measure which shall remove the great and acknowledged abuses that exist in and under the present Judicature Acts, he will be a public benefactor; and I hope he will bear in mind the words I have uttered on the evils of new trials. There ought to be no new trials, because there ought to be no wrong trials. A Judge, if he is worthy of his place, ought to prevent a jury from ever coming to a wrong conclusion. As a rule, cases are of a very simple kind; and, on the whole, no real doubts ought to exist. If the Judges are the superior class of beings that they are represented to be, justice would be done in all cases; and there would be no need for the present abomination of putting suitors to double and treble expense, as is now done by these new trials. Another great evil has not been alluded to by these great and disinterested Law Reformers—and that is the costs and charges to which unfortunate suitors are now put under the Acts which exist, with reference to bills of costs. I am almost inclined to think that barristers, notwithstanding their "independence"—of which I have heard so much to-night that I am sick—have almost as much worship for attorneys as they have for Judges. I am a living proof of their independence and public spirit; and when I bring my own case before the House, as I hope to have an opportunity of doing, a good deal of what we have heard to-night in adulation of Judges and the Bar will melt away. I should like, if I could, to learn from the right hon. Gentleman the Home Secretary, whether he has ever had the pleasure of being served with a bill of costs? [Mr. Assheton Cross: No.] Then I can tell him what a bill of costs is—it is neither more nor less than highway robbery by Act of Parliament. The old Dick Turpin put his pistol to your head and cried, "Your money or your life." The lawyer is now authorized by law to make the same demand; but, instead of a pistol, he has his bill of costs. He could not do it effectually if he were not backed up by Statutes, and these Statutes should be altered. The costs and charges to which unfortunate suitors are now liable are mere extortion under the colour of law. We have fine theories about cheap justice; but justice is found to be the most expensive thing we have. A friend of mine, some time ago, had four interviews with a country lawyer, and he sent him in a bill for the small sum of £30. What was my friend to do? I advised him not to tax, for the Master would probably not tax off one-sixth—as I have always found the Masters to favour the lawyers—and then he would have to pay the costs of the taxation also. I told him that the first loss was the best, and to yield to the demand, however exhorbitant, unjust, and even wicked. This is an example of what goes on—under the sanction of the law. It causes the greatest dissatisfaction in the public mind; it disgusts people with the general administration of justice, when, even in the attempt to get justice, they are robbed. ["Hear, hear!"] I am glad of that approving cheer from these hon. Members, as it shows me that the hon. Member for Hull (Mr. Norwood) is not the only person here who chafes at the present state of things; although that hon. Member, for giving expression to feelings which I believe pervade the mercantile community generally, as to the unsatisfactory state of the law, and the more unsatisfactory condition of the Bench, has had remarks made upon him far from agreeable by the Judge-worshippers who followed him. But the feelings of the country are with him, and are certainly not with those who fatten upon abuses. The hon. Member for Hull has devoted much time and thought to a remedy for our legal misfortunes, and can find none, but in an extension of the County Courts. I wish I could agree with him; but, seeing how they are confessedly constituted of inferior and incompetent men, of whom we have heard enough to-night, I am afraid the cure would be worse than the disease. I cannot consent to give increased jurisdiction to men who are unfit to deal with the matters already before them—men in whom, with an exception or two, no one has any confidence. But I suppose that the hon. Gentleman is driven to this, not because he loves County Courts, but because he detests the Superior Courts, as being, in his judgment, even far worse. I do not know which is the worse. Both are admitted by all the outside world to be bad. There are few Judges whom any sane man would like to go before, and there are fewer County Judges at whose tribunal it is not almost a misfortune to to appear. But no real remedy, as far as I see, has yet been suggested by any of those barristers whose virtue is approved when they buy other men's wives in public market.

Mr. WADDY said, it was unnecessary, after the speech they had just heard, to devote any time to proving that the mere fact of being educated in a liberal Profession, and of associating for a great number of years with some of the worthiest of one's fellow-countrymen, might fail to endue a person who had those advantages with that set of feelings and that state of thought which would qualify him to exercise an impartial judgment on a question like that now under discussion. But the last speaker had devoted a considerable portion of his remarks to the eulogy of his hon. Friend the Member for Hull (Mr. Norwood), not so much out of love for the hon. Member as out of detestation for other persons whom he wished to bring in comparison with him. The whole of the representation made by the hon. Member for Stoke-upon-Trent, as to the tenour of the remarks of the hon. Member for Hull, was an entire mistake from beginning to end. In the hearing of the hon. Member for Hull, he now stated that that hon. Gentleman did not say this evening the things which had been imputed to him—to his credit—by the hon. Member who had just sat down; and he stated this at the desire, and with the authority of, his hon. Friend the Member for Hull. Groundless as was the eulogy bestowed upon one person, equally groundless was the blame so freely bestowed upon others. While he would not stop to follow to its ultimate end the series of vituperations about the loathsome sycophancy of gentlemen with whom he had the honour to associate, and while he felt that such men as Master Dodson and Master Francis would be rather astonished to hear that they knew nothing about law, and that they had been appointed to their posts through pure and outrageous nepotism, yet he must assert that no hon. Member of the House, and, least of all, the hon. Member who had just sat down, was entitled to speak on behalf of the Profession, and to state that he represented the opinions of every member of the Bar. The right hon. Gentleman opposite would rejoice to hear that a verdict once given should be understood to remain; that there ought to be no new trials; and that anything in the shape of a new trial was a detestable abomination. The hon. Member for Stoke maintained that the verdict of a jury once pronounced ought to be held good; and certainly, therefore, the verdict of two juries, one after the other, must be exceedingly good.

DR. KENEALY said, he specially guarded himself by referring to new trials in small cases tried in the country.

MR. WADDY could not see what was the principle involved in this distinction. A Metropolitan special or common jury was at least as competent as the juries in small cases tried in the country. It seemed generally admitted that there was a great want of power in the judicial body to grapple with the work that was to be done even in the present state of things. He believed, after all, the one thing they would have to come to, unsatisfactory as it was to the minds of some people, was that they must have more Judges. If they wanted more work to be done, they must have more men to do it. At present, an enormous amount of work which ought to be done by the Judges was taken from them because they had not time to do it. He could name a Queen's Counsel who, as arbitrator, disposed of larger amounts during the year, if all were put together, than were disposed of by the highest Judge in the land. For his own part, he would like to see more trials without juries. If every case was tried by a Judge without a jury, unless a jury were asked for, a far greater number of cases might be decided in a satisfactory way than could be otherwise done, the Judge, in such cases, acting rather in the capacity of arbitrator.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Sir JOHN HOLKER) said, that in the course of this very interesting discussion some feeling of disappointment had been expressed by more than one speaker at the working of the Judicature Acts. Perhaps hon. Members who were too sanguine might feel disappointment; but it was well not to hope for too much, and those who did not hope for too much in this matter had no reason to be disappointed. The Judicature Acts, upon the whole, seemed to him to have worked as well as had been expected, and to have effected very considerable improvements in our judicial system. They had been in operation practically only since the end of 1875 or the beginning of 1876, and he could not help thinking that they had conferred a great benefit upon the community. They were very much indebted to them, in the first place, for having put an end to the scandal, which arose in consequence of the doctrine of the Courts at Lincoln's Inn being altogether contradictory to that of the Courts sitting at Westminster when applied to the same state of facts. They were also indebted to them for giving to the suitors a full measure of relief in the Courts in which they might sue or be sued, and saving them from being bandied about from pillar to post. We were indebted to them, too, for having introduced a uniform, reasonable, and simple procedure; for having done away with a highly technical and hardly intelligible system of pleading, and substituted a system founded upon plain, reasonable, and clear principles. And, again, the Courts of Chancery were indebted to them for having induced those Courts to adopt a reasonable means of arriving at the truth, instead of the ridiculous means formerly pursued. Lastly, they were indebted to those Acts for a most excellent High Court of Appeal and not less excellent Intermediate Courts of Appeal. But, though improvements had been effected in our Judicature, nevertheless it must be admitted the system was not altogether satisfactory. He thought the House was very much indebted to his hon. and learned Friend (Sir Henry James) for having moved this Resolution, and introduced the subject in so able and temperate a way. His hon. and learned Friend had endeavoured to point out certain matters in which our system was defective and might possibly be amended, and certain cases in which there was a waste of judicial power. Upon the question whether the number of Judges should be increased, he had listened with attention to the remarks of the hon. and learned Member for Barnstaple (Mr. Waddy), who was of opinion that a large increase was needed. He had not come to the same conclusion. Hon. Gentlemen who had either heard or read the explanation given by the Lord Chancellor when he introduced the Bill for the extension of the jurisdiction of the County Courts and the statistics which he laid before the other House of Parliament, must have come to the conclusion that the arrears were rapidly lessening, and that the Judges now on the Bench were, or very shortly would be, able to cope with the business they would have to dispose of. The noble and learned Lord explained very clearly that the arrears were diminishing in almost all the Courts, and that though for some time two of the Judges had been taken from the service of the Courts; the remaining Judges had been able to grapple with the business. There was no occasion, therefore, for the alarm felt by some. Nevertheless, he could not say that the course of business had been altogether satisfactory. He quite agreed with his hon. and learned Friend that there was room for considerable improvement, and there might be cause for considerable complaint. He would now go through some of the complaints, and some of the remedies for the evils complained of. In the first place, his hon. and learned Friend said that the Common Law Divisions formed barriers injurious to the administration of justice. He did not quite gather from his hon. and learned Friend whether he desired that the Divisions of Queen's Bench, Exchequer, and Common Pleas should be done away with. If his hon. and learned Friend's observations were directed to that end, it did not seem to him that there would be any advantage in extinguishing those ancient Courts, because the Judges of one Court could assist those of another, and no delay seemed to be occasioned by the existence of those ancient Courts. If it was desirable that there should be some Chiefs over the Judges, it was also desirable to retain those three Chiefs—the Chief Justice of the Queen's Bench, Chief Baron of the Exchequer, and Chief Justice of the Common Pleas. These Chiefs could regulate the business of their Courts and make arrangements necessary for its conduct. The Judges sat two or three at a time, and sat also in a Divisional Court. This, the hon. and learned Member said, was a waste of judicial power. It was said each Judge should dispose wholly of the case which came before him. He should try it with a jury; decide all the points that arose in it; and, in short, dispose of it. But the hon. and learned Member for Penryn (Mr. Cole) most conclusively pointed out that such was, in fact, the practice of the present day. The only case in which there was a resort to what was called the Divisional Court was where there was an application for a new trial. It might be said, and it was a point open for consideration, that instead of being made to the Divisional Court, the application should be made immediately to the Court of Appeal. But what was the nature of the cases which the Divisional Court sat to decide? They were Crown cases reserved, cases of appeals from magistrates, from County Courts, and from inferior Courts generally. It might be said one Judge would be enough to hear those appeals; but very frequently there was no appeal from the decision of the Divisional Court. The decision was final; and if they made one Judge capable of deciding the questions that arose in these cases, they would almost be obliged to give an appeal. Besides these, there were special cases—applications for criminal informations, writs of mandamus, and prohibitions; in the Exchequer, there were Revenue and Customs cases; and in the Common Pleas there were cases relating to elections and the franchise. All these cases involved questions of the greatest possible importance. They might be disposed of by a single Judge; but if tried before a tribunal consisting of one Judge, it must necessarily follow that there should be an appeal to the Appellate Court, and if they had an appeal in all these proceedings to the Appellate Court, the result would be, perhaps, to overwhelm that Court with business. He would say they should utilize their judicial strength by having those cases tried before a single Judge, if they could with convenience; but they could not do so in all cases without increasing appeals to an almost indefinite extent, which might overwhelm the Appellate Court. It could not be denied that the new system of pleading, which flowed from the Judicature Act, had given rise to a great number of interlocutory applications. It was quite appalling, some times, to consider the number of these interlocutory applications that might be made in the simplest case—for particulars, further particulars, interrogatories, leave to examine witnesses; all of which were entirely unnecessary. But it was the interest of those concerned in these proceedings to multiply these applications. If a stop could be put to them, great good would be done; but it was very difficult to know how to put a stop to them. The hon. and learned Member deplored the existence of all these interlocutory applications; but he did not succeed in pointing out a remedy. It was certainly a matter for serious consideration, and if the Government could invent the means of putting an end to the evil, they would be very glad to do so. Another matter was alluded to by the hon. and learned Member, for which he did suggest a remedy. He said there were appeals on interlocutory matters from Masters to Judges, and from Divisional Judges to the Appeal Court; and he was to a great extent right in his observations on that matter. But these questions sometimes involved a great deal. The titles to estates were often decided on such applications, and it certainly would be very detrimental to deprive parties to a suit of the right to appeal. But he did think the right to appeal might be somewhat limited. In practice, the necessity of appeal might be considerably lessened. The hon. and learned Member referred to the want of continuousness in the sittings for the trial of Nisi Prius cases. This was one of the greatest evils. As to how long the sittings would continue, and where and when the cases would be tried, they were left in a state of uncertainty; and great annoyance, inconvenience, and loss was the result. The inconvenience and loss that were now suffered could be prevented by reasonable arrangements, and this could be accomplished without resort to legislation. The Judges, and those who had the control of business, might, without difficulty, make such arrangements as would enable parties to ascertain when and where causes would come on for trial. He did not know how it was these difficulties had arisen, unless it were that the Courts had been working under exceptional circumstances, and that the new Judicature system was not in complete working order. If the Judges, when they determined to alter their arrangements, would make rules under which certain causes should be taken in certain Courts, the annoyance to which litigants were exposed would be removed. He agreed with his hon. and learned Friend the Member for Taunton, that there was a loss of judicial power on the Circuits from the Judges visiting towns where there was little business; but he did not approve the remedy suggested. Few would advocate any considerable change in the holding of Assizes for the trial of prisoners. Unless they were absolutely obliged, it would not be wise to group counties for criminal trials, because it was very desirable that popular respect for the administration of justice should be fostered by bringing it under the observation of the people, and allowing them to realize the impartiality and certainty with which it was administered. It would be a misfortune to prevent trials being held in the counties in which offences were committed. The same reasons did not apply to the same extent with the trial of civil causes; and now that communication was easy and cheap there was the less justification for requiring that the trial should be in the county in which the cause of action had arisen, or in which one of the parties resided. If a Judge were to be told off to sit continuously at commercial centres like Leeds, Manchester, Birmingham, &c., he must live for the time in the town at which the Court was held, for he could not keep travelling to and from London. Continuous residence would involve mixing in society and becoming more or less intimate with the inhabitants of the town; and there would arise, quite wrongly, in the minds of the humbler portion of the community a distrust of the Judge, and an idea that he could not be thoroughly impartial. There was another objection to his hon. and learned Friend's proposal. If the Judges were sent down to Manchester or Liverpool, or some other great centre for three months, they would, long before the expiry of that period, have exhausted their Cause List, and nothing would remain for them to do. His hon. and learned Friend seemed to have an exaggerated notion of the amount of judicial business arising in the great centres. It was large, no doubt, but not so large as to require the continuous presence of a Judge; and he could not help thinking that if the inhabitants of the great centres had three or four Assizes in the year they had no great reason to complain. One change, however, might be adopted with advantage. For the purpose of facilitating the trial of civil cases and husbanding the judicial strength, it might be well to group—say, two counties together, and hold the Assizes alternately in one and the other. The scheme would be easy to carry out, and it would save a great deal of delay and expense. The localizing of the Bar, to which the hon. and learned Member for Dewsbury (Mr. Serjeant Simon) had referred in his eloquent speech, was a consideration of the utmost importance. Nothing could well be more disastrous to the country than a judicial system which would tend to lower the dignity of the Bar and do away with its fearless independence. With the excellent remarks of the hon. and learned Member on the judicial systems of other countries where the Judges formed a distinct class from the Bar he could also agree; but the hon. and learned Member seemed to forget himself towards the end of his speech, when he proposed the appointment of a Minister of Justice in this country responsible to Parliament for all the Judges said and did and thought.

MR. SERJEANT SIMON said, he did not propose that the Minister of Justice should have the Judges under his control, but that he should deal with the whole question of judicial appointments.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Sir JOHN HOLKER) accepted his hon. and learned Friend's correction; but, at the same time, he did not see how the Judges could remain absolutely free and independent when there was a Minister charged with their appointment, and also, he supposed, with their dismissal. It was one of the great glories of our system that our Judges were thoroughly independent and fearless, and for some time, at all events, they might, he thought, get on without a Minister of Justice. His hon. and learned Friend opposite would, he thought, see that he thoroughly appreciated his Motion, and the very able manner in which he had laid his proposals before the House, although he could not altogether acquiesce in all he proposed to do. Some, however, were worthy of acceptance, and all would be considered; and he trusted that, after the useful discussion that had taken place, his hon. and learned Friend would consent to withdraw his Amendment.

SIR HENRY JAMES said, his object had been accomplished by the discussion which had taken place, and after the manner in which he had been met by his hon. and learned Friend the Attorney General, he would ask leave to withdraw his Amendment.

MR. ASSHETON CROSS said, the hon. and learned Gentleman opposite deserved their thanks for the very interesting debate which his Amendment had elicited, and he had no doubt good results would follow. In supporting the proposal for its withdrawal, he desired to say that the discussion had confirmed his conviction that the holding of four Assizes each year for the administration of criminal justice could not be departed from. He was strongly of opinion that when a man was convicted and sent to gaol he ought to work out his term of imprisonment; but he did not want anyone to go to gaol except he was convicted of a crime. It had unfortunately happened that people had been committed and had, as was stated by the hon. and learned Gentleman opposite, to remain in gaol awaiting their trial six, seven, and even eight and nine months, although some of them had on their trial been acquitted. The days for hardships of that sort being inflicted were, he hoped, gone by; and he trusted that magistrates would, in as many cases as possible, find themselves able to admit prisoners to bail. With respect to grouping, it would not be urged that they should have Assizes in every county in Wales for instance, as, in the majority of cases, there would be no prisoners to try. He would place in the hands of hon. Members a table, showing the system of grouping that was now adopted; and they would find that it was, in fact, a question of *Bradshaw*, and that no group was larger than a single county.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Main Question, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair," put, and *agreed to.*

SUPPLY—CIVIL SERVICE SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES, 1878-9.

SUPPLY—*considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Class III.—LAW AND JUSTICE.

£6,200, Law Charges, England.

Resolution to be reported *To-morrow;* Committee to sit again upon *Monday* next.

VALUATION OF PROPERTY BILL.

(*Mr. Sclater-Booth, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Salt.*)

[BILL 71.] COMMITTEE.

Bill *considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Preliminary.

Clause 1 (Short title) *agreed to.*

Clause 2 (Extent of Act) *agreed to.*

PART I.

PROCEDURE FOR VALUATION OF PROPERTY.

(1.) *Assessment Committee.*

Clause 3 (Appointment of assessment committee) *agreed to.*

Clause 4 (Constitution and powers of assessment committee) *agreed to.*

Clause 5 (Clerk and expenses of assessment committee).

MR. SCLATER-BOOTH said, that in the absence of his hon. and gallant Friend (Colonel Brise), who had put down on the Paper an Amendment to that clause, he would ask permission to move it in his place. He proposed, in page 2, line 19, after "guardians," to leave out "or with the sanction of the Local Government Board," and to insert the words "if unable or unwilling to serve." He had no objection to the Amendment with that addition.

MR. W. H. JAMES said, he would like to ask the right hon. Gentleman the President of the Local Government Board how far he intended to proceed with the Bill that evening? The right hon. Gentleman the Member for the City of London (Mr. Hubbard), who took great interest in the measure, had left the House under the impression that the Bill would not be proceeded with that evening. He believed that other hon. Members had also left under similar circumstances.

MR. SCLATER-BOOTH said, that he saw no reason why the Bill should not be proceeded with that evening.

MR. W. E. FORSTER said, that there were several Amendments on the Paper on clauses prior to that upon which the right hon. Member for the City of London proposed an Amendment. He did not wish to throw any unnecessary obstacles in the way; but he thought it must be evident to everyone in the House that the Bill was not expected to come on that evening. He had no doubt that many hon. Members would have been present had they had any idea that it was to be considered. He should therefore suggest to the Government the propriety of reporting Progress as early as possible.

MR. SCLATER-BOOTH said, it had been evident from the first meeting of the House that evening that this Bill was very likely to be reached. The first 16 clauses of the measure went through Committee last year, and he thought there could be no objection to their now being passed.

MR. W. H. JAMES inquired how many clauses the right hon. Gentleman proposed to pass that evening?

MR. SCLATER-BOOTH said, that if the hon. Member had any objection, he could wait until the clause to which they applied came under discussion.

Amendment *agreed to.*

Clause, as amended, *agreed to.*

(2.) *Making of Valuation List.*

Clause 6 (Making of valuation list by overseers).

MR. RAMSAY said, he had to move, in page 2, line 31, after "shall," to insert "annually." His object in doing so was simply this—he thought that the plan proposed by the Bill for having a valuation of property in each county and borough made quinquennially, and then having a supplementary list annually, would in practice be wholly illusory, and would not secure that uniform valuation of property which it was the object of this Bill to establish. Although it might not appear so to hon. Members who had only been accustomed to the system in use in England at the present time, and who were without experience of the valuation system in Scotland, yet it was clear, from the results obtained in Scotland, that the valuation could not be uniform unless it was annual. Like many other hon. Members, he had been under the impression that this Bill would not come on that night, the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer having said that it would not be taken at an unreasonable hour. He would ask whether it was not then an unreasonable hour?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER said, that he had stated it would be taken at a reasonable time.

MR. RAMSAY was sure that if the subject of discussion had been one that the right hon. Gentleman felt strongly about, as many hon. Members did, he would not have considered that a reasonable hour to commence the discussion. It was an unreasonable thing, in his opinion, to commence a discussion at that time upon an Amendment which involved an important principle. His Amendment was to the effect that an annual valuation was necessary, and he should give figures to show that, in the county with which he was connected, during the 12 years preceding the introduction of the present annual system of valuation, the rental of that county had only increased by £11,000; but that, in the very first year after the Valuation Act came into operation in Scotland, the rental increased £34,000. There was no use in a system of valuation which practically made a valuation take place only once in 10 years. As evidence of the necessity of an annual valuation, he would adduce the case of Glasgow. There were 2,000 new houses erected there in the course of the year, and during the same period there were upwards of 30,000 changes of occupiers. Of what use, then, would a revised valuation list once in five years be? Unfortunately, he had not the figures with him relating to the county with which he was best acquainted, for he did not think that the Bill would come on that evening. From them he could have submitted to the Committee sufficient evidence to prove that unless a valuation was annual, uniformity and accuracy could never be secured. The right hon. Gentleman's proposition was that a valuation should only take place once every five years. He thought that system would be wholly useless to secure a uniform valuation. As he had already mentioned to the Committee, in the county to which he had referred the rental increased only by £11,000 during the 12 years preceding the operation of the Valuation Act in Scotland. But during the next 12 years, it increased by £100,000, and after 25 years' experience, by at least another £100,000. It would be seen that this great increase did not arise by reason of new buildings having been erected. The figures which he had prepared on this subject, but which he had not then with him, showed what part of the increase was due to an improved rental derived from house property, and what part of the increase was due to increase in rent by the improvement of land. Speaking entirely from recollection, he thought he was correct in saying that not one-third of the increase in the county arose from the improvement in the rental of house property; and if that were the case in the county to which he referred, there was not a county in England in which a similar process was not going on. If the right hon. Gentleman would do him the favour to look at the evidence which he had placed before him, he would find that the facts were as he had stated, although no impression seemed to have been produced upon the right hon. Gentleman by their consideration. He did not see how it was possible to have a uniform and accurate system of valuation, if the lists were only revised at the periods provided by the Bill. He did not think that an annual system of valuation would add greatly to the expense if once established. He therefore begged to move that the word "annually" be inserted in the clause.

MR. SCLATER-BOOTH could assure the hon. Gentleman that he had fully considered the statement of increased values, and entirely admitted the accuracy of the facts and figures to which he alluded. But something must be allowed for the difference between the system in this country and that in Scotland. They were adopting a new system in England, and there seemed no reason for an annual valuation, as a valuation once in five years was found to answer very well in the Metropolis. He had reasons for believing that a valuation every year would be considered a troublesome burden in England; and he could not, therefore, consistently with his duty, recommend the Committee to adopt it. The hon. Gentleman had said that the system worked very well in Scotland. That might be, although it was true there were objections to it even there; but still he did not think it right that it should be introduced into England. In the Metropolis, they had found the proposed system of valuation to work exceedingly well. Nothing could be more satisfactory than its working, and he did not think it left anything to be desired. If that were the case, therefore, there was no reason why the system should not be found to work equally well in the rest of the country. He would also draw the attention of the hon. Member to the fact, that they provided by the Bill for an annual revision of the list, and they had a supplementary valuation. Under these circumstances, he was satisfied that the scheme proposed by the Bill would work well, and do substantial justice. He could therefore see no reason for altering it. It had not come to his knowledge that an annual valuation was desired in any part of England; and if there had been a necessity for such a thing, some hon. Member from England would probably have brought forward the matter.

MR. RAMSAY observed, that the right hon. Gentleman very truly said there had been no desire expressed in England for an annual system of valuation. If, however, his arguments were sufficient to show that no other system valuation could secure a uniform and equitable mode of valuation, he should have thought it desirable that the people of England should be made familiar with the system. It was also said that the increase in the Metropolis had been quite as great as could be reasonably expected. That statement seemed to assume that the increase had been commensurate with the improvement of the property. It did not follow that a valuation so conducted was either uniform, or kept pace with the increase in the value of property. The matter seemed to him to be of so great importance that he should divide upon the Amendment. He did not think that the clause should be allowed to stand as it was, and that the period provided by the Bill for making valuations was not a proper one.

MR. ANDERSON said, there were great objections in that House to copying any good thing from Scotland. He had no doubt that the annual system of valuation was the best, and he thought that the Chancellor of the Exchequer ought to adopt it, for the result of the system would certainly be to put the finances of the country in a much better condition. He was sure that the system which had been found to work so well in Scotland would work equally well in England, and the result arrived at would be that there would be uniformity of valuation between Scotland and England. As the matter stood, it was unfair to Scotland to have an annual valuation, while it did not take place in England, for, by means of it, she bore an unfair share in the taxation of the Empire. He believed that the Amendment of his hon. Friend ought to be adopted.

MR. W. E. FORSTER thought the difficulty into which the Committee had been put by this Bill coming on unexpectedly was quite apparent. It was only necessary to look at both sides of the House, to show that Members who took great interest in these matters did not expect the Bill to come on that evening, and were not in their places. The hon. Member spoke with a great deal of authority as to the practice in Scotland; but the Committee ought to know what was the opinion of hon. Members from England as to the desirability of an annual system of valuation. The hon. Member for South Norfolk (Mr. Clare Read), and the hon. Member for South Leicestershire (Mr. Pell), would certainly have been present if they had had the slightest expectation that the Bill would be taken. He was sure that the Committee would have been glad to have known their opinions on the subject. If the Government persisted in going on with the Bill at that hour, he thought they should be satisfied with its having got into Committee, and look upon it as an unexpected piece of good fortune that the hon. Member for South Norfolk did not move his Amendment. He should suggest that the Government should postpone the consideration of the Bill until it could be properly discussed.

Mr. SCLATER-BOOTH denied that the Bill had been taken unexpectedly. So far as the hon. Member for South Leicestershire (Mr. Pell) was concerned, he had already arranged with him what should be done as regarded his Amendment, and it had been agreed that the Amendment should be brought on at another stage. With regard to the hon. Member for South Norfolk (Mr. Clare Read), he had had every opportunity of knowing that the Bill might be taken that evening. He could not consent to the Amendment proposed by the hon. Member for Falkirk (Mr. Ramsay), and he thought the Committee would not consent to have such an annual valuation as he proposed. If the hon. Member were determined to raise the question which he had next upon the Paper, he was willing that the Bill should be postponed till another time. All he wanted to do then was to pass the clauses which had gone through Committee last year. With respect to the observation of the right hon. Member for Bradford (Mr. W. E. Forster), he could only say that he had no wish to press the matter, or to hurry discussion in the absence of hon. Members.

Sir GEORGE CAMPBELL said, that one good reason why the Bill should not be proceeded with that night was that it was not in the hands of hon. Members. As it was not expected to come on copies had not been furnished them, and they could not be procured. He thought, however, that the proposal of the Government was reasonable—namely, to take only on that occasion

the clauses which were agreed to last year.

Mr. SAMPSON LLOYD said, that the suggestions of hon. Members from Scotland, as well as from other parts of the United Kingdom, were always listened to with great attention in the discussion of English affairs. Still they would not know so well as English Members what measures would be precisely suited to this country. With regard to the question of an annual valuation, he might, from his personal knowledge, say that he was sure that in the populous districts of England an annual valuation would be found intolerable.

Mr. W. H. JAMES observed, that the arrangement of the right hon. Gentleman the President of the Local Government Board was with the hon. Member for South Leicestershire alone; but the question raised by him affected not only other hon. Members, but the whole country, and they were entitled to be considered before his proposal was withdrawn.

The CHAIRMAN pointed out that the Question under consideration was the Amendment of the hon. Member for Falkirk.

Mr. ONSLOW said, that he was not surprised that the right hon. Member for Bradford thought the Government had had sufficient good fortune in bringing the Bill into Committee. No doubt, the right hon. Gentleman did not wish the Government to have any good fortune at all. The right hon. Gentleman had also said that it was not reasonable to bring the Bill on at this hour. All the Chancellor of the Exchequer had stated was that the Bill should not be taken at an unreasonable hour. He would challenge the right hon. Gentleman to show that either he or his Government would have considered half-past 11 an unreasonable hour to enter upon the discussion of such a measure as this. It must be admitted that this was a most important question, and no doubt many hon. Members had been taken by surprise by reason of its now coming on; but the House of Commons was itself a House of surprises, and it could not be told one day from another what would come on, and if hon. Members who took a particular interest in a Bill were not present when it came on, surely it was most unjust to blame the Government for their absence.

MR. W. E. FORSTER observed, that as the hon. Gentleman opposite had appealed to him, he would state his opinion that this was not a reasonable time for bringing on the Bill. A very important question was involved, and by bringing on the matter at that hour the injury was felt, perhaps, more upon the Government than upon the Opposition side of the House. A great many Members on the Government side of the House took an interest in the matter, and were not there because they did not understand that the Bill would be reached. He ventured again to urge upon the Government to be satisfied with passing the Bill into Committee, without pressing it on in the absence of the hon. Members for South Norfolk and South Leicestershire, and of many other hon. Members who took a great interest in the question. He might add that he did not make these remarks out of any wish to obstruct the action of the Government.

MR. SCLATER-BOOTH repeated that the hon. Member for South Leicestershire, whose Amendment related to Clause 8, was willing to take the discussion upon it at another time. With reference to the hon. Member for South Norfolk, if he wished to raise any discussion upon the matter, he should be afforded facilities for so doing.

MR. RAMSAY said, that after the expression of opinion from his right hon. Friend, he did not feel disposed to divide the Committee upon the Amendment. At first, he thought that it was so important a question that he should not have felt satisfied without taking the opinion of the Committee upon it; but after the desire expressed by English Members to adopt anything good from the law of Scotland, he did not feel disposed to press the matter upon them at this time. For many years past it had been the endeavour of Englishmen to bring the law of England into harmony with that of Scotland, and this was one point upon which he had been desirous that the law of England should be assimilated as nearly as possible to that of Scotland. At the same time, he had no desire to ignore the sentiments of the people of England, and he would now ask leave to withdraw the Motion he had made. He would take advantage of the right hon. Gentleman's proposal to report Progress, as the next Amendment standing in his name was one upon which considerable discussion would ensue.

MR. YEAMAN remarked, that it was an injustice to Scotland that there should be an annual system of valuation there and not in England. A large portion of the revenue raised under the valuation roll was applied for Imperial purposes. It was therefore clear that, considering the yearly increase on heritages in England was very great, and if the valuation was only made every five years, Scotland would suffer injustice by throwing into the Imperial purse the increase every year, while England valued only once in five years.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Committee report Progress; to sit again upon *Monday* next.

RACECOURSES (METROPOLIS) BILL.

(*Mr. Anderson, Sir Thomas Chambers, Sir James Lawrence.*)

[BILL 48.] CONSIDERATION.

Bill, as amended, *considered.*

MR. ONSLOW said, he would like to point out what he considered to be a great defect in this Bill. Clause 6 of the Bill said that

> "Any person who shall be the owner, or lessee, or in possession or occupation of any open or enclosed land or space for which a licence for horse-racing is required under this Act, and upon which any horse-race shall be held, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor."

It was absurd, in his opinion, to say that the owner, or any person in possession or occupation, should be treated in this way.

MR. SPEAKER: The Question before the House is that the Bill shall be considered, and the hon. Member is out of Order in discussing at this stage a clause in the Bill. I understand the hon. Member to be objecting to a particular clause.

MR. ONSLOW said, that he objected to a Bill by which it was provided that the owner, or occupier, or person in possession of any land within the limits of the Bill, upon which any horse-racing took place, was guilty of a misdemeanor. That was, even if the horse-racing were without the cognizance of such a person, yet he was made liable to be fined and treated as a misdemeanant. It appeared to him to be rather a curious state of things, that in any place near the

Metropolis the owner of a piece of land upon which a horse-race should take place, without his cognizance, was to be liable to be fined as for a misdemeanor. He would ask the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he would consider this matter?

MR. RAMSAY rose to Order. He did not think that the hon. Gentleman was in Order in discussing a clause of the Bill after the Speaker had ruled that he was not in Order.

MR. SPEAKER: I understood the hon. Member to be stating his reason why the Bill should not be now considered; but the discussion of a particular clause is certainly out of Order.

MR. ONSLOW explained that he was stating his reasons why the Bill should not be considered. Supposing a prize-fight took place upon a piece of land, the owner of which knew nothing whatever about it, it would be very hard that the owner or lessee of that land should be fined and punished in the matter. In his opinion, the Bill would act very hardly upon the owners of land near the Metropolis, and, at any moment, persons might come upon land, and, without the knowledge of its owner, commit offences against this Bill for which the owner would be liable. He would ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether his attention had been drawn to the provisions of the Bill, and whether he would sanction such a state of things as, unquestionably, it would give rise to?

MR. ASSHETON CROSS said, that under the ruling of the Speaker, with which he entirely agreed, he could not discuss any particular clause of the Bill. He might say, however, that it seemed to him that the proper course for the hon. Member to take, if he objected to the Bill, was to put down an Amendment at the proper time, and thus raise the question.

MR. ANDERSON said, that he proposed the Bill should be read a third time that evening.

MR. ASSHETON CROSS said, that the Chancellor of the Exchequer had stated that no other Bills were to be taken that day.

MR. ANDERSON said, it was quite understood that what the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer meant was that no other Government Bills were to be taken. But he would like to ask Mr. Speaker if the statement of the Chancellor of the Exchequer bore the meaning which the hon. Gentleman the Home Secretary attached to it?

MR. ASSHETON CROSS understood his right hon. Friend to be speaking generally, and he appealed to hon. Members present as to whether it was not a general understanding that no other Business should take place that night?

MR. ANDERSON asked if the right hon. Gentleman would have any objection to the third reading being taken at that time?

MR. ASSHETON CROSS said, he could not assent to that course.

MR. SPEAKER: What does the hon. Member propose to do?

MR. ANDERSON: To take the third reading now.

MR. SPEAKER: On occasions of urgency two stages of a Bill are sometimes taken at the same Sitting; but, except in such cases, it is not usual to take two stages of a Bill at the same time.

Bill to be read the third time upon *Tuesday* next.

WAYS AND MEANS.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Resolved, That, towards making good the Supply granted to Her Majesty for the service of the years ending on the 31st day of March 1878 and 1879, the sum of £299,218 1*s*. 2*d*. be granted out of the Consolidated Fund of the United Kingdom.

Resolution to be reported *To-morrow;*

Committee to sit again upon *Monday* next.

House adjourned at half after Twelve o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Saturday, 22nd March, 1879.

MINUTES.]—SUPPLY—*considered in Committee —Resolution* [March 21] *reported.*

WAYS AND MEANS—*considered in Committee—Resolution* [March 21] *reported.*

PUBLIC BILL—*Committee—Report*—Consolidated Fund (No. 2) *.

The House met at Twelve of the clock.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That this House do now adjourn."

QUESTION.

SOUTH AFRICA—WAR OFFICE PAPERS.

QUESTION.

MR. SHAW LEFEVRE: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War, When he will lay upon the Table of the House the War Office Papers with reference to South Africa, and especially the Memorandum of Lord Chelmsford of September 14, to which I referred a few days ago?

COLONEL STANLEY: I will endeavour to have the Papers circulated on Monday, if possible. The delay has taken place merely in order that we should avoid reprinting Papers that have already appeared in another series.

SOUTH AFRICA—LORD CHELMSFORD.

WITHDRAWAL OF MOTION.

MR. E. JENKINS: Sir, I beg to give Notice that I shall withdraw from the Paper the Notice of Motion which I have given with regard to the Commander of the Forces in South Africa. After reading the despatch of the 9th February, addressed by Lord Chelmsford to the Government, I feel that it would be unjust and ungenerous to that Officer to leave upon the Paper any longer a Resolution which would appear to convey a personal reflection upon him, and that it is necessary to consider in what terms, if any, a censure on the Government is hereafter to be moved.

Motion *agreed to.*

ORDER OF THE DAY.

WAYS AND MEANS.

Resolution [March 21] *reported*, and *agreed to.*

Instruction to the Committee on the Consolidated Fund (No. 2) Bill, That they have power to make provision therein pursuant to the said Resolution.

House adjourned at a quarter after Twelve o'clock till Monday next.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Monday, 24*th March*, 1879.

MINUTES.]—PUBLIC BILLS—*First Reading*—Drainage and Improvement of Lands (Ireland) Provisional Order Confirmation * (32).

Second Reading—Committee negatived—District Auditors * (30).

Third Reading — Debtors Act, 1869, Amendment * (9); Bankruptcy Law Amendment * (8), and *passed.*

SOUTH AFRICA—THE ZULU WAR—SIR BARTLE FRERE.

ALTERATION OF RESOLUTION.

THE EARL OF CAMPERDOWN gave Notice that to-morrow evening the Marquess of Lansdowne, in moving his Resolution on the subject of the Zulu War, would add to it the words—

> "And the House regrets that, after the censure passed on the High Commissioner by Her Majesty's Government in the Despatch of the 19th of March, 1879, the conduct of affairs in South Africa should be retained in his hands."

VISCOUNT CRANBROOK: The Motion to be proposed by the noble Marquess (the Marquess of Lansdowne) having now lost its ambiguity, and being a censure on Her Majesty's Government, I, as representing the Government, need not say that I shall not move the Previous Question, but shall meet the Motion with a direct negative.

SOUTH AFRICA—LORD CHELMSFORD.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

THE DUKE OF CAMBRIDGE: My Lords, I beg to make a statement with reference to a despatch which is in your Lordship's hands. It is one from my noble and gallant Friend, Lord Chelmsford. I am personally alluded to in it, and, unless I make some explanation, it may lead to inconvenience and also to misapprehension with regard to myself. I have no doubt that your Lordships are aware of the despatch to which I refer. It is Enclosure No. 1 in No. 13 of the Papers, and is dated Durban, Natal, February 9, 1879. In that despatch there is this sentence—

> "In June last I mentioned privately to His Royal Highness Commanding-in-Chief that the

strain of prolonged anxiety and exertion, physical and mental, was even then telling on me. What I felt then I feel still more now."

Well, my Lords, on reading that despatch, I was extremely struck by the circumstance that I had no recollection whatever of any such letter having been addressed to me. I have made every endeavour in my power to ascertain whether any such letter was received by myself or in the Department over which I have the honour to preside. As far as research has gone—and we have been two days about it—we can find nothing of the kind. My memory is good, and I remember nothing of the sort. I have questioned every one of the high Officers of the Department; but none of us know anything with reference to this letter. It is only just and fair to myself, and I hope your Lordships will so consider it, that it should not be supposed for a moment that I was either aware of there being any such despatch or letter from my noble and gallant Friend, Lord Chelmsford, or that I had withheld the information as to his health which that communication is said to have contained, or that Her Majesty's Government ever received such information from me, or that both myself and Her Majesty's Government had received such information and had taken no notice or action on it. There are two letters in March from Lord Chelmsford. The first is dated the 11th of March, 1878, and the only thing we can find in them is that he had just arrived and had assumed the command, and had found a good deal of duty thrown upon him, but had such good relations with Sir Bartle Frere, and had such a well-organized staff, that he felt satisfied he should be able to perform his duties to my satisfaction as Commanding-in-Chief, and, of course, I should say to the satisfaction of Her Majesty's Government. That is the only allusion I can find in that letter. He refers now to the month of June, but I can find nothing in that month. There is a letter dated the 1st of July, in which he states that he has just arrived at Cape Town; that the war had been concluded and an amnesty declared; and that he was able to say it had been brought to a successful conclusion. He ends that letter thus—

> "I cannot be sufficiently grateful to your Royal Highness for having given me the opportunity of commanding a force which, by its excellent conduct, has enabled me to bring a difficult war to so speedy a close."

After reading such a sentence as that, I could never have supposed that the state of his health was such as to justify the idea that he would break down under the strain that was put upon him. From that date up to the present day I have learnt nothing more, and I was under the impression then that a more robust man, or a man in all respects more capable of doing his duty in trying circumstances, could not be found than my noble and gallant Friend, Lord Chelmsford. And that was my impression up to the moment I saw the Despatch of the 9th February. I had a private letter from him, which is dated February, 1879, but without the day of the month; and I beg your Lordships especially to mark the mode in which this sentence is expressed—

> "Might I suggest to your Royal Highness the advisability of sending out a Major General who will be competent to succeed me, not only as commanding the Forces, but also as Lieutenant Governor and High Commissioner should anything happen to Sir Bartle Frere."

I ask your Lordships' attention to the words "might I." If a man felt that he was unable to carry on the duties intrusted to him, he would hardly say "might I." I think he would use a stronger expression. Then comes the next extract, which is from a private letter dated February 10, 1879. I believe it came by the last post which reached us—

> "I trust your Royal Highness will be able to send me out a second in command. I do not anticipate breaking down, but I feel that the strain is very great on me in every way, and that such an event may occur suddenly."

Certainly, I confess that, reading those sentences, I should have supposed it to be the most natural and proper thing for an officer situated as my noble and gallant Friend was, that he should have thought it right to indicate to myself as the head of the Army and to Her Majesty's Government that the circumstances were so grave that it was necessary to look forward to the possibility, either by ill-health, or by accident, or in action, of something happening which might require some other officer to take his place. All I can say is, that Her Majesty's Government—and I venture to say myself in conjunction with them—had already anticipated Lord Chelmsford's wish—which we think very natural—by sending out four General Officers on the first opportunity that we could possibly have despatched them to those distant lands. As far as I am concerned, I am in total ignorance of any such reference to me as that of June. I do not say that such a letter never was written. It is possible that it may have been, and may have been lost in the post, or may otherwise have miscarried; but I can only assure your Lordships that if it had reached my hands, I should have felt it my duty to put the Government in possession of it at the earliest possible period.

HIGHWAY ACT, 1878—DISTURNPIKED ROADS.—OBSERVATIONS.

EARL DE LA WARR rose to call attention to the Highway Act of last Session, with special reference to Clause 13, by which roads disturnpiked previous to the 31st December, 1870, are excluded from becoming main roads; and to move for a Return of highways which have been disturnpiked since the year 1870. The noble Earl said, that the objects of the Act seemed to have been to afford relief to ratepayers in districts and parishes where turnpike roads formerly existed but which had since been abolished, the effect being to throw additional burdens upon ratepayers for the maintenance of highways. This end was proposed in the Act to be attained by making disturnpiked roads main roads, and paying half the expense of their maintenance out of the county rate. No one could question that this was an object much to be desired—especially in agricultural districts where the heavy and often increasing burdens upon land were already much felt. But by the operation of Clause 13 of the Act, the expected benefit appeared in only a comparatively few instances to have been realized. Under that clause, it was confined to roads which had been, or should be, disturnpiked since the year 1870, and no others were entitled to the benefits provided for in the Act—namely, that one-half of the expenses of the maintenance of the road should be paid for by the county, unless there were exceptional circumstances. Now, it was difficult to understand why this limitation should have been made, and why a road which was disturnpiked, say in the year 1868, should not receive the same advantages as roads disturnpiked in 1871, or afterwards. There were many instances of that inequality being much felt. He would mention one of which he happened to have the particulars. It was a parish in an agricultural district of Sussex. The trust of a turnpike road running through the parish was abolished in the year 1868; and to show the effect upon the rates in consequence of that, it appeared that during the time the trust existed the average sum paid annually for the maintenance of highways by the ratepayers was £215; since the abolition of the trust the average sum had been £351—being an increase of more than one-half. In the adjoining parish the trust was abolished after 1870, and they were consequently in a position to claim the benefit of the Highway Act. There seemed to be some hardship in this; and as a large number of trusts were abolished previous to the year 1870, there were many cases similar to that to which he had referred. It was true that Clause 15 of the Act gave power to a highway authority, such as the Quarter Sessions, to make any road a main road; but it was only in limited and exceptional circumstances, such as being a thoroughfare to a railway station or a medium of communication between great towns, and was not likely to be of extensive application; and it was evident there might be important highways to which those conditions would not apply. He had brought this subject under their Lordships' notice, as he thought it was unadvisable to put additional charges upon ratepayers, especially in agricultural districts where the land was already heavily burdened, and among the burdens the maintenance of highways was not one of the least. In existing circumstances, and in regard to the changes which were being made in local administration, they might look to advantages which would arise from extending rather than limiting the area of taxation, and thus include property which was now exempt in a great measure from the burdens which fell upon land. He ventured to hope that the subject would receive the consideration of Her Majesty's Government, whether further relief might not be afforded to ratepayers by an extension of the provisions of the Highway Act of last Session. The noble Earl then moved for a Return.

THE DUKE OF RICHMOND AND GORDON reminded their Lordships that the Act was but a recent one, and probably had not been worked out in all its details. He did not agree with his noble Friend that whole districts had been left out of the Bill; but he did think that the Act applied to roads of which the noble Earl had alluded, because it was in the power of highway authorities to declare a road a main road and bring it within the operation of the Act. The Government were not prepared to bring in an amending Bill; but there might be eventually a necessity to bring in a Bill to consolidate the various measures relating to highways. Some of the information moved for by the noble Earl was already available, having been laid before the House of Commons on the Motion of Lord George Cavendish. To the other Returns asked for there was no objection.

THE EARL OF KIMBERLEY hoped the noble Duke would not be too hasty in his conclusions. If he would study the Returns, he would see that an amendment of the Act was a necessity.

Motion amended, and *agreed to.*

Return of the names of the several turnpike roads which have become disturnpiked between 31st December 1870 and 30th June 1878 in each county in England and Wales, with the number of miles of each such road, and a statement of the cost of maintaining the same as shown by the last published account; similar Return with respect to the turnpike roads the trusts of which have been fixed by the Turnpike Continuance Acts to expire within five years from 30th June 1878; and Return of the number of turnpike roads the trusts of which will expire within the same period under the Acts by which the same were constituted, if not extended by any of the Turnpike Continuance Acts: Ordered to be laid before the House.—(*The Earl De La Warr.*)

TREATY OF BERLIN—THE BRITISH FLEET.

OBSERVATIONS. QUESTION.

LORD CAMPBELL said: My Lords, it is not in order to address the House on any new phase the Eastern Question has arrived at that I have put this Question on the Paper; but only with a view to the two inquiries it contains, and which it seems to me the present moment calls for. It has been alleged in a variety of quarters, and according to the ordinary channels of intelligence in the other House of Parliament—that the Fleet has left the Sea of Marmora where it had so long continued. It will hardly be denied that your Lordships are entitled to an official declaration on a matter so important, and one which in this House has been so seriously canvassed. Should the answer be that the Fleet continues where it was, the second Question has not any special urgency at present. But should the answer be that it has gone back to the Mediterranean, the second Question unavoidably suggests itself. The presence of the Fleet in the vicinity of Constantinople tended on many grounds, which this is not the moment to go into, to promote the backward movement of the Russian Armies, according to the stipulation I have mentioned in the Notice, in nine months over the Danube, in three months more across the Russian frontier. Should the Fleet have therefore been withdrawn—a step on which I offer no opinion—it seems desirable to know how far, in other ways, the execution of the 22nd Article in the Treaty of Berlin may be depended on. In a despatch dated January 26th, which cannot be too widely known or accurately studied, the noble Marquess the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs has explained that Russia has neglected to conform to other portions of the Treaty. As regards the Article in question, it is evident that there are many motives to leave it unperformed, and a variety of pretexts for neglecting to adhere to it. There are even symptoms of reluctance to observe it, if it is true, as I have lately seen in a Constantinople journal, that 40,000 troops have lately come from Russia, to replace those which seem to be departing. In that respect, the distant wars in which we are engaged must add to what we may perhaps consider the temptations of St. Petersburg—first, because they carry off and occupy the military power of this country; next, beause they lull the vigilance with which the events of Eastern Europe used to be regarded in it. Whatever may be the case with individuals, the public at large are not inclined to the labour of keeping three considerable subjects in the memory together. The House may therefore wish to know whether the Fleet has been withdrawn; and, if it has, whether the complete evacuation on the part of Russia of a position menacing to Europe, is secured?

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY: My Lords, your Lordships will have seen, by the Papers which are on the Table, that in the course of last autumn

—I think in September—Her Majesty's Government caused it to be signified to the Russian Ambassador at Constantinople that as soon as the Russian troops evacuated what I shall call, for convenience sake, Southern Roumelia—that is to say, the Turkish Empire outside Eastern Roumelia—the British Fleet would retire from the Sea of Marmora. The reason for so doing was obvious. The presence of the British Fleet in that sea was for the protection of Constantinople; and as soon as the Russian Forces had retired beyond Adrianople, it could not be said that the presence of the British Fleet in the Sea of Marmora contributed effectually to the protection of Constantinople, or that Constantinople was any longer the subject of pre-occupation on the part of the signatory Powers. It was for these reasons that we gave the undertaking which will be found in the Blue Book. The evacuation of Southern Roumelia was delayed much longer than we expected — much longer, perhaps, than we had a right to expect; but it was not possible for us to remonstrate with what was, at all events, a departure from the Treaty; because Russia placed it in a parallel line to a similar departure from the Treaty of which Turkey was guilty in not evacuating the fortresses of Spütz and Podgoritza. As soon as these fortresses were evacuated, the movement of Russian troops out of Southern Roumelia commenced. It is perfectly true that there are still other obligations of the Treaty which Russia has in due time to fulfil. She will have, at periods indicated in the Treaty, to evacuate Eastern Roumelia, Bulgaria, and Roumania. The noble Lord asks, as I understand, what provision we have taken for insuring the performance of these obligations? We have taken the only provision by which it is open to us to insure the performance in the future of any particular act by any particular Power—namely, a Treaty engagement from her that she will do so. That Treaty engagement Russia has repeatedly acknowledged, and she has told us, in the most formal terms, that she is fully resolved to execute it. It is not open to us—and certainly it is not open to me—to suggest a doubt that that promise will be fully performed. Even if it were so, I do not suppose that the waiting of the British Fleet in the Sea of Marmora would be of any use in respect of the performance of that particular portion of the Treaty. If that portion of the Treaty is not executed, and if the Sultan thinks that the presence of the British Fleet, either in the Sea of Marmora or in the Black Sea, will tend to secure the execution of the Treaty, he is authorized to ask for the assistance of his Allies; and when that request is made, it will be open to any of the maritime Powers that are signatories to the Treaty to send their Fleets through the Straits, through the Sea of Marmora, or the Black Sea. But I certainly do not contemplate any such contingency. I only allude to it for the purpose of showing the noble Lord that to have left our Fleet in the Sea of Marmora merely for the purpose of anticipating a contingency which is not likely to arise, would not have been an advantageous proceeding—it would in no way have forwarded the end we have in view, and might have exposed our own motives and actions to misconstruction.

House adjourned at Six o'clock,
till To-morrow, half past
Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Monday, 24th March, 1879.

MINUTES.]—SUPPLY—*considered in Committee* —CIVIL SERVICE ESTIMATES, £4,109,067, on Account, Classes I., II., III., IV., V., VI., VII., and REVENUE DEPARTMENTS.

PRIVATE BILLS (*by Order*)—*Second Reading*— Bromley Gas*; Mirfield Gas*; Wombwell Local Board*.

PUBLIC BILLS—*Ordered*—General Police and Improvement (Scotland) Provisional Order (Inverness)*.

Second Reading — Land Tax Commissioners' Names* [109].

Select Committee—Sale of Food and Drugs Act (1875) Amendment* [56], *nominated.*

Committee—Report—Poor Law Amendment Act (1876) Amendment [44].

Considered as amended — Consolidated Fund (No. 2).

PRIVATE BUSINESS.

LIVERPOOL LIGHTING BILL.

MR. RAIKES moved—

"That the Order of the 11th of March that the Liverpool Lighting Bill be committed to a

Select Committee of Seven Members, Four to be appointed by the House and Three by the Committee of Selection, be read, and discharged."

He said, it was necessary to make this Motion in consequence of circumstances which had arisen in regard to the Bill. He understood that the promoters were not prepared to bear the brunt of fighting the Bill in Committee, owing to the length to which the inquiry ordered by the House might extend, and the cost which might, in consequence, be entailed. He had, therefore, no alternative but to move the discharge of the Order, and this course would arrest the progress of the other Bills which had been referred to the same Committee, which, until some other Committee was appointed, would remain suspended.

Motion *agreed to.*

Ordered, That the Order [11th March] that the Liverpool Lighting Bill be committed to a Select Committee of Seven Members, Four to be appointed by the House and Three by the Committee of Selection, be read, and discharged.—(*The Chairman of Ways and Means.*)

SOUTH AFRICA—THE ZULU WAR—SIR BARTLE FRERE.

ALTERATION OF RESOLUTION.

Sir CHARLES W. DILKE gave Notice that he proposed to add the following words to the Resolution which stood on the Paper in his name for Thursday:—

> "That this House further regrets that after the censure passed upon the High Commissioner by Her Majesty's Government in the Despatch of the 19th day of March, 1879, the conduct of affairs in South Africa should be retained in his hands."

QUESTIONS.

THE IRISH CHURCH COMMISSION — DATE OF EXPIRATION.—QUESTION.

Sir HARCOURT JOHNSTONE asked the Chief Secretary for Ireland, If it is settled that the Irish Church Commission shall expire on July 31, 1879, as fixed in the Irish Church Act; if it is intended that the Irish Board of Works will succeed it in the work now carried on under the Commission; and, whether he will furnish to Parliament a Return of the entire cost of the Church Commission from its beginning?

Mr. J. LOWTHER: The Government is now engaged in communication on this subject; but no decision has as yet been arrived at with regard to it. With reference to the Return asked for, there can be no objection to furnish it at the proper time.

POST OFFICE CONTRACTS—THE PENINSULAR AND ORIENTAL STEAM NAVIGATION COMPANY.

QUESTION.

Mr. BAXTER asked the Postmaster General, What number and amount of penalties have been incurred by the Peninsular and Oriental Steam Navigation Company during the last eleven years; how many have been remitted and how many exacted; if it is the case that although the tenders had to be made under the absolute penalty condition in the contract itself, the liability has been commuted for a sum of £10,000; and, if the absolute penalty clause was suggested by the Peninsular and Oriental Steam Navigation Company; and, if he is aware that the effect of it has been to prevent other Companies tendering, as they had no guarantee that there would be a remission in their case under any circumstances whatever?

Lord JOHN MANNERS, in reply, said, during the last 11 years the number of voyages on which penalties were incurred by the Peninsular and Oriental Steam Navigation Company was 345, and the amount of such penalties was £65,900. Of this sum, £7,000 was remitted on account of 27 voyages, and the balance—£58,900—exacted. The form of tender for the service recently contracted for was based upon a system of absolute penalties. But persons tendering were invited to say what deductions they would agree to in the subsidy, if the penalties, instead of being absolute, were made conditional. The Peninsular and Oriental Company, in their tender, offered to abate £10,000 a-year in such case, and Clause 50 of the contract gave the Postmaster General the power to avail himself of the offer. The absolute penalty clause in the last contract was not suggested by the Peninsular and Oriental Company, but was insisted upon by the Post Office. He was not aware that the effect had been to prevent other companies from tendering.

ARMY—THE SCIENTIFIC CORPS.

QUESTION.

COLONEL ARBUTHNOT asked the Secretary of State for War, If he is prepared to state the action which Her Majesty's Government will take with reference to the appointment of a Royal Commission to inquire into the conditions of service of officers in the Ordnance Corps, and other matters relating thereto?

COLONEL LOYD LINDSAY, in reply, said, that his right hon. and gallant Friend (Colonel Stanley) had the appointment of the Commission under his careful consideration. The hon. and gallant Gentleman himself would admit that it was a matter of considerable difficulty and some delicacy. His right hon. and gallant Friend would shortly be able to state what action he could take.

NEW GUINEA—ITALIAN COLONISTS.

QUESTION.

SIR WILLIAM FRASER asked the Secretary of State for the Colonies, Whether any communication has been made to Her Majesty's Government by the Government of His Majesty the King of Italy relating to a projected settlement of Italian subjects in the island of New Guinea; and, if so, whether the territory settled will be considered by Her Majesty's Government as part of the dominions of the King of Italy?

SIR MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH: Of course, any such communication as that to which the hon. Baronet refers would have been addressed to the Foreign Office; and, therefore, the Question would, perhaps, have been better replied to by my hon. Friend the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs than by me. But, having made inquiry, I am informed that the Foreign Office have received no communication on the subject beyond a newspaper extract transmitted by Her Majesty's Minister at Rome. Whether, in the event of any such settlement, the country occupied would be Italian territory would depend, I presume, on the action of the two Governments.

DRAINAGE AND IMPROVEMENT OF LAND (IRELAND) ACT, 1878.

QUESTION.

MAJOR O'BEIRNE asked Mr. Attorney General for Ireland, If the Chairman of the Irish Board of Works has directed his attention to the defective working of the Drainage and Improvement of Land (Ireland) Act of 1878 for the improvement of land in Ireland; and, if any steps will be taken to remedy such defects?

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. GIBSON): Sir, my attention has not been called to the working of this Act. It only obtained the Royal Assent on the 16th of August last, and there has been no opportunity of testing its working, and no scheme had been brought forward under it.

CONTAGIOUS DISEASES ACTS—THE SELECT COMMITTEE.—QUESTION.

SIR HARCOURT JOHNSTONE asked Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, When he intends to nominate the Select Committee on the Contagious Diseases Acts?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: I hope to nominate it after Easter.

POOR LAW (SCOTLAND)—LEGISLATION.—QUESTION.

MR. FRASER MACKINTOSH asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, When the measure for the amendment of the Scottish Poor Laws, promised in the Ministerial Statement, is to be introduced?

MR. ASSHETON CROSS, in reply, said, that there would be no unnecessary delay in introducing the Bill.

FRANCE—COMMERCIAL AND MANUFACTURING DISTRESS.—QUESTION.

MR. MUNDELLA asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether he will furnish Members of the House with the Evidence and Report of the Commission appointed by the French Senate to inquire into the causes of commercial and manufacturing distress in France?

MR. BOURKE, in reply, said, that Her Majesty's Ambassador had been instructed to obtain copies of the Report and Evidence of the Commission as soon as they had been issued by the French Government. The hon. Gentleman seemed to be under the impression that they had been issued; but that was not the case. Copies would be transmitted by Her Majesty's Ambassador to the Government as soon as the Report and Evidence were issued. As to laying them on the Table, the Government were sensible of the interest both of the Report and the Evidence to the mercantile classes of this country; but the Papers were very voluminous, and he was afraid would not be very useful to the mercantile classes without a translation. That would be a serious matter to the Foreign Office, and would be also expensive; but if his hon. Friend would communicate with him, they might arrive at some conclusion.

MODEL SCHOOLS, IRELAND—DISCONTINUANCE.—QUESTION.

MR. ERRINGTON asked the Chief Secretary for Ireland, Whether, now that a Parliamentary system of intermediate education is in operation in Ireland, he has taken or intends taking any steps towards dealing with the "model schools," in accordance with the Report of the Royal Commission on Primary Education (1870), who recommended in paragraph 120 of their Report,

> "That the course of education in primary schools ought not to be extended to secondary or intermediate subjects," and, in paragraph 104, "That the existing provincial model schools should be gradually discontinued?"

MR. J. LOWTHER: The points referred to are, at the present moment, under consideration in connection with an improvement of the position of the National School Teachers, towards attaining which object, no doubt, reductions will be necessary under other headings; and, therefore, the recommendations of the Royal Commissioners will be fully considered.

PARLIAMENT—THE EASTER RECESS. QUESTION.

MR. A. MILLS asked, When it was proposed that the House should adjourn for the Easter Recess?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: We contemplate proposing that the House should sit on Monday and Tuesday in Passion Week—that is to say, on the 7th and 8th of April; and that, at its rising on the 8th, it should adjourn till Thursday, the 17th of that month.

SOUTH AFRICA—LORD CHELMSFORD. QUESTION.

SIR ROBERT PEEL: I wish to ask a Question of the Chancellor of the Exchequer. It will be in the recollection of the House that, on the 14th of March, in answer to a Question of the hon. Member for Dundee (Mr. E. Jenkins), with reference to the supersession of Lord Chelmsford, the Chancellor of the Exchequer replied in these terms—"As at present advised, No." I wish to ask the Chancellor of the Exchequer, Whether at that time the Government were in possession of the despatch of Lord Chelmsford, dated February 9; and I also wish to inquire of Her Majesty's Government whether they have any information to submit to the House of Commons with reference to that despatch?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: With regard to the first Question of the right hon. Baronet, I have no difficulty in answering it. We were not in possession of the despatch at the time I gave the answer referred to; and, with regard to the second Question, whether we have any explanation to give of that despatch, I do not know what to say; but I think it would be more convenient if such a Question were put in debate, or that Notice should be given of it in the Paper.

EGYPTIAN FINANCE—THE IDENTIC NOTE.—QUESTION.

SIR JULIAN GOLDSMID: I understand that an Identic Note from the British and French Governments has been sent to the Viceroy of Egypt, within the last few days, with regard to the management of his country. I should like to ask the Chancellor of the Exchequer, Whether that statement is correct, and whether the right hon. Gentleman will lay a copy of the Paper before the House?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: Perhaps the hon. Gentleman will give Notice of the Question.

SIR JULIAN GOLDSMID: Certainly.

ORDERS OF THE DAY.

INTOXICATING LIQUORS (LICENCES).

ORDER FOR RESUMING ADJOURNED DEBATE DISCHARGED.

SIR WILFRID LAWSON: I wish to make an intimation concerning the Order of the Day for the resumption of the debate on the Resolution I brought forward a fortnight ago. Since that time, I find that the hon. and learned Member for Cambridgeshire (Mr. Rodwell), and the hon. and learned Member for Dewsbury (Mr. Serjeant Simon), who had Amendments on the Paper, have brought in a Bill embodying those Amendments; and, under those circumstances, it would be, perhaps, inconvenient to resume the debate on my Resolution. I will, therefore, if I am in Order, move that the Order be discharged.

Motion *agreed to.*

Order for resuming Adjourned Debate on Amendment [11th March] read, and *discharged.*

CONSOLIDATED FUND (No. 2) BILL.

(*Mr. Raikes, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson.*)

CONSIDERATION.

Bill, as amended, *considered.*

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: I propose that this Bill be read a third time to-morrow at half past 4 o'clock, previous to the Notices of Motion. That will enable it to go to the House of Lords early in the evening. I do not suppose there will be any objection to that course.

Bill to be read the third time *To-morrow,* at half past Four o'clock.

SUPPLY.—COMMITTEE.

Order for Committee read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair."

CYPRUS.—OBSERVATIONS.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE rose to call attention to the occupation of Cyprus. He said, that various reasons had been given for the occupation. One was that the Island had been occupied as "a strong place of arms, so that there present in our force we might support the Sultan." But the force had disappeared, melting away before our eyes. Another explanation declared that Cyprus had been occupied as a sort of model farm—as an example to the Turks of what might be done in Asia Minor. But we had bound ourselves by the terms of a wretched Convention, by which the Cypriotes continued to be Turkish subjects, and by which we were for ever to wring £115,000 a-year out of the unhappy people for the benefit of the Constantinople Pashas, in addition to what was needed for the government of the Island. We had become tax-gatherers for the Turk. It was from the second, or model-farm point of view, that he wished to ask certain questions as to the changes which had been introduced into the government of the Island by Sir Garnet Wolseley, who was eating out his heart upon this modern Elba, when he was greatly wanted elsewhere. The questions which he had indicated in his Notice had a somewhat startling look. "Forced labour," "flogging," "exclusion of newspapers," "refusal to allow barristers to plead," and "non-recognition of the mother tongue of the Cypriotes"—these were singular reforms, and did not seem likely to give the best example to the Turks. Yet he should read to the House letters, the charges made in which ought to be investigated, from leading native inhabitants, in which these were the statements made. He would say but little about the health question, the harbour question, or the military and financial situation of the Island. He would leave these points to others. They would have an opportunity of dealing with the military question in an unusual place, for there was a regiment of troops for Cyprus borne upon the Civil Service Estimates for the coming year. The regiment had been put there to evade the plain words of an Act of Parliament. There was an Act of Parliament to forbid our enlisting foreigners. The Cypriotes were foreigners, by the admission of the Lord Chancellor and of the Law Officers of the Crown. So the difficulty was to be got over, in a manner worthy of the present Government, by putting them into the Civil Service Estimates, although it was admitted that their duties would be military. As for the harbour, a Blue Book had been issued, which was meant to be, not blue, but rose in colour. But it made no reference to cost. When he looked at a similar Blue Book as to Alderney, and saw what had been said about that "natural harbour," and then considered how much had been spent before that harbour had been given up as a bad job, he could not have pleasant anticipations about Famagousta. The Admiralty Blue Book itself declared that in 1878 every inhabitant of Famagousta had had the fever, that one-half had ophthalmia, and one-sixth were blind; so Famagousta was not, on the whole, an encouraging place, though, doubtless, there was room for improvement. It was true that Fortunatus had been born at Famagousta, and had returned and been buried there in his own chapel; but his purse and his cap had been lost, for the inhabitants no longer ever got their wish, or else they would not go blind, and their wealth was certainly no longer inexhaustible. As for the Famagousta fever, the hon. Baronet the Member for North Durham (Sir George Elliot) had a plan for pumping the rivers round to their sources and back again to make them run, a plan which he had explained to the House, but not made clear. That the health of the troops in the Island was in a most terrible condition, *The Lancet* had conclusively shown. As for the finance, the First Lord of the Admiralty had naively said that "Cyprus had not been obtained in order to make a good investment." No; for, in spite of frightful taxes, such were the hard conditions of the Convention to which we had bound ourselves, that we were raising only £170,000 a-year, out of which we paid £115,000 to the Turk, leaving only between £50,000 and £60,000 for all the costs of government. This was swallowed up by the civil administration, leaving the British taxpayer to provide for military and naval costs, barracks, harbour, and also for roads, except so far as the abominable institution of forced labour might be brought to our aid. Now, with regard to this forced labour. An Ordinance lately published by our Government in Cyprus enacted that—

> "Every Cypriote is required to serve, either consecutively or at intervals, one month in the year for public works."

Sir Charles W. Dilke

That Ordinance ought to be withdrawn. The Under Secretary of State had said, on that day last week, that that Ordinance had been "enacted by the Legislative Assembly." There was no such Body. If he meant the Council, that Body consisted of seven nominees of a paternal, foreign, and despotic Government, of whom five were foreigners, and only two were Cypriotes—one of the two a Turk, and one a Greek. On the night after that on which the Under Secretary had admitted that forced labour had been introduced into Cyprus he had had the pleasure of hearing the Governor of Fiji denounce the system of forced labour, which, on his arrival at Fiji, he had abolished, and denounce it on the ground that, even if honestly executed, and not enforced by flogging, it was a monstrous tax, for it fell with crushing force on some, while others escaped scot free. A writer in Thursday's *Times* had declared that forced labour existed in Canada. Everybody knew that the *corvée* existed in Canada, as it existed in the Channel Islands, in Switzerland, and in many other free countries. This was work by regular roster on the village road, and for the village. If that were forced labour, then we had forced labour in London, because all of us were bound to sweep the snow from our doors. But it was ludicrous to compare the *corvée* to the forced labour in Cyprus. The fact was that the system of forced labour which we had introduced into Cyprus was similar to that which we had denounced and opposed in Egypt—forced labour on public works at the decree of the State. A pretty institution this for our model farm, which was to teach the Turks how to govern Asia Minor! Colonel Warren, the Commissioner at Limasol, had already built a khan by forced labour, and also, he believed, a slaughter-house; and he was about to construct dykes and aqueducts by forced labour. The Under Secretary said that this was but a modification of the custom of the Turk. Were we to adopt all the Turkish customs? Besides forced labour, there was Negro domestic slavery still existing on the Island, in the Turkish families under the shadow of our Flag. Was that to be continued? The fact that the custom was a modification of the Turkish custom, if it had been true, would not have made it better. But was it true? He held in his hand a letter from Mr. Jassonides, a Cypriote Undergraduate at Christchurch, who wrote—

> "To the best of my knowledge and recollection, there has been no instance these 30 years of forced labour in Cyprus by the Turks. I know, by hearsay only, that such a practice existed during the Age of Terror—1820-1830—and is quoted now as a custom of bye-gone, barbarous ages."

This law, which had become obsolete under the Turks, it had been left for the English Government to revive. The pressed people were to be paid, they were told by the Under Secretary. But Mr. Jassonides wrote to the effect that some of the people "compelled to labour have not received a farthing—they are starving." The incredible statement was made in Cyprus that the Edict had been sent to England for approval, and that it had received the sanction of the English Government. Mr. Jassonides added—"Corporal punishment has been enjoined against Greek natives." That statement as to flogging did not stand alone. He held in his hand a letter from Mr. Palæologos, President of the Greek Club at Limasol, who said—

> "Torture is now in use, which, in the darkest time of Turkish mis-rule, was not inflicted."

The Archbishop of Citium also wrote—

> "The Turkish Zaptiehs commit more violence than they did formerly."

He knew Sir Garnet Wolseley to be a humane and an enlightened man; and he could only suppose that, having no funds from which to pay disinterested and competent persons to carry on his government in the interior, he was forced to rely upon the services of cruel and corrupt Turkish police officials. Besides the letters he had mentioned from Mr. Jassonides, Mr. Palæologos, and from the Bishop of Citium, he had one from Mr. Oratis, of the firm of Violara and Oratis, of Alexandria, who was President of the famous Cypriote Fraternity in Egypt. That gentleman wrote—

> "The inhabitants of Cyprus are right in complaining against the present Administration. England, as you know, has not condescended to consider the natives of Cyprus as English subjects. Hence all Cypriotes are required to pay to the English authorities, on leaving Cyprus, 11*s.* each for a passavante. When they come to a Turkish country, as here to Egypt, they are imprisoned by the police, and they are not let free till they present two Turkish subjects as their sureties, and pay 10 francs again each, because the Harbour-Master will not accept the English passavante. It is quite impossible for me to describe to you the hatred of the English authorities against the Christians in Cyprus."

Mr. Oratis then goes on to make specific complaints, of which the chief are—

> "The rejection of the election of Theokaris Mitzi in Larnaca, only because he was a Greek;" "the rejection of the Greek language, and order to the Archbishops and Bishops to write in Turkish;" and, "the prohibition on the introduction of Greek Newspapers into Cyprus."

Mr. Palæologos writes upon these points—

> "Our poor country is in a far more wretched state than when under direct Turkish rule. The present Administration, by measures inconceivably Turkish and anti-Christian, are endeavouring to force the most numerous portion of the population to leave the Island. Our Bishop has been forbidden to write in Greek, and is ordered to write in Turkish all applications he has to make to the Council. Our Bishop answers bravely that he knows no other tongue but his mother-tongue, which even the Turkish Government considered the official language of the ecclesiastical authorities. Taxes, which have been paid up to March, have been exacted a second time, although the people possess documents to prove that they have paid them."

The Bishop of Citium wrote—

> "You probably know that I was delighted at first at the change of Administration in the country. In a short time I found, however, from those who represent among us the noble and generous English nation, that we were in great error in the hopes we entertained. They are not ashamed to openly declare that the present Administration is not a new one, but a continuation of the former—that is, of Turkish mis-rule, and that they are the clerks of Turkey. Their acts, unfortunately, prove that they speak the truth. Our peasants are brought down in manacles without the slightest cause, although all the Pashas we had in Cyprus confessed to me that they are the most peaceful and law-abiding people in all Turkey. The sentences of the Turkish Cadi, the well-known Bekkir Effendi, are even more unjust than formerly; but they are pitilessly executed by the Commissioner when they are pronounced against Christians."

Mr. Jassonides wrote that those of the Greek residents who could afford it would leave the Island. He went on to say that the Greeks complained of the exclusive recognition of the Turkish language as the official one. No application written in Greek was accepted, even from villages exclusively Greek.

> "And it is hopeless for poor people speaking only Greek—which is the general tongue of the Island, and spoken even by the Turks—to have any redress for wrong done to them. The Archbishop, and the Bishop of Citium, had their

letters on important questions rejected, simply because they were written in Greek. Violence and crimes committed by the Turks are left unpunished, and the slightest offence of a Christian is visited with heavy fine and imprisonment. Priests are manacled and imprisoned in the fortress for debt, and forced to work publicly in the market, which affords the highest satisfaction to the fanaticism of the Turks. All the rayahs have been compelled to pay twice over the licence tax—once to the Turkish Government, up to March, 1879, and once to the new Government. The rent tax has also been increased, and very heavy fines imposed. The Customs duties are increased, and have led to a general depression of trade in Cyprus."

Mr. Jassonides went on to make a definite charge, as to which he would ask for a definite reply. He said that—

> "One Greek gentleman has been imprisoned, and fined £25, for having said that the Greek community in Cyprus had expected that the arrival of the British would have improved the position of the Greeks in the Island; but that, as a fact, it had made it worse."

Was that statement correct? Mr. Jassonides went on—

> "I have no doubt that such an abuse of power as that exhibited in Cyprus, if the people were not peaceful and law-abiding—as they are—would create a revolt. But the timid Greeks are not like their warlike brothers, the Cretans; they prefer to leave the Island and abandon their property."

The Constitution of the new Council in Cyprus was also a matter of complaint. The Council under Turkish rule had consisted of nine persons, of whom seven had been natives of the Island, and four of these seven were elected by the natives. The new Council consisted of seven persons, none of whom were elected, and only two of whom were natives of the Island—one a Greek, and one a Turk. In other words, under direct Turkish rule, Cyprus possessed the management of her own affairs. The Government of Cyprus was now an iron despotism, already detested by the population. Further complaints concerned the opening of private letters and the interception of telegrams. He had also to complain of the refusal to allow barristers to plead, which had been brought before the House by some of his hon. and learned Friends. Up to the present time, the order had been maintained that no barrister could be allowed to address a Cyprus Bench without permission from the Turkish Minister of Justice at Constantinople. That permission had not been granted, and he understood that it would continue to be refused. He could, of his own knowledge, make a further complaint as to the administration of the law in Cyprus, for he was in a position to state positively that a priest under sentence of imprisonment for debt at Limasol was, and long had been, confined in the same room with a convicted murderer. The priest's debt consisted in the non-payment of a tax which he had never paid under Turkish rule. So much for our model farm, which was to be an example to the Turks in Asia Minor! It was admitted that the great need in Cyprus was capital; but how could they expect people to invest capital in the Island until they had some security for the administration of good law by competent Judges? The present system was one of drum-head court martial by English naval and military officers, varied by decisions of corrupt Turkish cadis based upon pretended Turkish law. During the days of direct Turkish rule there were two securities for justice which had been now removed. As regarded cases between natives, there was a possibility of appeal, which had been abolished; and foreigners, by the Capitulations, had been subject only to the jurisdiction of their Consuls. These were the words in the Treaties by which that privilege was given—

> "Even when they may have committed some offence they shall not be arrested and put in prison by the local authorities; but they shall be tried by their Minister or Consul, following the usage observed towards other Franks."

Now, we had claimed the right to set aside these Treaties as regarded Cyprus, although the Cyprians continued to be Turkish subjects and Cyprus to be Turkish soil, without the consent of the other Frankish Powers. In December he had pointed out that an American citizen had, contrary to the Capitulations, been arrested in Cyprus by the British authorities for an offence against Turkish law, had been tried by a Turkish cadi and a British assessor, and had been punished. He wished to know whether the American Government had acquiesced in those proceedings? During the present month he had called the attention of the House to an official Note, published in the autumn of last year, from the office of the Assistant Commissioner of Larnaca, to the following effect:—

> "His Excellency the High Commissioner desires that the business of the Court should be conducted without recognizing any Consular jurisdiction. If cases occur in which Consular jurisdiction is involved, the parties must be informed that the authority of foreign Consuls in these matters cannot be allowed to interpose itself, and the ordinary procedure of the Court is that to which all persons in the Island must submit."

Now, "the ordinary procedure" meant Turkish procedure—the law of the Koran administered without appeal. Looking to the extraordinary terms of this order, he had asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether it had been published, and "whether the Frankish Powers entitled to exercise Consular jurisdiction in Cyprus under the Capitulations had agreed to waive their rights?" The Under Secretary of State had replied that the Powers had not waived their rights, and that the High Commissioner had not reported the issue of any such notice. He wished to ask whether the High Commissioner had now reported his notice? The Under Secretary of State had also told him that "communications had passed between some of the Powers and Her Majesty's Government as to the most convenient way of dealing with the question of foreign jurisdiction in Cyprus." He knew that a complaint had been made by Italy to our Ambassador at Rome, on or about the 27th of December, and he believed that a complaint had been made by the United States. He wished to know if any settlement of the subject had been arrived at? An Ordinance as to jurisdiction in Cyprus had been drafted here, and sent out there; altered there, and sent back again; and he believed it had now been sent out a second time. The House ought to see that Ordinance. He wished to ask the Government to give the House any information in their possession as to forced labour and flogging; as to taxation in Cyprus and fines; as to the case of the Greek merchant said to have been fined and imprisoned for the mere expression of an opinion which seemed to be universal in the Island; as to the exclusion of Greek newspapers; as to the refusal to allow barristers to plead; and as to the position of the negotiations upon the subject of the Capitulations.

SIR JULIAN GOLDSMID said, he also desired to ask a few questions on some points which had not been referred to by his hon. Friend the Member for Chelsea. In the first place, he wished to know why the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs should take charge of an Island which was governed by a British General and garrisoned by a number of British troops? He wanted to know what precedent there was for such a course on the part of the Foreign Office? The country had been told, upon the authority of the Prime Minister, that Cyprus was to be occupied as a great military and naval station. Well, if it was to be a great military and naval station, the Island ought surely to be either under the War Office or the Admiralty. They had been distinctly told that it was not a Colony; and that would be the reason given, he supposed, for its not being placed under the control of the Secretary of State for the Colonies. Why had the Government adopted the unusual course which they were following? Cyprus had been said by the Prime Minister to be one of the brightest gems in the Crown of England; but he (Sir Julian Goldsmid) was afraid it was a gem which had been borrowed from the pawnbroker, and one which the British Crown had no right to wear. It had yet to be explained how a property, which we were administering on behalf of the Turks, could be "a bright gem of the British Crown." He wished also to refer to the arrangements that were made by the Government with regard to Cyprus under the Berlin Treaty. The country was told that, under the Convention, Cyprus would be occupied by us to counterbalance the possession by Russia of Kars or Batoum or one of them. It was his opinion that the Government had never explained fully their conduct with regard to Batoum. Lord Beaconsfield had stated that Great Britain would protest against the cession of Batoum to Russia; and yet Russia knew well, if she had not been directly informed by the Foreign Office, that we did not mean to do more than protest. Therefore, as we professed to go to the Berlin Congress without having any personal interest to serve, it looked ill for the Prime Minister to enter that Assembly with a copy of this Convention in his pocket, and to say—"We have made an arrangement elsewhere in consequence of your occupying Batoum." If Her Majesty's Government deemed the possession of Cyprus to be so valuable, why did they not make arrangements with Turkey for buying it outright? Such a course would have been cheaper and more creditable to us, and there would have been no occasion for differences with foreign countries. There would have been no cause for those reflections in foreign papers, in the truth of which lay their sting, that to serve our own purposes we were endeavouring to set aside the Treaty stipulations with regard to the Capitulations because they were inconvenient to us. They had been told that the Island was to become a great naval and military station. He denied that it would be either. 10,000 troops had been sent there, and, after many of them had died or been invalided, nearly the whole 10,000 had to be removed. Last year, as he had previously unsuccessfully endeavoured to land in the Island, he asked the Secretary to the Admiralty whether it had a port or not? His hon. Friend said he was informed by the Admiralty that there were two or three very good roadsteads. But at Larnaca, one of the roadsteads referred to, he believed it would be impossible to make a port. Famagousta was at one period a magnificent port; but harbours which were fine ones in the times of the Venetian triremes could obviously not be considered fine ones now. At present we possessed in Cyprus neither a military station nor a place where our Fleets could ride at anchor with safety. Consequently it was obvious that if Cyprus was to become a naval station, we should have to go to great expense to make a suitable harbour at Famagousta; and when made it would be of little use for Cyprus is as far from the Dardanelles as Malta, and consequently the latter station, where we have everything ready to hand, is at least just as good a base of operations for checking a Russian fleet. To say that the occupation of Cyprus was necessary in order to protect a possible railway across Asia Minor was perfectly futile; for he ventured to assert that such a railway would not be constructed in the lifetime of any person now living. The occupation was also equally useless for the purpose of protecting our interest in the Suez Canal. The Prime Minister, who was the licensed romancer of a prosaic Ministry, stated at the Lord Mayor's banquet, on the 9th of November last, that Cyprus was a strong place of arms, and that the Government had fixed on it after having examined all the other Islands in the East of the Mediterranean. He challenged the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs to produce the Papers on which that statement was founded. From their classical studies, hon. Members might be inclined to think that Mitylene would have been much better suited for the purpose. They had occupied the Island of Cyprus for a purpose which could not be accomplished. They were to administer it on behalf of a country whose government had been hitherto miserable, and would, he was afraid, continue to be equally bad. They were getting the discredit of this precarious occupation. He appealed to the Government whether they had not found difficulties arising because of the false position in which they were placed as the lieutenants of the Turkish Government in Cyprus? His hon. Friend had pointed out the difficulty with Italy in regard to jurisdiction. He was informed that there existed a German difficulty also. Her Majesty's Government were not afraid of Italy, but they were afraid of Germany; and they might be preparing for themselves in that quarter a difficulty which would not be easily surmounted. He should like to be informed whether the edicts or decrees of the Council had not to be submitted to the Porte for approval in those cases where they were in opposition to existing Turkish law? If they had no right to enforce them without first obtaining the sanction of the Turkish Government, it would be most humiliating to us. They ought not to have sent one of their best Generals to Cyprus, in order to place him in the position of a Turkish Pasha. With regard to the financial question, the Government had taken credit to themselves because they were going to pay the cost of the civil administration of the Island out of the surplus that remained after the payment of the tribute to the Sultan; but he contended that they deserved no credit, because from this account they omitted all the main items of their expenditure. He believed that the maintenance of Cyprus would involve an enormous cost to this country. It was the duty of the Government to get out of the awkward position into which they had fallen. Either an arrangement should be come to with Turkey, whereby the Island could be administered according to British practices, or the Island should be given up altogether. The real state of the case was this. They had undertaken to govern an Island on behalf of Turkey; they had doubtful authority there; and the occupation had obviously not accomplished the objects for which it was said to be undertaken. They ought, therefore, either to simplify the position in the way he had indicated, or retire from it absolutely.

MR. BOURKE said, he was very glad the hon. Baronet the Member for Chelsea had had an opportunity of bringing that question before the House. He was glad of it for two reasons—first, because he was anxious that a short statement should be made on that subject; and, in the second place—what was far more important—because he quite agreed with the hon. Baronet that many of the observations he had made required strict investigation. All he could say for the Government was that they should receive all the investigation which the hon. Baronet could wish; and in corroboration of that he might add, that whenever they had any complaints of the nature of these brought before the House by the hon. Baronet they had sent them to Sir Garnet Wolseley for explanation. From the evidence they possessed respecting some of the subjects to which those statements related, he made bold to aver that no person would be more astonished than Sir Garnet Wolseley when he read the interesting, and, he might say the alarming, statements of the hon. Baronet. Something had been said by the hon. Baronet with respect to a regiment sent out to Cyprus whose expenses had been included in the Civil Service instead of in the War Estimates. The Government had, in fact, been accused of having evaded the law by that transaction. Now, he understood the Secretary of State for War to have explained the circumstances of that matter the other night; and if his own explanation was not quite satisfactory, he felt sure that his right hon. and gallant Friend would be ready to explain it more fully later in the present discussion. But the reason for what had been done was very simple. It was not their wish to evade the law, but to comply with it. If that charge had been put into the Army Estimates, it would have been against the law. He could not see that they should blame themselves for endeavouring to follow the law in that respect. They had, in the most open manner, placed the charge in the Civil Service Estimates; and, considering the criticism and discussion to which those Estimates were always subject in that House, it was not likely that the Government would have placed it there if they had desired to evade the law. Then the hon. Baronet stated that in Cyprus the taxes were raised all round. That was not the fact. There had been an equalization of some small taxes; but no new taxes had been raised in the Island.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE explained that he had not stated as from himself that the taxes had been raised; but had asked a question in consequence of what he had heard about the subject.

MR. BOURKE said, that whether the matter was mentioned by the hon. Baronet on his own authority or otherwise, all he could say was, it would receive from the Government exactly the same attention. The hon. Baronet had devoted the greater portion of his speech—as was natural, considering what his information had been—to the question of forced labour. He would himself call it statute labour; but it was called forced labour, he supposed, by Gentlemen who wished to make a charge against the Government. He would state exactly how that question of forced labour really stood. The right hon. Member for Bradford (Mr. W. E. Forster) said the other day that it was new, as far as he was aware, that any labour of that kind, or any statute of that kind existed in our Colonies. All he could state was that the principle of forced labour for the repair of public roads had been applied from early times in British North America and the West Indian Colonies under the name of statute labour. Acts and Ordinances of that description were in force in Nova Scotia and various other Colonies, which he could furnish to the right hon. Member for Bradford if he desired to have them. He had not contradicted the right hon. Gentleman at the time, because the right hon. Gentleman had had considerable official experience; and he, therefore, felt crushed at the moment, when it was suggested that no such thing was to be found in the Colonies. But the right hon. Gentleman was entirely in error. Almost the first thing the Government had heard of this statute-law labour in Cyprus was contained in a telegram from Sir Garnet Wolseley, asking that there should be legislation on the subject. His Excellency said—

> "The law to compel villages and districts to furnish labourers at a fixed rate of 1*s*. a-day for the construction of roads or other public works is in accordance with immemorial custom in Cyprus and generally throughout the Ottoman territory."

And here he might remark that he was inclined to take Sir Garnet Wolseley's evidence that that was in accordance with immemorial custom in Cyprus, rather than the opinion of any gentleman who had been in communication with the hon. Baronet the Member for Chelsea. But, at the same time, they would send that communication to Sir Garnet Wolseley and ascertain whether the fact was so or not beyond dispute. The telegram went on to say—

> "It was the law in Zante when we occupied that Island, and to its existence the people there owe the admirable roads and public works constructed by Sir Charles Napier while he administered that Island under the High Commissioner of the Ionian Islands. It is not intended to put it in force when sufficient labour can be obtained in the open market; and as all employed under its provisions will receive a fair rate of wages, it cannot be considered as in any way oppressive. Great care will be taken that it is not enforced at periods of the year, or, indeed, in any way, that would impede or interfere with the ordinary farming operations."

When that despatch was received by the Foreign Secretary in last October, his noble Friend sent Sir Garnet Wolseley this reply—

> "You may requisition labour either under old law or a new one, as you please. We think punishment in default should be a fine on villages, not on individuals."

So that anything in the shape of personal coercion was not only not intended or supposed by his noble Friend, but absolutely forbidden by him the moment he heard of a requisition on the subject. There could be no doubt as to the opinion of Lord Salisbury on the matter; and it naturally came into his noble Friend's mind, because, as he afterwards mentioned to Sir Garnet Wolseley, taking into consideration the proximity of Cyprus to Egypt and that they had set their faces in the strongest manner against forced labour in Egypt, and also against the Slave Trade in those countries, and as, moreover, they were now negotiating a Turkish Convention for the abolition of the Slave Trade, his noble Friend immediately saw that if anything in the nature of forced labour was imposed by personal coercion it might give rise to a suspicion that the Government would countenance practices which were really repugnant to it. Therefore, his noble Friend gave the most emphatic orders on the subject. Another reason which actuated his noble Friend all through in dealing with the question was that if such labour were to be enforced by personal coercion, through the medium of officers not very often of a superior class, it would, of course, be liable to abuse. The despatch went out, and an Ordinance was passed; and when it came home it was found to contain a clause permitting the penalty of imprisonment to be passed on any person who left his work. That principle, it was felt by the Government, would infringe the one they had thus laid down for their guidance, and it would therefore be repealed. The date was 17th January.

Mr. W. E. FORSTER: And what was the date of Lord Salisbury's despatch?

Mr. BOURKE replied that it was the 25th October. The position in which the matter stood at present was this—The head of every village was required to furnish yearly a statement as to the number of persons who would be available for statute labour if their services should be required, and the result was that once in three years those persons were required to give their labour in roadmaking in their particular districts. That was the effect of the Order, and when it came to this country in the shape in which it would be eventually put in force it would be laid on the Table of the House. Knowing that the House would be anxious to obtain as much information as possible, he had telegraphed to Sir Garnet Wolseley on Saturday, and asked him whether the forced labour Ordinance referred to in his telegram had been put in force in any district; and in his reply, received just before the meeting of the House, Sir Garnet stated that the Ordinance referred to had been most successfully applied in a small way at Limasol, where a military road was being made. He should infer from that telegram that the Order had only been put into force in that particular district; but if he was wrong on the point he should be able to correct the mistake hereafter. That was all the information he was in a position to give the hon. Baronet at the present moment. The hon. Baronet had further asked him whether fines had been inflicted in certain cases. He did not understand what kind of fines the hon. Baronet alluded to. He did not know of any authority which existed on the Island which allowed fines to be inflicted except those fixed by law; and certainly the fines referred to by the hon. Baronet had not been enforced. In reply to another question of the hon. Baronet, he could not believe that any Greek merchant had been imprisoned because he had expressed disappointment at the small improvement in the government of the Island which had been effected by its transference to British rule. But Her Majesty's Government would make inquiries on the point. With regard to the case of the English barristers who desired to practise in the inferior Courts of the Island, he could only give the same answer as he had given the other day, and that was that English barristers did not seem to Sir Garnet Wolseley to be of much assistance where the Judges were two Greeks and two Turks. The hon. Baronet mentioned some cases of flogging; but Her Majesty's Government knew of no case of flogging; and he did not believe that Sir Garnet Wolseley would have permitted it to have happened without having inflicted the most severe punishment upon the Zaptieh who had been guilty of such conduct. He was sure also that the Commissioners and sub-Commissioners appointed by Sir Garnet Wolseley would take the same view of the matter. If such a charge were well founded, it was a pity that the matter was not brought under the notice of Sir Garnet Wolseley at the time. As far as he was aware, there was no law in Cyprus which permitted of flogging, and if there was he was quite certain that it had never been put in force. An Ordinance had been passed with regard to the military police, giving power to Sir Garnet Wolseley to inflict lashes on the military police who were proved guilty of insubordination and mutiny. The hon. Baronet also mentioned the case of a Greek newspaper having been excluded from the Island. He had not heard of any such case, and did not believe that any such exclusion had occurred; because, some months ago, Sir Garnet Wolseley had mentioned an article that appeared in some of the London journals to the effect that newspapers had been stopped at the Post Office, and had obtained a Report from the Postmaster on the subject. That Report stated that only two newspapers had been sent back, as the parties to whom they were addressed had not desired to renew their subscriptions. In reference to the subject of the alleged manacling and imprisoning of priests in the Island, he had to say that he did not believe the statement. It was clear, however, that the ecclesiastical authorities in Cyprus had hitherto believed that they were above the law, instead of being bound to obey it, and in one case a priest had been imprisoned for a few days because he refused to pay the taxes which he justly owed, and because Sir Garnet Wolseley was anxious to show that nobody was above the law, no matter what his ecclesiastical status was. He had received a private letter from Sir Garnet Wolseley on this subject to the following effect:—

> "My first object since I landed has been to do justice to all men, no matter what their faith may be. And, in order to show that I have throughout endeavoured to check illegal exactions on the part of those in office here—in fact, to purify the system of official administration and to reform the judicial departments—I may mention that one tax collector has been imprisoned for robbing; a dignitary of the Greek Church has been imprisoned for a few days for refusing to pay the tithes he owed the Government; Mr. Cesnola was tried for breaking the law in order to show the people that Europeans should abide by the law as well as Cypriotes; and I have dismissed from office men whom I found to be unworthy or dishonest. I have, in carrying out this policy, endeavoured to strike at the top of the tree, and, in doing so, have shown the people that I am no respecter of persons. For the first time, I imagine, in the Turkish history of Cyprus, the peasants have been protected against the cruel exactions of the tithe farmers. I believe the results of this policy to have been successful, and that the character of the English nation stands high here in consequence. This has been effected without any new laws, and in strict accordance with the Turkish written law. The Native Judges now feel that they are secure in their places as long as they act justly; but they and the people also know that if they are found tripping they will be severely dealt with."

The hon. Baronet appeared to have made one error in his speech. He seemed to think that everybody in the

Island was now subject to Turkish law. But this was not the case. All Cypriots were subject to Turkish law; but no person was subject to it who would have been exempt from the Turkish jurisdiction under the Capitulations. These persons were now dealt with under the Ordinance of Her Majesty's Government to which he had referred. The whole subject of the judicature in Cyprus was, however, under the consideration of Her Majesty's Government, and would be dealt with by them, though it was a matter of great intricacy. When a system of judicature had been drawn up, it would apply not only to Cypriotes, as administered by two Greeks, two Turks, and one English assessor, under the old Turkish law, but also to those foreigners who were now excluded under the Capitulations. The hon. Baronet also mentioned the subject of passports, and referred to cases in which passports had been asked for by the Egyptian Government from Cypriotes coming from the Island into Egypt. He believed it was quite true that the Egyptian Government had asked for passports in these circumstances; but Her Majesty's Government had already communicated with Sir Garnet Wolseley on this subject, and arrangements were now being made with the Egyptian Government for doing away with passports in the case of Cypriotes going to Alexandria and other places in Egypt. The hon. Baronet had further stated that there was a minority of Christians in the Legislative Council.

Sir CHARLES W. DILKE said, what he complained of was that there were only two Cypriotes out of seven on the Council.

Mr. BOURKE said, the Council consisted of three official members and three natives. Of the three natives one was a Turk, one a Cypriote, and one an Italian, who had been nearly all his life in the Island. This Legislative Council had been called into existence by Her Majesty's Government, and he was not aware that any charge had been brought against it in respect of its constitution. As to Negro slavery, he did not believe any such thing practically existed in Cyprus, and he was quite sure that if it did it would be very soon put an end to under British administration. They were now firmly determined to govern Cyprus. It was, of course, impossible to bring new laws into operation immediately. They were obliged at first to administer the law they found existing there at the time; and Sir Garnet Wolseley, and everybody else who had studied the subject, admitted that Turkish law was not bad in itself; but its vice arose from bad administration, from the corruption of those who administered it, and the weakness of the Government. The opinion of Sir Garnet Wolseley, and of everybody who had gone to Cyprus, was that the law in existence there was not the old Turkish law, but that it was framed upon the *Code Napoléon,* and they came to the conclusion that it was a very good law. With regard to the jurisdiction of the Courts over foreigners resident in the Island, he would remind the House that, in the Convention of the 4th of June, 1878, it was declared that—

> "His Imperial Majesty the Sultan further consents to assign the Island of Cyprus to be occupied and administered by England."

By the "Additional Article" of the 14th of August, it was furthermore declared that—

> "His Imperial Majesty the Sultan, in assigning the Island of Cyprus to be occupied and administered by England, has thereby transferred to and vested in Her Majesty the Queen, for the term of the occupation, and no longer, full powers for making laws and Conventions for the government of the Island in Her Majesty's name, and for the regulation of its commercial and Consular relations and affairs free from the Porte's control."

These stipulations gave the fullest power to Her Majesty's Government over all the inhabitants of Cyprus, whatever their nationality; and hon. Members would recollect that in the Foreign Jurisdiction Act it was provided that the Queen might exercise any power or jurisdiction which Her Majesty might have in any country or place out of Her dominions

> "in the same and as ample a manner as if Her Majesty had acquired such power or jurisdiction by the cession of conquest of territory."

It was, therefore, in the power of Her Majesty to establish in Cyprus a form of government analogous to those which had hitherto been established in British Colonies acquired by cession or conquest which did not possess representative institutions, and which were usually termed "Crown Colonies." In accordance with these powers, therefore, an Order in Council was issued, providing for the establishment of Executive and Legislative Councils for Cyprus. It would, therefore, be seen that when Her Majesty's Government determined temporarily to maintain the existing tribunals in Cyprus, and when they passed the Ordinance he had referred to, they were acting within their powers. It was their intention that that Ordinance should apply to foreigners who had been hitherto exempt from Turkish rule. The hon. Baronet had asked several questions as to the disputes which he assumed they had had with foreign Powers, and he had also mentioned the subject more than once in the House. Of course, the matter had been carefully considered by the Government, who had decided that all who had been under the authority of the Turkish Government should, in future, be subject to the authority of the Representatives of Her Majesty, both Judicial and Executive.

SIR JULIAN GOLDSMID asked whether the foreign Governments had agreed to that change?

MR. BOURKE: The hon. Gentleman seemed rather anxious that they should have difficulties with foreign Governments. Questions had been asked on the subject; but there was no reason to suppose that any foreign Government would make objections. However, as to the Capitulations proper, they all knew that they contained a vast number of judicial regulations which no Christian State could admit for a moment. They had been called into existence on account of the weakness and corruption of the Turkish Government; but when the evils that they were designed to counteract were removed, the very *raison d'être* of the Capitulations ceased, and foreign Governments would not wish to supersede the administration of British law. The hon. Baronet had also asked questions as to the Revenue of the Island. He (Mr. Bourke) would not pledge himself by any statement of figures. That Revenue was derived chiefly from Customs, Excise, Tithes, Capitation Grants, and other minor sources. With regard to the tithes and the method of their collection, they were bought in March by speculators and merchants, who gave in return bonds payable in six months, and signed by the farmer himself and two sureties. The farmer watched the fields, and saw the corn cut and the grain stored in the thrashing places. Then came the transport of the tithe, with respect to which, and the labour compulsorily supplied for the purpose, considerable hardship was often inflicted. In the case of fruit and other perishable produce which could not be stored up, the tithe was usually commuted into money. As for the vines, they had often been the subject of dispute. The vineyards were visited in August by the tithe farmer, when their value was estimated, and the cultivator often submitted to exactions rather than delay the sale of the grapes. The natural consequence of that was that the cultivation of wines was very much reduced. It was clear that the result of the whole system was a great loss to the Revenue and the impoverishment of the Island. Production was checked, and at least two-thirds of the culturable area was untilled. He need not dwell on the necessity of reform, or on the fact that the subject had demanded the most serious attention of Sir Garnet Wolseley. In future, he was glad to say, the tithes would be differently collected, and their value would be assessed by officials under Government supervision, so that when the tithe farmers were done away with there would be a more perfect land settlement, in character similar to our own. He might mention, in passing, that the triangulation of the Island was now complete, and that an efficient map of the whole country was being made. He next came to the Verghis, of which there were three classes—namely, the tax upon occupied houses and lands, the tax upon unoccupied houses and lands, and the tax on trades and professions. The village authorities prepared an annual statement designating the contribution required from each village, and the money was then levied according to the number of the houses and the means of the population, and forwarded to the treasury of the sandjak; but now, owing to the corruption of the collectors—corruption not unknown even under our rule in India—the system would be altered, and the collection would be made by officials under the supervision of the Government, with the assistance of the village councils. The Customs were very simple; it was a tariff of 8 per cent upon importation, and of 1 per cent export duty. Since our occupation of the Island the Customs had been more than doubled; and there was every reason to believe that, though less would probably be consumed in the next year than in the present, there would be no very material diminution of that very great increase. The export duty, he knew, sounded badly in the ears of the House, and he hoped that its repeal would give a fresh impetus to the trade of the Island. There was also a tax of 6*d*. per head on sheep, which were enumerated in March, and it would be the duty of the Government to see to the just collection of that tax. The monopoly of salt was more important, and had once yielded a large revenue; but on account of an injudicious increase of price, the supply had been diverted to Tunis and other places. Moreover, two or three years ago the excessive rains had inundated the salt lakes, and great damage had been done in consequence, so that not much money would be derived from that source in the present year. In fact, the Government, regarding all monopolies as undesirable, had determined not to renew the salt monopoly; and no money would, therefore, be spent in restoring the lakes. With regard to the expenditure of the current year, money had been spent on the Turkish Governor for part of the year, on the High Commissioner, the Financial and Judicial Commissioners, the District Commissioners, the Native and British Establishments, the Military Police, the Customs and Excise Establishments, and on Public Works. He might say that the estimates made some months ago by Mr. Kelner showed that, in all probability, there would be a fair surplus. He would not, however, quote the figures to the House, partly because the accounts were not yet quite complete, and partly because he could not be responsible for their absolute accuracy in every particular. The House, he might add, was well aware that under the provisions of the Anglo-Turkish Convention there were certain reservations made of land which belonged to the Porte. With regard to those lands, which were of considerable extent, the Government had been in negotiation with the Porte, and it was thought by Sir Garnet Wolseley that it would be extremely inconvenient that the Government should not possess the same rights over them as over other lands in the Island. Those negotiations had, he was happy to say, come to a conclusion, and an agreement had been entered into, by which all the rights of the Porte in those reserve lands had been given up to us just as fully as in the case of the other lands in the Island.

Mr. H. SAMUELSON: Does that include the private lands of the Sultan?

Mr. BOURKE: No; the private lands of the Sultan, however, would be in the same position as those of private individuals. The consideration to be paid the Porte for——

Sir JULIAN GOLDSMID asked what was the consideration for the cession of this right?

Mr. BOURKE was just going to say that for those lands which they had now acquired they had given the Porte £5,000 a-year in perpetuity. When he said they should have a respectable surplus, he took that sum into consideration. As to future Expenditure and Revenue, he had every reason to believe that they would turn out to be more satisfactory than that of the current year. He was fortified in that conclusion by the fact that the estimates formed had turned out to be satisfactory so far as we had gone. After only nine months' experience, however, it was not thought desirable to make any great change in the taxes, or the sources from which they were derived; but the practical result of the steps which had been taken would be, it was hoped, considerably to increase the Revenue. The hon. Baronet (Sir Charles W. Dilke) seemed to think they would get into a terrible scrape with respect to public works, and would not be able to expend anything on roads. But, during the ensuing year, roads connecting the various towns of the Island would be commenced. The question of constructing railroads had also been under the consideration of the Government; but they had come to the conclusion that it would not be desirable to make them at present. He hoped, however, hon. Gentlemen opposite would not be disappointed if he stated he had reason to hope that railways would be made by means of private enterprize. He might also mention that the question of planting had engaged the attention of the Government, inasmuch as the forests throughout the Island were in a lamentable state. The Eucalyptus had accordingly been planted, and a large quantity of wire fencing had been sent out to fence round the trees, of which he hoped there would be a large number in a few years, as they were likely to produce a very sensible effect on the health of the Island. A permanent forester would be engaged, and £3,000 would be taken for forests. Considering the great importance of facilitating communication, and the great impulse which a good system of roads would give to commerce and agriculture, Sir Garnet Wolseley had been authorized to commence the necessary works immediately, and to borrow for the purpose a sum of £28,000 in the event of there not being a sufficient surplus from the general Revenue. The Government, he might add, had laid down a rule that no more money was to be borrowed than the Revenue of the Island would bear the interest of in addition to annual instalments, which would discharge the principal. He would, in the next place, say a few words as to the administration of the affairs of the Island by the Foreign Office. Personally, he need hardly say, he should wish very much that the Foreign Office had nothing to do with it, inasmuch as it was likely to involve a considerable amount of trouble. The administration of the Island, however, it appeared to him, came peculiarly within the province of that Department of the Public Service. The negotiations which he had referred to had to be conducted with the Porte, as well as other negotiations with foreign Powers which the circumstances of the case had made necessary. It was, therefore, thought by the Government that a great deal of time would be lost if matters were to be referred to another Office. There were in the Foreign Office many gentlemen who were well acquainted with Colonial affairs; and he might mention, especially, that his noble Friend the Secretary of State had the benefit of the Colonial and legal experience of Sir Julian Pauncefort. With regard to other points which had been referred to, they were well worthy of investigation, and he did not think they could do better than send out the speech of the hon. Baronet to Sir Garnet Wolseley, who would no doubt read it with astonishment. He had now, he thought, given the House such information as would enable it to form an opinion on the question before it. He had no doubt that as time went on there would be improvement, and that our administration of the affairs of the Island would be an advantage to all people in that part of the world. They had been told that they had taken over Cyprus in order to make it a "model farm," and show the whole of Asia Minor how such farms should be conducted. It was the old story of persons putting into the mouths of their opponents things they did not say; and he was not aware that any responsible Member of Her Majesty's Government had put that forward as a reason—though it might be one of the reasons—and he had no doubt they would be able to show a good example. The reason for the occupation of Cyprus was one of high policy, and was justified by the events which had arisen out of the Turko-Russian War. There could be no doubt that those events forced themselves upon the attention of Her Majesty's Government. They perceived that those events changed the relations of all the European Powers with Turkey. Those events made an enormous change in the power of Turkey. Therefore, considering those changes and the position of the Turkish Empire, it was absolutely necessary that Her Majesty's Government should, in view of future events, have at their command in that part of the world a place where a harbour could be made. [*A laugh.*] Well, he was not ashamed to say so. They wanted a harbour which would be a means of safety in case of the Suez Canal being threatened, and which could be the basis of future operations in case their communications with India were threatened. If it was true that the Ottoman Empire was to be overwhelmed, and in a few years to be no longer heard of or seen, he should have thought that those who held that opinion would have been the very first to wish that improvement should be carried into those countries where they had always been so much interested. But that had not been the way in which their opponents had acted. They had magnified every single impediment—impediments which were, and must always be, necessary when a Government took possession of a new country. In this case, they much recollect a circumstance they never seemed to recollect, which was that the occupation of Cyprus had been taken with the virtual assent of every man in the Island, with the exception, perhaps, of a few Turkish officials; and, notwithstanding particular hardships that might have been suffered from the loss of ecclesiastical authority on the part of the privileged Christian hierarchy, yet he believed their rule was popular, and would continue to be so. He had no doubt that Cyprus would become a place of arms for England, and that Famagousta would become one of the finest harbours in the world; and these results could be obtained without any appreciable expense on the part of the Imperial Exchequer. All he could say, in sitting down, was this—that he believed it to be the opinion of Her Majesty's Government that, no matter how much they might be assailed and taunted with any petty failure, there was nothing to which exception might be taken in Cyprus which could not be accounted for by causes that were easily removable. Notwithstanding all taunts, Her Majesty's Government would continue to carry out the policy which was contained in the Anglo-Turkish Convention, which he believed in his heart would do much to increase the power of England, to promote liberty in the East, and to secure our position alike in Asia and in Europe.

Mr. W. E. FORSTER said, the hon. Gentleman the Under Secretary of State, in the course of his speech, had given a good deal of information—and he might say, interesting information—about the present position of Cyprus and the intentions of the Government, and had indulged in some rather sanguine expressions of trust as to what the future of Cyprus would be. In the few words which he (Mr. W. E. Forster) intended to offer to the House, he should not refer to that part of the hon. Gentleman's speech; but should confine himself to the answers which the hon. Gentleman had given to the different questions brought forward by the hon. Member for Chelsea. Those questions affected two subjects. First, the confusion—and, he confessed, what seemed to him the almost hopeless confusion—of law in Cyprus. He would not, however, dwell upon that. Other Members of the House were much better able to deal with that question. But to a layman it certainly did appear as though the confusion was hopeless, and that it was most difficult to find out whether justice prevailed, whether an attempt to administer justice was made in Cyprus upon Turkish law or upon British law, or upon Turkish law upon British principles, or upon British law upon Turkish principles. One difficulty—which was evidently a very great difficulty, and one which the Government ought to have foreseen when they took Cyprus—had not been at all removed by anything the hon. Gentleman had said. The present Government had added Cyprus to the rule of Her Majesty. Having made Her Empress of India, they had now made Her *vice-reine* of Cyprus; and, if the last title had any real meaning in it, it would be a very great difficulty for Her Majesty to administer law and justice and govern Cyprus in subordination to the Turkish Government; and until that position was put an end to, these difficulties would continue. The point upon which he wished to make a remark was really the nature of our present rule. The Chancellor of the Exchequer was supposed to have said they were about to convert Cyprus into a sort of model farm. At Birmingham and elsewhere, the right hon. Gentleman had pointed to the great advantage of our reign in Cyprus, and the importance of our setting a good example to the Turkish Government; and the right hon. Gentleman had spoken in sanguine terms of the improvements that were to follow the hoisting of the British flag. What he wanted to know was, how far they had succeeded in setting an example? Take the question of forced labour. No doubt they would have been in a far better position for discussing that question if the hon. Gentleman had allowed them to have the Ordinance before them; and he thought they had some right to complain that they had not got that Ordinance. A week ago it was asked for, and the hon Gentleman gave an answer which he (Mr. W. E. Forster) certainly did not understand, and many other Members of the House were in the same difficulty. The hon. Gentleman said he could only give the Ordinance with other Ordinances. Now, it appeared to him (Mr. W. E. Forster), that the Ordinance was a thing by itself, and that the House might have had it before them——

Mr. BOURKE said, he had quite forgotten to mention this subject in his speech. When the hon. Member (Sir Charles W. Dilke) asked for the Ordinance, he (Mr. Bourke) promised that it should be laid on the Table; and he repeated again, that it would be produced when it had been received as altered by Sir Garnet Wolseley, in accordance with the instructions sent out to Sir Garnet by the Secretary of State. He wished it to be understood that, although he had promised the hon. Baronet to lay the Ordinance upon the Table, it could not be produced at the present moment.

MR. W. E. FORSTER said, the object of the House was to know what had been done by the British Government and Administration of Cyprus, and they ought to have been informed what the Ordinance in force was, and the actual Ordinance under which the people of Cyprus had to labour. There could be no question that there was such an Ordinance in force; and there was no reason why the Government should not have it laid before them. The Government might enter into any explanation they pleased; but the fact still remained that this Proclamation had been issued in Cyprus, and was still in force, and the Government might have allowed the House, in entering upon the discussion that night, to be informed of the exact state of the matter. His hon. Friend the Member for Chelsea had quoted what he believed to be the Proclamation which had been issued in Cyprus. It did not seem to him to be a matter on which it was likely there would be any great mistake. The words were these—and he read them again, because his hon. Friend had omitted two important lines at the beginning—

> "Whereas, it was in use long ago that every Cypriot served the Government for a month in the year. Every Cypriot is required to serve either consecutively or at intervals one month at the public works, receiving 1*s.* per diem."

It might turn out that this Preamble was a mistake; but, if it was true, or anything like the truth, the House would see at once an enormous difference between it and an agreement for repairing the roads by what had been called forced labour throughout the Colonies. The hon. Gentleman the Under Secretary of State expressed surprise at his (Mr. W. E. Forster's) not having heard of this so-called forced labour in the Colonies. Now, he inquired about it at the Colonial Office afterwards, and got substantially the same answer from the permanent officials.

MR. BOURKE remarked that the conditions were the same, except that there were no penalties.

MR. W. E. FORSTER could only say that the requirements in the Colonies did not mean forced labour.

MR. BOURKE said, that was only the impression of one official.

MR. W. E. FORSTER said, he had asked more than one, and they were very important officials also. It was evidently not their impression that the two things were identical; and it was certainly his (Mr. W. E. Forster's) impression that to compare the two things together would be absolutely to mislead the House. It was useless to say that where everybody was free, and yet came to a mutual agreement to repair the roads by labour, it was such an act as that involved in such a Proclamation as he had read. In the case of Cyprus, his informant stated that forced labour was found to be such an exaction from the Turks, and so oppressive, that it was discontinued. It had now, however, been renewed by an edict establishing it all over the country; and, although there was payment for it, otherwise it was made even more onerous than it was before. Sir Garnet Wolseley had declared that it should be enforced by personal coercion; and he suspected that he would find it very difficult indeed to carry out his Proclamation without such personal coercion; and he should like to know, after all, what was the great difference between the Ordinance as Sir Garnet Wolseley proposed it and as Lord Salisbury intended to change it? The personal imprisonment of the individual was removed, and the penalty was to be a money fine on the village. But supposing the village could not pay the fine? Was a mere inability to pay it to be a sufficient excuse? He could not for a moment believe that there was not something in the nature of personal coercion behind all this, and that if it had to be enforced it would be by personal coercion. [MR. BOURKE: No, no.] He (Mr. W. E. Forster) thought that if it were not so, the Proclamation would become a dead letter. The House, however, were in some difficulty in the matter, as they had not before them either the Ordinance itself nor the interesting Correspondence from which the hon. Gentleman had quoted. It seemed to him, however, that the system was condemned by a few words quoted from Sir Garnet Wolseley's despatch—

> "It was not intended to put the system in force, if labour could be obtained in the open market."

Well, why could not labour be obtained in the open market? There could only be one reason for it, and that was that the Government of Cyprus would not pay the market rate of labour. Now, he could not conceive that, if they wished to set an example of good government to Turkey, they could more surely do so than by acting with justice in the vital matter of the payment of wages, and not with injustice. If they could not get the labour in the open market, it was because they would not pay the market price for it; and if they insisted on getting labour at less than the market price, they would be setting an example to Turkey and to Egypt which would lead to the continuance of one of the greatest abuses in the East, and which had had a great deal to do in leading to the present state of things. He had fully expected that the hon. Gentleman would have told the House that Sir Garnet Wolseley had found a necessity for forced labour in the desirability of getting some works done quickly; and he could not but think that if the Chancellor of the Exchequer said anything in the course of the debate, he would not permit the Government to stand up in defence of this kind of labour. Was it worth while to keep up this system of forced labour? If the Government wanted a hint, he would give them one, not from his own intelligence, or from any one of his friends; but he would inform them what was done by a great Indian official in a very similar case. The late General John Jacob—the right hon. Gentleman knew very well what an able man General Jacob was—in receiving temporary charge of the Province of Scinde from Sir Bartle Frere, immediately issued the following Order, finding that forced labour was the usual method adopted for carrying on all public works:—

> "Statute for forced labour is abolished. Every man is at perfect liberty to work when, where, and at what rates he pleases. Every Government servant hereafter guilty of compelling a person to labour on public or private works is liable to be dismissed from the Government service, and to legal prosecution. Every work, of whatever description, is to be performed by contract, or by payment of daily task wages, at the discretion or pleasure of the parties concerned. No person, henceforth, is to assume the right arbitrarily to name the rates at which labourers are to be paid, such rates to be by mutual consent and agreement between the parties concerned."

If the right hon. Gentleman really wished to set a good example to Turkey and the East generally, it would be by carrying out such instructions as these, which were the principles of English administration and of English freedom; and not by discovering and making use of some old law which the Turks themselves did not venture to enforce, and then supporting it on the ground of what had been done by some villagers in Canada, when they found it easier to do things by labour than by payment of wages. There were one or two other things which he thought had hardly been fully answered. In the first place, in regard to the imprisonment of certain priests, he entirely agreed with his hon. Friend the Member for Chelsea, that Sir Garnet Wolseley had done right in putting the priests under the common law of the country; but he thought that the law ought to be put in force with great care, and that it was unfortunate to see the priesthood imprisoned for non-payment of taxes in prison by the side of a murderer. As regarded slavery, he had been sorry to hear the remarks of the Under Secretary of State. He knew that the hon. Gentleman disliked slavery as much as he (Mr. W. E. Forster), and he had proved it by the good work he had already done in trying to put a stop to it. But he thought the hon. Gentleman showed an alarming amount of ignorance in regard to the practice in the Turkish States as to slavery——

Mr. BOURKE said, he had referred only to Cyprus.

Mr. W. E. FORSTER asked what the position of the English Government was at this moment? They had come into possession of Cyprus, which up to that time had been a Turkish State, with Turkish habits and under Turkish authority——

Mr. BOURKE said, he knew very well that slavery existed in Turkey; but, in practice, he did not believe that slavery existed in Cyprus.

MR. W. E. FORSTER said, he did not suppose that the hon. Gentleman was of opinion that slavery existed in Cyprus. When a Question was asked last year as to what the Government would do with regard to slavery, he remembered very well an answer being given by the Government to this effect—"You must not be in a hurry in this matter. We mean to put slavery down, but we want first to know what our position and powers are." [Mr. BOURKE: Exactly.] Surely they knew by this time what their power and position were; and why had they not issued an Ordinance declaring to the people of Cyprus that slavery would no longer be allowed there? He thought it would be found, on examination, that slavery did still exist. The writer of a letter, which had already been quoted, said—

> "During six months' residence in Cyprus last autumn, I made inquiry respecting the existence of slavery, with the following result:—Every family of moderate means has in its household a black servant, who is held as a slave. Negresses are employed in the villages. I was told by a Greek gentleman, who could speak Turkish, that they were there as slaves. They are well treated, as domestic servants generally are."

Under the circumstances, he (Mr. W. E. Forster) confessed his surprise that, while we had been in the Island so long, a more careful inquiry had not been made as to whether slavery existed or not; and that, having to deal with a country which had been under Turkish rule and Turkish authority, and acting under Turkish customs, an Ordinance had not been issued prohibiting slavery. He had no doubt it would be found necessary to do so very shortly. Reference had been made to M. Jassonides. He was acquainted with that gentleman, who had been studying at Oxford, and bore a most excellent character. He appeared to be a modest gentleman, believing thoroughly and absolutely what he said. It might turn out that he had been misinformed, or that his story was exaggerated; but, if so, the exaggeration would have been unintentional. There was no doubt that M. Jassonides's relations in Cyprus were in great alarm lest he should get into difficulties in consequence of the information he had given. This showed that, with every intention to rule justly, Sir Garnet Wolseley had not yet removed from the people of Cyprus the idea of vengeance attaching to any attempt to interfere with the acts of the Government. He told the gentleman of whom he was speaking that the last thing he need fear was danger from laying before the Government or its officials any information on any subject which he believed to be true. He would not enter into the question brought forward by the hon. Member for Rochester (Sir Julian Goldsmid) with regard to the great advantages of obtaining Cyprus as a place of arms, because the question of the government of the Island was of more importance at the present moment; but nothing that he had heard in the discussion which had taken place seemed to make those advantages greater, nor the difficulties and dangers less, than they had hitherto appeared.

GENERAL SIR GEORGE BALFOUR said, he had no doubt that the step taken in abolishing the salt monopoly, and in freeing salt from all taxes, would effect a great good both on the people of the Island and on trade. This one necessary of life, all Conservative Governments had taxed heavily, merely by reason of the inability of the poor, who mainly suffered, being unable to oppose the burden. It was hoped that this free trade in salt would be followed by like freedom in India; but the principle might be extended by the Government of modifying the other taxes of the Island, and in abolishing some of the special taxes peculiar to Mahomedan rule, which would also work some good; but when he compared this Island with other Islands in our possession, he could not but come to the conclusion that it was an exceedingly poor and wretched place. Compared with the Island of the Mauritius—which was only one-fifth of the size of Cyprus—it would be found that the former had four times the Revenue of the latter. It could not, therefore, be said that Cyprus was by any means a "gem" of the ocean, which the Mauritius undoubtedly was. If Cyprus were even compared with Tanjore, an inland district of India which was about the same size—4,000 square miles—it would be seen that Tanjore produced more than double the Revenue of Cyprus. The only conclusion he could come to was that Cyprus was very badly cultivated, and that the population must be extremely poor. To raise up the cultivation, extensive works and reservoirs ought to be constructed. The highly advanced state of Tanjore, and of the Godavery districts of the Madras Presidency, were examples of what irrigation could effect. But to provide these works for Cyprus for irrigating 1,000,000 acres, a capital outlay of about £2,000,000—or, say, £2 per acre—must be incurred. With this improvement there ought to be a Land Revenue of at least £1,000,000 per annum. With regard to the extensive improvements which the Government contemplated in the Island, he hoped the people of England would remember that this could only be done out of the taxes of this country. It was all very well to say that there was a surplus revenue in Cyprus which could be employed in carrying out public works. The surplus probably did not extend to £60,000; and according to the scale of Civil establishment to be maintained on this small Island, this sum would barely pay the Civil charge. It should be borne in mind that they were bound to pay Turkey £110,000 a-year in accordance with the Convention, and this sum deducted from the stated Revenue of £170,000, only left the £60,000. When he remembered that the Mauritius paid £26,000 a-year towards the Military Expenditure, he asked why the people of this country should be taxed for the purpose of converting Cyprus into a model garden? It was not fair nor just that the Government should tax the people of this country for the benefit of Cyprus. The liability for the military government of the Island could not be less than £100,000 a-year, taking into account the £20,000 charged this year in the Army Estimates for Staff, and Staff establishments, and for the regimental pay and allowance of the officers and men of the Infantry, Artillery, and Engineers now forming the garrison, so that the people of England were really contributing to the Revenue of Cyprus with taxes raised in this Kingdom. If they were bound to contribute at all, it ought not to be in that form. He thought it was only just that they should make the contribution of English taxpayers quite clear by paying the whole sum they were now liable for by a direct grant to the Island, so that it should be seen that the people of England were paying for their own government more than the inhabitants of Cyprus. The House had been told that it was contemplated to spend £28,000 in the construction of 1,000 miles of new roads, and that this sum would be raised by borrowing He contended that it was impossible to make these roads for less than £300 a-mile; and he felt sure the entire cost would be ten times the amount of the Government Estimate. If once the Island Administration was permitted to enter on great public works by the aid of borrowed money, no other result than that of indebtedness could be expected, and with it all the evils now seen in Egypt and Turkey. When he heard of the harbour that was about to be made in Cyprus he was alarmed, for the money for those works must come directly from the pockets of the people of England. He had made much inquiry into harbour works and their cost in this country, and he knew the disastrous results attending the construction of many of them. This project of spending £150,000 or £200,000 on the harbour of Famagousta excited his alarm; because, speaking from experience, he knew that sum would be quite insufficient. As to the question of forced labour, he might mention that, some 25 years ago, he was nominated a Member of a Commission to inquire into the question of conducting useful works by means of labour provided by the villages interested therein in the Presidency of Madras, which had an area of 128,000 square miles. The whole of the irrigation works in that vast area were constructed with this kind of forced labour. After a long inquiry, the Commission came to the conclusion that a more objectionable plan could not be followed than that of constructing irrigation works in the Madras Presidency by such means. He earnestly hoped that the Chancellor of the Exchequer would obtain the evidence from the Madras Presidency, where forced labour was at one time in force, in order to prove to the Foreign Secretary that it was unwise to continue such labour in Cyprus. No European Governor could control the evils that inevitably would flow from it. Besides, forced labour would be more expensive at 1*s.* than voluntary labour at 2*s.* per diem. He objected strongly to continue this expenditure, even though the villagers, who were to be forced, might hereafter benefit by the works so made. He thought they had a right to complain that the Reports which it was known had been made to the Government with reference to the Island of Cyprus had not been laid before the House.

SIR EDMUND LECHMERE, having had some experience during a short stay in the Island of Cyprus, wished to say a few words on this subject. There could not be a doubt that last season had been a most unfortunate and exceptional one. Considering the heat which the troops encountered after being some time on board ship, having been placed at once under a broiling sun with the very slight protection of tents, the Commissariat not being quite prepared to meet them, and their food not being that to which they had been accustomed, the amount of sickness that prevailed could not be matter of surprise; but the gravity of the sickness had been very much exaggerated. A servant of his own had suffered from fever, and he had helped to nurse him. There was a good deal of exhaustion and oppression, but he shortly recovered; and he was assured by his medical attendant there was no fear of its return. Important objects were sought to be secured by the possession of the Island; and being so close to Asia Minor, with a mixed population of varying creeds, it presented an admirable opportunity for carrying out some of the reforms which were very much wanted. He had made the acquaintance of some of the principal landowners, who were wealthy men; and they had assured him that while formerly they had been obliged to arm their servants, since they came under British rule they had been able to sleep with open doors without their accustomed protectors. With reference to the ecclesiastical question, he had an interview with the Archbishop of Cyprus, who told him that they hailed with the greatest satisfaction the advent of the British rule; that they felt secure under British rule; that they felt their religion would be respected; and that the English and Greeks would continue to work together for the good of the whole community. He (Sir Edmund Lechmere), however, could not close his eyes against certain things that were anomalies in the Island, and he hoped the Government would take the proper means to remove them. He thought there would be great advantage in securing the services of a better class of interpreters. This would be a great satisfaction to the people of Cyprus. At present they were derived from a class little better than dragomans. The import duty levied on goods arriving at Cyprus from Egypt was a very high one. The Egyptian export duty was 1 per cent to English ports and 8 per cent to Turkish ports; and on arrival at Cyprus goods were charged another 8 per cent, on the ground that it was not a Turkish, but an English port. This was a matter which required the attention of the Government. He thought great care should be taken to avoid taxing too heavily the industries of the Island; and that, on the contrary, everything possible should be done to encourage and develop its industries and natural resources. It was probable that any accumulation of property would bring a visit from the tax-gatherer. There was a duty on building material which ought certainly to be abolished. He thought the Government should do their best rather to improve the Oriental institutions of the Island than to Anglicize them, since the Orientals clung to their old institutions, and were unwilling to give them up. He considered that ample reasons had been given for the retention of the Island under the administration of the Foreign Office; and if, in the future, it was possible there might be a military depôt under the War Office, at the same time the fiscal arrangements might be under the Colonial Office. Coming in contact with a number of well-informed persons of various nationalities in French and Austrian ships, he was glad to hear universal approval of our action in acquiring Cyprus, which was considered to have added to the prestige of this country. His own favourable opinion of the policy of the Government had not been shaken by anything he had heard. He believed they had secured an advantageous position, from which they might exert a useful and reforming influence; but he hoped the Island might in time become the absolute property of this country, and that they might also obtain the Island of Rhodes, which, being salubrious and having a less variable temperature, would be valuable as a "sanatorium." The fortifications there, once held by the Knights of St. John, could be easily adapted for barracks, and in other respects the Island would be a valuable acquisition.

MR. H. SAMUELSON agreed with much that had fallen from the hon. Baronet (Sir Edmund Lechmere), and particularly that the vast majority of the inhabitants of Cyprus welcomed British rule; but he did not concur in what was said about the salubrity of the Island. He was told that last year the temperature had been but a few degrees above what it was normally in the months of July, August, and September. He was there in September, the most unhealthy month, and the hon. Baronet in November and December, the more healthy season. But his own muleteer—a Cypriot—like the hon. Baronet's servant—a Turk—was stricken with the fever, which attacked Natives equally with Europeans, and repeatedly, too; so that, as medical observers remarked, the Natives had the general appearance of men imbued with the seeds of malaria. No doubt, there was increased security now; but the insecurity was formerly mainly due to the depredations of Turkish criminals, and not to the acts of Cypriots, who rarely brought themselves within the criminal law. The Government declared they had selected Cyprus as the best place they could find for their purpose; the hon. Baronet, however, said Rhodes would have been better; at any rate, it had an harbour; while Crete, a footing in which might have been acquired on easier terms, had an harbour at Suda Bay that would hold the Fleets of the world. He was told that efficient and trustworthy interpreters were much wanted, but that they would cost more than the Government of the Island could afford to pay them. The "model farm" theory had been adopted by the hon. Baronet; and if the exact phrase had not been used by the Ministry, it was a fair illustration of their language, for the Under Secretary of State had spoken of the Island affording an example of good government to Asia Minor; and the Chancellor of the Exchequer, while disclaiming presenting a "model farm," spoke of using it to show the Turks what was to be possible in the way of improvement and good government. Then the noble Earl the Prime Minister said that Cyprus was admirably suited to be a place of arms, and that they had fixed on it after having examined all the other Islands in the East of the Mediterranean. He did not know when that examination was made; at all events, they had not had any Papers on the subject; but if of all the Islands in the East of the Mediterranean, Cyprus was the most suitable for their purpose, then it was plain that no Island in the East of the Mediterranean was suitable. It was said the Island would pay its way in due time. That might be; but not a single penny had been spent as yet on improving it, though they were told that next year roads were to be made that would cost £28,000, which they were to borrow, and that £6,000 would be spent on Government buildings, of which the Island was entirely destitute. He considered it most anomalous that works of this description should be placed under the Foreign Office. The hon. Gentleman the Under Secretary of State had talked of the intense pleasure which Gentlemen on that (the Opposition) side felt at the difficulties which the Government experienced. But that was no wonder, seeing they believed, and had said all along, that the Government had made an enormous blunder in occupying the Island, and were committing this country to great expense, to no purpose. The hon. Gentleman had said that they were attacking Sir Garnet Wolseley. There was no hon. Member who would make an attack on one who had proved himself an admirable General; but for all that, he thought it would be better if in such positions military men were replaced as Governors by tried civilians. He denied that there was any parallel between the "statute labour," as the hon. Gentleman called it, of the Island of Cyprus and that which prevailed in our North American Colonies — Nova Scotia, for example. There it existed in the form of a voluntary arrangement to work instead of paying for the repair of roads; but there was no voluntary arrangement on the part of the inhabitants of Cyprus, who were forced to labour under a despotic Turkish law, which even the Turks had for a long time not enforced. He hoped, now that the matter had been exposed, they had heard the last of this system of enforced labour, which was not creditable to the British Government, and was anything but a good example to the Porte for the government of Asia Minor. From beginning to end there was a confusion of laws. No one knew under what National

Code the Island was administered. With regard to flogging, under the Turkish law that punishment was strictly legal; and he asked whether, because the zaptiehs were subject to the bastinado, the police raised under the Foreign Office were to be subject to it also? It would be a singular thing if the Government introduced into Cyprus a system which, owing to the exertions of the hon. Member for Rochester (Mr. Otway), had been abolished in the British Service. They were told that foreigners residing in Cyprus were to come under the jurisdiction of our Courts; but what would happen supposing any foreign country refused to agree to this breach of the Capitulations? Was it possible that Her Majesty's Government, without the consent of foreign countries, would relieve themselves from the binding force of these engagements? With respect to the employment of the Islanders in Government labour at the commencement of the occupation, and afterwards, he had authority for saying that it had greatly injured the prospects of the grain harvest in the Island by diminishing the amount of labour necessary for work in the fields. It had been said that the labourers would receive more money under the improved system, as it was called; but even if that were so, he believed that the Island would suffer loss, inasmuch as the progress of agriculture would be seriously interfered with. Then, as regarded the harbour and town of Famagousta, they could not doubt, from the official evidence in their hands, that the harbour and town were unhealthy, and that they were not more unhealthy than the neighbouring plains. [The hon. Member read an extract from a report by a civil engineer—who was, on the whole, greatly in favour of the occupation—in reference to the harbour, which went to prove that it would be both difficult and costly to construct a harbour in that place.] [*Cries of* "Name, name!"] He did not like to state the name of the gentleman at that moment, as he had left it behind him, and was not quite sure that he correctly recollected it; but he would give it to the hon. Baronet opposite (Sir George Elliot), or to any other Member privately——

SIR GEORGE BOWYER rose to Order. He wished to know whether the hon. Member was in order in appealing to a high authority, and then being unable to give his name to the House?

MR. H. SAMUELSON said, he was always willing to give way to the hon. and learned Baronet; but there were occasions when hon. Gentlemen could not give their authorities, as he had explained. The engineer in question was author of an article in the February number of *The Journal of the Society of Arts*, which was accessible to every hon. Member.

SIR GEORGE BOWYER said, that when an hon. Gentleman gave someone as a high authority he ought to be prepared with his name.

MR. SPEAKER said, that the hon. Member was quite in Order in referring to the document. If, however, he did not give the name of the author, the House could take the authority for what it was worth.

MR. H. SAMUELSON hoped that nothing would be done towards the construction of a harbour in Cyprus until the plans were laid before the House, the cost was estimated, and full opportunity was given for discussing the entire question. There were some pertinent questions he should like to put to the Government on this question of Cyprus. He should like to know, for instance, what was to be the recognized coinage of the Island? Was it to be English or Turkish? Again, under what flag was a Cypriot ship to sail—English or Turkish? If a Cypriot committed murder on the high seas, by what law was he to be tried? Or, if he committed a crime in Constantinople, was he to be tried by the Consular Court, or by what other authority? Then, again, with reference to the status of the inhabitants of Cyprus and the administration of justice in the Island, he was informed in Cyprus that no Petition was allowed to be received by the Courts in the Greek language. They must be written in Turkish, and might be accompanied by an English translation. He had put a Question the other day to the hon. Gentleman the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Mr. Bourke), asking whether Petitions that were not in the Turkish tongue were entertained, and received an answer to the effect that the hon. Gentleman did not know, and at his (Mr. Samuelson's) request, he promised to obtain information upon the subject.

Mr. BOURKE: The hon. Member does not seem to have a very good memory. He says my answer to his Question was that I knew nothing about it.

Mr. H. SAMUELSON: The hon. Gentleman was not in his place when I used the words, and I do not know where he heard me from. Some words I uttered appear to have caught his ear. What I said was, that when I put a Question to him the other day as to whether petitions other than in the Turkish language were received, he told me he did not know as to the petitions. He did answer another part of my Question.

Mr. BOURKE: What I object to, Sir, was, that the hon. Member said a moment ago, that when he put a Question to me the other day, I answered that I knew nothing about it. Those are his words. Now, I appeal to the House whether that was my answer? I deny, Sir, that that was my answer, or anything like it.

Mr. H. SAMUELSON: I rise to Order, Mr. Speaker. I wish to know if I am in possession of the House? By some curious and unfortunate misapprehension the hon. Gentleman has managed to distort my meaning. [" Oh, oh!"]

Mr. BOURKE: You used the words.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. Member is, no doubt, bound by his words; but he says he did not use these words.

Mr. H. SAMUELSON: I did not intend to say the hon. Gentleman knew nothing of the subject generally.

Mr. BOURKE: You said so.

Mr. H. SAMUELSON: The hon. Gentleman said he knew nothing of the question of petitions. He did not know anything about it, and he knew nothing about it now. If he did, why could not he tell the House what he knew, as he (Mr. Samuelson) now challenged him to do. ["Order, order!"] These interruptions rather interrupted the current of one's ideas. It seemed to him a strange thing that they should compel the population of Cyprus to petition in a language which was only the language of a small minority of the inhabitants of the Island. He had also to complain of the partiality that was shown to the Turks at Larnaca and elsewhere. At Larnaca four Turks were placed on the municipal tribunal, and only two Greeks, and the Turks formed but one-tenth of the population of the town. Referring to a statement made by the Prime Minister on February 14th, he asked what extent of land in Cyprus came under the head of the Sultan's private estate? He had been informed that nearly one-half the Island did so; but possibly the statement was not correct. If they were to gain any advantage from the Island, either in the sense that it was to prove a model of good government to the Turks, to be a place of arms, or a naval station—the attention of the Government must be turned, without delay, to the erection of the necessary buildings. When he was at Larnaca there were enormous quantities of valuable stores lying about exposed to the air. At present there were no harbours, no roads, no railways, no quays, few trees, and very little water. He thought the Government ought to place in the hands of the House some Papers showing what they proposed doing with reference to the Island.

Sir GEORGE ELLIOT said, he would not have spoken had it not been for certain remarks that had fallen from the hon. Member for Chelsea. Some time ago he had addressed the House, and he then pointed out what he thought was the best mode of improving the sanitary condition of the towns of Cyprus, especially those on the sea coast. Its unhealthiness arose from the want of drainage. The Island was small, and there was no river sufficiently large to produce a volume of water to find its way to the sea, but was stopped before reaching it. The sea itself was almost tideless, and the rain water collected together on the soil and formed large marshes. In his opinion, however, it would not be a difficult thing to produce an improved state of things. Nearly every one of the towns specially subject to unhealthiness was built at the base of an inclined plane, down which the water flowed, yet was unable to break its way through the soil and sand to the sea. The consequence was the formation of a deadly marsh. To remedy this, he thought the water should be collected, and either lifted into the sea or forced back to irrigate the land behind it. Famagousta, he predicted, would be a great place at no distant day. It had all the elements for a harbour. It had 85 acres of dock. [An hon. Member: Made?] Yes, made as clearly as any dock at Birkenhead, Liverpool, or Cardiff. All it wanted was what the docks of any of those other places would want if they were neglected a quarter of the time that Famagousta had been. It wanted dredging, having got silted up merely by lapse of time. It was all inclosed and sheltered; it had got its mole, its entrance, and everything perfect; and a better situation than Famagousta for a dock could not have been selected. He had not seen a better place in the Mediterranean, or one which was more easily capable of being made to meet all the requirements either of commerce or of war. He would challenge any engineer to contradict that statement, in spite of the authority who wrote the stupid article quoted by the last speaker as having been read before the Society of Arts. He ventured to say that the writer of the article had no repute in Great George Street. The Government said they would lay down no railways; but he hoped they would change their mind on that point and make a narrow-gauge line to Nicosia, which would be of great service. He did not say it would be impossible to make a harbour at Larnaca; but it was not desirable to do so when they had such a convenient place for the purpose as Famagousta. With regard to the system of forced labour, he took it that there could be no intention of introducing it into any of our dominions. As to slavery, there were no doubt slaves. There had always been eunuchs, who were really slaves, and who were necessary for the government of the establishments where they ruled. If sanitary and other improvements such as he suggested were effected; and if England, taking the bolder course, acquired the fee simple of the land from the Porte, and secured the unconditional enjoyment of the Island, there would be no difficulty in finding private capital and enterprize that would prove beneficial to the Island.

MR. T. BRASSEY, having recently visited Cyprus, asked leave to present to the House the result of a personal examination of our most recent acquisition. He went to Cyprus unprejudiced and unbiased, and he came away convinced that in our hands the Island would certainly be prosperous. As a place of arms it was useless. As a coaling station it might prove valuable. Cyprus was not adapted for a place of arms, partly because of its climate. There could be no question as to the miserable condition, to which the troops who first landed had been reduced. It might be that the summer of 1878 was exceptionally unhealthy. The troops would, doubtless, have suffered less in permanent barracks, or in the mud huts of the natives, or in the barracks it was now proposed to build on the Troados. Assuming, however, that the troops could retain their health in the Troados, it was scarcely conceivable that they could occupy such a position in any considerable numbers, without a large expenditure in transport. During his visit to Cyprus he spent two days on the Troados, and remained one night at the monastery of Kikho, 4,000 feet above the sea level. At that elevation the mountains were almost precipitous. The only vegetation consisted of the fir and the vine. Provisions must be carried up on camels. Roads for carts were impracticable. Even a railway on the Righi system, as proposed by the hon. and learned Member for Oxford (Sir William Harcourt), was impossible. With so many disadvantageous features, strategical and sanitary, it could not be contended that Cyprus was important as a place of arms. A fleet of steam transports must be a more effective base of operation in Syria, and the possession of Cyprus would not supersede the necessity for a commodious harbour on the mainland. As a coaling station, Cyprus possessed great natural facilities. They were informed by the Hydrographer that an inexpensive breakwater would render Famagousta available for the coaling of our Fleet, and a secure anchorage for six large ships of war. He doubted the necessity for any new works, other than a light iron pier for the mere purpose of coaling the Fleet. The outlying rocks would afford excellent shelter for a pier of sufficient length to allow of two ships being coaled simultaneously. At present six or eight steamers of moderate size could find an anchorage in all weathers. The easterly gales, to which Famagousta was exposed, seldom blew with violence. The sea wall at Larnaca, which was exposed to the full range of the swell from the south and east, was only six feet above the water. The rickety buildings at Larnaca and Limasol, which were almost washed by the sea in fine weather, received no injury from the winter gales. Whatever the decision of the Government might be as to a breakwater, he trusted that no attempt would be made to establish a naval station or a mercantile port at Famagousta. It was the most unhealthy town in Cyprus. If the Fleet were detained at Famagousta during the summer season, the health of the crews would be most seriously affected. When they turned from the political question to the capabilities of the soil of Cyprus, they found themselves on less controversial ground. The plain of Messarea was admirably adapted to the growth of wheat. The plain of Morfu produced madder. If properly made, the wine would be excellent; and all descriptions of fruit were abundant. He had received from the Commissioners at Larnaca and at Limasol letters conveying the most favourable impressions of the agricultural prospects of the Island. New potatoes were offered for sale in December at 1*d.* per lb. The growth of wine had been doubled; and the inhabitants needed only the assurance that our occupation would be permanent to induce them to make further exertions. Here we opened up a large question. Were we going to remain in Cyprus? He fully concurred with the leading Members of his Party in the wish that we had never gone there; but he held that, once having entered upon an occupation, we could not surrender the Island to the Turks, without great injustice to the inhabitants, and that to attempt to establish any form of self-government would be quite premature. He proceeded, therefore, to consider the position, on the assumption that our occupation would be permanent. Such being the case, the terms, under which that occupation was commenced, would require revision in many essential particulars. We must ourselves acquire the nominal sovereignty still retained by the Sultan, and relieve the Island from the payment of an annual tribute of £115,000 a-year. Under the terms of the present Convention, England stood in an unworthy position. We were tax-gatherers for a bad Government. The tribute was a heavy burden upon Cyprus. The majority of the people were miserably poor, and they had perhaps been impoverished by the very circumstance that the tribute had been too heavy for their scanty resources. The amount of the tribute was based on Turkish estimates, and on Turkish notions of administrative responsibility. The so-called surplus was only realized by ignoring all the reciprocal duties of a Government towards its subjects. The total Revenue of the Island was £170,000. A portion of this amount was derived from taxes, which must be repealed; and when the tribute, the salaries of local officials, justice, and police, had been provided for, a paltry surplus of £15,000 would remain to do all that was required in so large an Island, after the neglect and misgovernment of ages. Once relieved of the heavy burden, which Cyprus was compelled to bear, while in bondage to the Porte, the Local Government would possess ample resources, without the aid of the Imperial Parliament. It could resist all unjust taxation. It could make Cyprus a free port, and the great depôt for the trade with Syria and Asia Minor. It would be able to construct a railway, if a railway were thought necessary, and to cover the expenses of new roads, public buildings, and the planting of forests. Once let the people be assured of the honest administration of justice, and of protection for life and property, and we might safely leave in their own hands the development of the material resources of Cyprus. Whatever could be usefully done, to co-operate with the spontaneous enterprize of the people, would certainly be undertaken with zeal and enlightened philanthropy by Sir Garnet Wolseley and his able staff. As an example of the spirit in which those gallant gentlemen had undertaken their task, he would read an extract from a communication lately received from Colonel Warren, the Commissioner at Larnaca—

> "You may not approve of our being here, but we have to labour here to make England's name respected and beloved. Do not believe that our mission here is a small and humble one. We in Cyprus have already commenced to show what a beneficial and just rule means. Syrians, inhabitants from the neighbouring countries, men from Beyrout, Alexandria, and the Lebanon, are here, and have revisited their homes, which still lie under Turkish Government. These speak out their minds; and soon the clamour of the people will necessitate a change in the manner of ruling in Asia Minor. When people demand what the whole world knows that they deserve, they will assuredly get it. The holding of Cyprus will be the leaven in the mass of dough. Do not let your politics stop the good work."

Colonel Warren thus proceeded to speak of the foundation of schools, and concluded by saying—

> "We have a pier now; our market is finished; we have planted trees, widened roads, and are working as Englishmen ought. Give us words of encouragement now and then."

The advantages to England of the acquisition of Cyprus were problematical. To the Cypriots the substitution of such men as Colonel Warren and his colleagues, for the corrupt officials of the Sultan, must be an unmixed blessing.

SIR JOHN HAY entirely agreed with the hon. Member for Hastings (Mr. T. Brassey) on the general question; but he wished to point out that if it was necessary—as he believed it was—for us to have a harbour, coaling station, and port in the eastern part of the Mediterranean, the present unhealthiness of the place ought to be no bar to the occupation of Cyprus. There were, no doubt, means by which the Island might be made healthy. He had the honour of serving when the Island of Hong Kong was occupied, and for three years great unhealthiness prevailed amongst the troops and the seamen. At that time there was the same outcry against the occupation of Hong Kong as there was now against that of Cyprus. But Hong Kong was now as healthy as almost any Island in the tropics, and it had yielded all the advantages which were anticipated from it. It had given us a hold upon the China Seas and the commerce of that part of the world, which had fully repaid us for the difficulty and danger in originally occupying it. And if it were true—as he believed it was—that they ought to have a naval station in the East of the Mediterranean, the position of Cyprus was one of the best that could be obtained. He wished to say a few words on the advantage of having such a station for our men-of-war. It had been pointed out, in a very able Paper which had gained the gold medal at the United Service Institution—and he believed it was not disputed—that the coaling capacity of their men-of-war represented generally a distance of about 3,000 miles; so that a ship could not be despatched to a greater distance than about 1,500 miles from a coaling station. It was, therefore, exceedingly desirable that, in the event of war, they should possess a coaling station between Malta and Aden, in order to protect the Suez Canal and serve as a stepping-stone on the road to India; and besides being of the greatest advantage as a naval and coaling station, would prove highly useful for the protection of their trade. It must be remembered that while Port Said offered a coaling station during peace, it would be neutral territory during war, and therefore not available as a coaling station for our ships either stationed in the Levant, or on their way to the Red Sea and Indian Ocean. Good and sufficient reason therefore, had been shown for the occupation of such an Island. With regard to the harbour of Famagousta, he referred the House to the opinions expressed by the Hydrographer of the Navy and Admiral Hornby. The Hydrographer reported, as the result of a preliminary examination made early in the present year, that the harbour of Famagousta was capable of affording shelter from the south-east gales of winter for vessels of from 20 to 22 feet draught; and Admiral Hornby, in inclosing this Report, said that after the erection of a breakwater, which it was said could be made at a small cost, 14 iron-clads might be moored there under its shelter in five fathoms of water with a good bottom at one cable apart. Now, the grand harbour of Malta could only accommodate nine iron-clads, at three-quarters of a cable apart; so that Famagousta, when improved, would afford a better harbour than the grand harbour of Malta. It was on these grounds that he believed Cyprus to be a great naval acquisition.

MR. DODSON thought he had probably a longer personal acquaintance with Cyprus than any other hon. Member in the House, and, so far as his experience went, he could say that during the last year it was about the best abused Island in the world. When he visited Cyprus he saw no signs of the unhealthiness of which they had heard so much. On the contrary, the inhabitants appeared healthy and robust. It was true that a great deal of sickness prevailed among the soldiers stationed there. That, however, was not the fault of the climate of Cyprus, but of those who sent 9,000 or 10,000 men there, when 500 or 600 men would have sufficed, to swelter in bell tents in the heat of summer without sanitary arrangements, without occupation, or amusement. The same thing would have occurred, under similar circumstances, in the West Indies, or Gibraltar, or any other tropical or sub-tropical climate. Her Majesty's Government were in a dilemma. If they did not know when they sent that large force to Cyprus the docile character of its population and its utter want of accommodation for troops, they were guilty of grasping at the possession of the Island without acquiring as much information about it as they might have learnt from a school geography or a traveller's handbook; and if they did know these things, they had risked the health of our men for the sake of a portion of a policy of bluster and display. Cyprus, he believed, was at least as healthy as the average of places in the Levant. It was an Island of infinite fertility and of great resources and natural beauty. But what did they want with Cyprus? And what use was it to be to them? The Prime Minister told a deputation from California that it was capable of containing an illimitable military power. But they had not got an illimitable military power, and if they had they would not want to place it in Cyprus. He believed Cyprus had been taken with the idea that it would be a valuable naval station, and the Prime Minister had said that it was selected after examining all the other Islands in the Eastern Mediterranean—words which implied that they had not examined Cyprus itself. The ideal of a naval station was a small Island with a large harbour; but Cyprus was a large Island with no harbour at all. A rocky islet like Scarpanto, with its land-locked harbour Tristoma, would have been better adapted to our wants. True, the harbour of Famagousta was now proclaimed to be better than that of Malta, only there was the fatal objection that it did not exist, and still had to be created. Then, again, it had often been said that Cyprus would be valuable as a coaling station; but Cyprus was further from Malta than either Alexandria or Port Said. The Report made to the Admiralty as to the harbour of Famagousta only showed the magnitude of the works that we should have to undertake. The old Venetian harbour was silted up, and when dredged and excavated would not be suitable for any but mercantile purposes. For the reception of ships of war, a breakwater must be constructed a mile or more in length upon a broken and sunken reef of rooks. That was not a very promising state of things; and even when all the works were complete the entrance to the harbour would prove an awkward one except to steamers. The Report went on to describe Famagousta itself. It was, as he knew, the most unhealthy place in the Island; but he should never have believed it to be so deadly a town as to necessitate the elaborate measures described as requisite to make it simply habitable. A lake was to be drained, lagoons were to be filled up and planted; and while the trees were growing, what might not happen to the Armenian Frontier? According to this Report, earth, air, and water must be changed, to make Famagousta serviceable. Now, it did not appear that the Government had any present intentions respecting the place. The First Lord of the Admiralty, indeed, had spoken of future contingencies, but had been indefinite as to time; and the Foreign Secretary had referred to the time when "England might be called upon to defend actively her interests in that part of the world," and that, he had implied, would be time enough for us to consider our position. No doubt, it was probable that nothing would be done at present; but some day an alarmist Ambassador at Constantinople would frighten the Government, and a Vote would be taken for works at Famagousta. Very naturally the Government was loth to begin the great expenditure that would be necessary, because our position in Cyprus was peculiar. He would refer hon. Members to the assurances given to foreign Powers as to our tenure of the Island. Lord Salisbury, in a despatch to M. Waddington, dated July, 1878, had declared that our possession of Cyprus was provisional only, and was not intended to last longer than our defensive alliance with Turkey. If, then, that defensive alliance were in any way broken off, their occupation of Cyprus would be at an end also; and if they were to leave the place, what would be their position with regard to compensation for material improvements? Hon. Members would see by the *annexe* of the Anglo-Turkish Convention and the correspondence thereon that they waived claims for compensation. Lord

Salisbury objected to the introduction of any such clause in the Convention; but he wrote to Sir Henry Layard, to the effect that he did not object to the principle that, in the event of their leaving the Island, they should not require compensation for money spent by them in improvements, unless such improvements were yielding an annual revenue to Her Majesty's Government, or the money had been advanced by private capitalists. The consequence was that if they were to retire from Cyprus after having constructed a military harbour at Famagousta, barracks for their troops, prisons, sanitary works, and done other works of that character, not yielding a revenue, Her Majesty's Government would not be entitled to receive any compensation for those works, and the British money which had been expended upon them would be completely sunk in the Island. He had listened with satisfaction to some of the statements which had been made by the hon. Gentleman the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs with regard to financial matters. There was, indeed, it seemed, a sum of £5,000 to be paid in perpetuity to the Sultan; but he presumed, nevertheless, that the payment would cease if they were to retire from the Island. Someone in the course of the debate had said they hoped they were not going to Anglicize Cyprus. They had, however, begun the work of civilization by creating a debt to the extent of £28,000. As to farming the tithe, which was to be abolished, he would observe that a tithe as understood by Turkey was generally more than one-tenth; but he would add that a tithe in Cyprus had the advantage over a land settlement such as that in India, that it varied with the circumstances of the season. The system was, therefore, convenient in a country where there was little or no capital belonging to, or to be borrowed by, the cultivators to carry them through a bad season. He had heard with satisfaction that the Customs duties on exports—which amounted, he believed, to only 1 per cent—were to be done away with, and that the tax on sheep and goats would receive the attention of the Government, he hoped with a view to its abolition. He agreed with his hon. Friend the Member for Hastings (Mr. T. Brassey), that now they were in possession of Cyprus it was their duty while they continued to be its rulers, both out of regard to the interests of the inhabitants and their own credit, to endeavour to administer its affairs as well as they could, and to make the laws there more equal and just than they had hitherto been. Up to the present time, however, they had, in his opinion, only involved themselves in a series of anomalies. The Anglo-Turkish Convention recited that we had occupied Cyprus to enable us to defend the Armenian Frontier, which was, on the face of it, absurd. It was sometimes said that Cyprus was to hold an illimitable military force, which they had not; it was sometimes spoken of as a great naval station, although it had no harbour; while, again, it was said that it was to be made a model of good government to every Pasha in Asia, although it seemed very doubtful whether they were not resorting to forced labour, and, in other respects, imitating Oriental Rulers. They were tributaries to the Sultan; they had not got the fee simple of the Island; they had not even got a lease of it. Their tenure of it, in short, was quite uncertain; and if they were called upon to leave it at any moment, they could not, so far as he could see, be entitled to compensation for works, without which the place was valueless. He hoped the Government would seriously turn their attention to those matters. If they could obtain the fee simple of the Island it would be better, he thought, than the precarious position which they now held with respect to it; and unless they acquired that fee simple it was a question whether they had not better be quit of it. At all events, he hoped the Government would not be so chary of giving information with regard to it in future, and would lose no time in laying all the Papers connected with the subject on the Table.

Mr. MAC IVER said, the right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Dodson) had begun his speech in a spirit of noble independence, but as he went on, the temptation to attack the Government—honestly, if he could, but still to attack them—became too strong for him. On the other hand, the speech of his hon. Friend the Member for Hastings (Mr. T. Brassey) had greatly disappointed him. He commenced his speech with a weak attack upon the Government, which, afterwards, the facts did not support; but as he went on his honourable nature gained the ascendant, and his natural truthfulness compelled him to do the Government more justice. At any rate, he must congratulate him upon his appreciation of the great fact that, whether or no the English Government were right in acquiring Cyprus, we had, at all events, got it, and it was our duty to administer its affairs with the object we had in view when we acquired it. As for the speech of the hon. Baronet the Member for Chelsea, who introduced this subject, it was evidently addressed to an audience outside that House, and the statements it contained were only part of the truth. There was, for instance, no real analogy between the harbours of Alderney and Famagousta. He had no doubt Famagousta could be made as good a harbour as had been predicted. The statement of the Hydrographer to the Navy was an absolute contradiction of that made by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Chester (Mr. Dodson). The Hydrographer's Report, taken in conjunction with the speech of the hon. Baronet (Sir George Elliot) who spoke behind him (Mr. Mac Iver), and who had practical knowledge of the subject, ought to satisfy any reasonable man that there would be no great difficulty in making a harbour at Famagousta. As to the denunciation of forced labour in Cyprus, it was a very different kind of thing to what had taken place in Egypt in the construction of the Suez Canal. We should not attempt too rapidly to Anglicize Cyprus; but what we had done was, at all events, an improvement, and would infinitely benefit the inhabitants of that Island, and he had no doubt would justify the arguments that had been used by more than one Minister. People with whom he traded in the Mediterranean informed him that the whole of the East of the Mediterranean, last summer, was exceptionally unhealthy, and Cyprus was not worse than the coast of Barbary, or the coast of Syria. He knew that some persons in the Island had certain aspirations, expecting that when the English came they would put down the Turks in favour of the Greeks, and that they would gain Cyprus in the same way that they gained the Ionian Islands. The surrender of the Ionian Islands, by the Ministry of which the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Greenwich was a Member—and on his recommendation—he regarded as the first symptom of decadence of the British Empire. He feared that if the right hon. Gentleman came again into Office, the same fate that had overtaken the Ionian Islands would befall Cyprus. He trusted that that time would never come, to which some persons were looking forward, when the destinies of this country would again pass into the hands of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Greenwich. He regarded the accession of Lord Beaconsfield as the era of the revival of the national prestige, and trusted the power would long remain in the same hands.

Sir WILLIAM HARCOURT said, he did not know by what right it was that the hon. Gentleman assumed that it was only those who supported Her Majesty's Government who were governed by honourable and truthful motives. Let him tell the hon. Gentleman that before he lectured Gentlemen on this side of the House—["Oh, oh!"]——

Mr. MAC IVER begged to call the hon. and learned Gentleman to Order. ["Chair, chair!"] He never said a word of the kind.

Sir WILLIAM HARCOURT said, before the hon. Gentleman lectured Gentlemen on the Opposition side of the House, he had better make himself acquainted——

Mr. MAC IVER again rose amid loud cries of "Order!"

Sir WILLIAM HARCOURT said, he would not yield to the hon. Gentleman.

Mr. MAC IVER rose to explain.

Sir WILLIAM HARCOURT said, he did not yield to the hon. Gentleman. ["Order!" "Chair!"]

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. and learned Gentleman is in possession of the House; and if, at the close of his address the hon. Member for Birkenhead desires to make any explanation, he would have an opportunity of doing so with the indulgence of the House.

Sir WILLIAM HARCOURT said, he should always be the first man to yield to any Gentleman who desired to make an explanation when he addressed the House in a becoming manner; but, in his opinion, the language which the hon. Gentleman addressed to Members on the Opposition side of the House was not becoming.

MR. MAC IVER again rose amid cries of "Order!"

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT said, he did not yield to the hon. Member, because he thought the language which he used with reference to the hon. Member for Hastings (Mr. T. Brassey) and others on the Opposition side was not language which ought to be employed. If he might give a bit of advice to the hon. Gentleman, it would be to make himself a little better acquainted with the political history of this country before presuming to make such remarks as those with which he closed his speech. The hon. Gentleman seemed to attribute the giving up of the Ionian Islands to his right hon. Friend the Member for Greenwich. The hon. Member was a very young Member of the House, and probably had not begun to study politics at the time the event in question occurred; otherwise, he would know that the mission of his right hon. Friend the Member for Greenwich to the Ionian Islands was undertaken at the instance of a Conservative Government. He was sent there by the late Lord Lytton during the Government of the late Lord Derby, and the cession of the Ionian Islands was not made by his right hon. Friend the Member for Greenwich, but by Lord Palmerston. He now passed from the hon. Member and his language to matters of more importance. It had been often asked, during that debate, why they were at Cyprus at all after the inquiries and investigations that they were told were made with reference to the Islands in the East of the Mediterranean; and his hon. Friends had complained that they had got no information from the Foreign Office as to those investigations, of which surely there ought to be some record. But the curiosity of hon. Members would be satisfied when they learned that it was not in any recent Blue Book that it was to be found. The fact was that the acquisition of Cyprus was determined upon at a much earlier period, and the record of it might be found in works that were not, perhaps, so official, but far more interesting, than any Blue Book. By referring to it, he thought he could tell them when the investigations into the Islands of the Ægean were made which determined that the Island should be acquired. The work to which he referred said—

> "The English want Cyprus, and they will take it as compensation. The English will not do the business of the Turks for nothing. They will take this city and occupy it. They want a new market for their cotton, and, mark me, England will never be satisfied until the people of Jerusalem wear calico turbans."

There was the investigation which at a much earlier period determined that England should acquire Cyprus, and should not do the work of the Turks again for nothing. It would be found in a work entitled, *Tancred; or, the New Crusade*, and if hon. Members wished to know the name of the author, he would tell them. After this, of course, it was unnecessary to go any further into the matter. Now that they had Cyprus, everybody admitted that it ought to be made better than it was; but, curiously enough, this was a possibility which never seemed about to be realized. He was not going to enter into any controversy about Famagousta—whether it was as good a harbour as that of Birkenhead but for the accidental circumstance of its having 15 feet of sewage in it. The House was relieved from all difficulty in the matter, because it had it on the authority of the Foreign Secretary that nothing was to be done to the harbour of Famagousta. It was, indeed, suggested that some future Administration might be absurd enough to make a harbour at Famagousta; but that was an assumption that some future Administration would be more unwise than the present one; and, though he did not say that was an impossibility, it was, at least, improbable. If Her Majesty's Government, having acquired Cyprus, were not going to do anything with it, he thought their Successors would follow their example, and not waste money by making a harbour at Famagousta. They might, therefore, pretty safely dismiss Famagousta from their consideration. In a Correspondence between the Foreign Secretary and the Porte as to the improvement of Asia Minor, one of the arguments of the Porte was that they were unable, although willing, to perform their promises, because they had not got any money. Our administration of Cyprus seemed to be intended to show them how to do it without money. They were driven to every sort of shift, such as compelling people to work for inadequate wages. Then they were employing zaptiehs and police on what he should call the "cheap and nasty" principle, because they had not got any money; and they were starving everything in Cyprus in order to make good the statement that Cyprus was self-supporting, while all the time they knew it was nothing of the kind. The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs said they would have a very respectable surplus for public works; but he added that if it did not turn out so much as they expected they had taken power to borrow £28,000. That showed, at all events, that the Government had begun to make Cyprus a respectable place by laying the foundation of a National Debt. There were signs everywhere of their insolvent condition in Cyprus. What was the meaning of those pioneers on the Civil Service Estimates? Why were those people called "military pioneers?" His theory was that they were not really military people at all; but that, as the Government wanted people to do their civil work, and make good their assurances that Cyprus would pay, they called them military pioneers, and accordingly put them in the Estimates. The Government had placed themselves in a very false position. They wanted to be more Turkish than the Turk, in order to make good their promise to administer Cyprus for the Turk. It was for that purpose apparently that they flouted and snubbed the Greeks in every possible way. He had read in a book by Mr. Hepworth Dixon that the English Commissioners, in order to look as much like Turks as possible, had whips and horsetails in their hands, it having been the custom of the Turkish Commissioners to carry those articles. Because the Government were administering the Island for the Turks, they were obliged to give a certain amount of countenance to all sorts of things which English ideas very much disapproved. He hoped the Under Secretary for State would not be angry with him for saying that some things existed in Cyprus of which he knew nothing. When it was alleged that slavery existed in the Island the Under Secretary of State said it was not the case; but his hon. Friend the Member for Durham, (Sir George Elliot), who knew a great deal about Cyprus, told them that there were a great many slaves there, and the domestic institutions of the Island could not be carried on without them. Why had not the Government acquired Cyprus for themselves? Why had they not made it an English Island, which could have been administered under English law by the British Crown? That was a question the Government would have to answer. He would tell the Chancellor of the Exchequer why the Government did not adopt that policy, and he asked the right hon. Gentleman to deny it if he could. Time pressed, and they could not afford to wait. It was necessary for them to have Cyprus before they went to Berlin, and they were obliged to take it at the price that was asked for it. He should have thought that a permanent guarantee of a Protectorate of Asiatic Turkey was of such value to Turkey that it would be worth a free gift of the Island. The Turks were a very cute people, and preferred having hard cash to relying upon the guarantee and the Anglo-Turkish Convention. Thinking a cheque for £100,000 a very good thing, they allowed the Government to have the administration of the Island, though they would not hand it over to the English. He was not going again over the disputed point as to the health of Cyprus; but seeing the Secretary of State for War in his place, he desired to call his attention to the fact that the figures he gave the other day as to the sanitary condition of the Army had been distinctly challenged. He read the other day in *The Lancet* some remarks upon those figures. They were compared with the Returns laid on the Table of the House as to the health of the Army in other places. The statements given in *The Lancet* showed that the proportion of the deaths in Cyprus to strength was four times that of the troops in England, double that in India, more than double that in all the Colonies, except the Mauritius. Those comparisons were made on the average of the 10 years from 1867 to 1876. The average rate of death, according to that journal, in Cyprus was 37 per 1,000; in Bombay, 17 per 1,000; and in Bengal, 23 per 1,000; the last average being taken in years in which numerous visitations of cholera occurred. With regard to sickness, which was, perhaps, more important in connection with the efficiency of a force required for immediate action, the figures given by the Secretary of State for War were 4,298 per 1,000, so that it appeared that each man had been admitted to the hospital more than four times in each year included in his Report. *The Lancet* said that at Malta the admissions were 806 per 1,000; that was to say, the admissions into hospital in Cyprus were five times as numerous as the admissions in Malta, seven times as numerous as those at Gibraltar, three times as numerous as those in Bengal, four times as numerous as those at Madras, and three-and-a-half times as numerous as those of Bombay. The Secretary of State for War referred to the Mauritius as a proof that a place, originally unhealthy, afterwards became, by sanitary precautions being taken, more free from disease; but *The Lancet* spoke of that as an instance rather to the contrary, as the rate of admission had trebled since 1867.

COLONEL STANLEY: What I meant was that, although the Mauritius was an unhealthy quarter, there was a curious case to the contrary—namely, there had been a wave of epidemic which had become endemic. I was making merely a general comparison.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT said, the figures of the Secretary of State for War might possibly have been taken from those relating to the existing year in Cyprus; whereas those given in *The Lancet* were taken from other places upon an average of years. He would now like to ask what was the legal position of the Government in Cyprus. It seemed to be one of a most obscure character. His hon. Friend the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs told them that the Ordinance was issued in January. They had often heard about it, but had not been able to see it, and it had not been published in Cyprus. What had become of it since January? The Attorney General in July last had stated, in answer to a Question he had put to him, that British subjects would have justice administered to them in Cyprus according to their own laws; but no British subject had had British law administered to him since July. They had had Turkish law administered by people who did not understand either Turkish or British law. He did not yet quite understand what was to be done with the Ordinance. Was it to be applied to the Cyprians or to British subjects? There would, as he understood, be this difficulty—that there would be two codes of law in the Island—Turkish law for the Cypriots, and the Ordinance for British subjects. This was not a very convenient arrangement. [Mr. BOURKE explained that this was only a temporary arrangement.] But how long was it to last? Perhaps the occupation of Cyprus was only to be temporary, too. But whether the Ordinance was to be only temporary or not, he thought it would get the Government into a great difficulty. He understood the Under Secretary of State to say that foreigners in Cyprus were to be bound by the Ordinance, which was to exclude the jurisdiction under the Capitulations. But this was a very serious matter. These Capitulations were Treaties between European Powers and the Porte. Did they claim that, by a Convention between themselves and the Porte, or an Ordinance issued by the Queen in Council, they could annihilate these Treaties without the consent of the Powers? Was this in accordance with the Law of Nations? He had asked the Attorney General this Question last year; and the answer he received implied that their action depended upon the fact whether the foreign States put forward their claims or not. He did not know whether the Attorney General had acquired more courage since then, and was prepared to state how, by an Order in Council, they could terminate the Treaties of foreign States with another country, and so put an end to the Capitulations. But the Under Secretary said their administration would be so excellent that nobody would object to it. Well, if this was so, of course there was no difficulty. But he would not advise the Government to chance things of this kind. They had already got into several scrapes of this sort, and he would advise them not to get into any more. They had got into a scrape about extradition, when they maintained they had a right to impose conditions on the United States which were not in the Treaty, and after they had voted this by their majorities, they were obliged to give way and acknowledge that they were wrong; and at the present moment they were giving up prisoners to the United States without those conditions which they had held it was their duty to impose. That was not a good position to put a great country in. It was humiliating to a great country to advance claims it could not support. He would, therefore, recommend Her Majesty's Government to be very cautious in dealing with this matter. If they chose to prolong this ridiculous mixed occupation of Cyprus, their proper course was to go round Europe and get their authority recognized. But this was not a very dignified thing to do. How in the world was it possible that the Porte could give them a right as against third people without their consenting? Cyprus remained Turkish soil for 20 purposes as much as any part of Asia Minor, or Constantinople itself; and if that were so, how could they, if the claim was ever set up, dispute it? To go into matters blindfolded in this way was like a man buying an estate with a bad title on the chance of his never being found out. It seemed to him to be perfect madness to take a course of that kind. He trusted that the Attorney General would be as prudent at the present moment in giving advice to Her Majesty's Government as he was in July last; and that he would not lay down the doctrine that two countries together could destroy a Treaty, which had been made with several other Powers, without their consent.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Sir JOHN HOLKER): My hon. and learned Friend (Sir William Harcourt) has challenged me with some emphasis, and I cannot, therefore, altogether abstain from making a few observations on the legal objections which he has taken to the policy of Her Majesty's Government. He has given us advice—no doubt very disinterested advice—which the Government will attend to and, perhaps, follow. But the difficulty as to the advice which my hon. and learned Friend has given—at all events, the difficulty which occurs to my mind—is, that it is so vague that one does not exactly understand what it is. What kind of Ordinance my hon. and learned Friend would have framed it is quite impossible for us to imagine. It is, of course, not a very difficult thing to find fault, and the hon. and learned Gentleman is a great hand at that kind of criticism; but I should like to be able to judge of the sort of performance which would have come from him had he been in a position and required to act. With reference to the answers I gave in July last, I daresay they were in reply to Questions framed with a good deal of anxiety to make them as embarrassing as they could possibly be made; and I think I am hardly to be blamed—as I am, to a certain extent, responsible for the answers given to those Questions—for making them as cautious and circumspect as possible. I told him in July last, what I believe was perfectly correct, that, as things existed, Her Majesty's subjects would be governed by the laws which then applied in the Island of Cyprus. [Sir WILLIAM HARCOURT: My hon. and learned Friend said "British Law."] I doubt whether I did say that; and, as I cannot carry all these things in my mind, I shall be glad if he will read me the passage. It appears that I am reported in *Hansard* to have said—

> "Any power or jurisdiction which Her Majesty possesses by Treaty out of Her Majesty's dominions, the Queen may, by the Foreign Jurisdiction Act, exercise in as ample a manner as if Her Majesty had acquired it by the cession or conquest of territory."

And, further—

> "With regard to the population of the Island generally, law will be administered on this footing—British subjects will have justice administered to them according to their own laws, as they would at present."—[3 *Hansard*, ccxlii. 40-41.]

Well, at the time I spoke, I believed that British subjects in Turkey were entitled, under certain stipulations made between this country and the Ottoman Court, to have British law administered to them; and that was the position of British subjects at the time I answered the Question propounded so astutely by my hon. and learned Friend. I should have thought he would have known that himself. No doubt he did; but it was convenient to get an answer from myself as representing the Government. But since that time matters have been altered, and the power of Her Majesty with regard to Cyprus has very considerably increased. My answer was given in July; but in August a Convention was entered into between the Sultan and Her Majesty the Queen, by which Her Majesty, for a term of occupation, should have full power of making laws for the government of the Island in Her Majesty's name, and the regulation of its commerce and Consular affairs, free from the control of the Porte. Undoubtedly the Island was not ceded to the British Government; but Great Britain was allowed to occupy it and to administer its affairs. Thus, at that time, the law which I endeavoured to explain to my hon. and learned Friend prevailed. But after that time, Her Majesty acquired further powers, and the Sultan has now relinquished to Her the power of making laws for the regulation of the Island, its good government, and so on. It is, therefore, clear that after the answer given to my hon. and learned Friend, with which he does not seem substantially to quarrel, Her Majesty did acquire more authority in Cyprus than She formerly possessed. But let us endeavour to see of what it is that he now complains, and in ascertaining that, I fear there will be great difficulty. As far as it appears to me, his complaint was, that although the Sultan had given such powers to Her Majesty, Her Majesty had no right, by any Ordinance which She may make under the Treaty, to deal with any subjects other than British or Turkish subjects; or rather to deal with the subjects of any Power having Capitulations with the Ottoman Court. Now here, of course, arises, or there might arise, a question of considerable anxiety and of considerable difficulty. The Sultan has given to Her Majesty the occupation and administration of the Island. He has given up not only the occupation and administration of the Island, but he has given to Her Majesty the right to legislate, and the right to make Treaties. Therefore, he has relinquished to a highly civilized Power—perhaps the most civilized Power in the world, if I may venture to use the term—not only the right to occupy and to administer the affairs of the Island, but the right to legislate and make such laws as Her Majesty shall please, and to enter into such Conventions and Treaties with regard to that Island as She shall think proper. The reason why foreign Powers — take France or Italy, for example—made Conventions with the Porte, under which it was stipulated that, to a certain extent, and under certain conditions, the subjects of such Powers should be treated differently to Turkish subjects, was that the administration of the law by the Ottoman Courts was distrusted; because it was thought —and, perhaps, justly—that their tribunals were corrupt, and because it was considered by those Powers that entered into these Capitulations, and made these Conventions, that they could not rely upon the justice of the Porte being impartially administered to their subjects who might happen to be in Turkey. But as soon as the government and administration of the Island was handed over to Great Britain; as soon as Her Majesty was empowered to make laws for the Island; as soon as She had any power to enter into Treaties and Conventions with respect to the Island, surely the reasons for the Capitulations being entered into entirely ceased, and there was no reason to enforce their stipulations. I think it will not be considered unreasonable in me to express a wish that my hon. and learned Friend would take a somewhat broad and extended view of this position, when possibly he might come to the conclusion that the Capitulations are not binding upon this country. Let my hon. and learned Friend, in justice to me, bear in mind that I do not say this is so. He will surely allow me to continue to be cautious. I am not going to pledge myself to the proposition that these Conventions have ceased to exist because Her Majesty has entered into a Treaty with Turkey. That is a question that it is not necessary for me to decide. But my hon. and learned Friend, who has made International Law his study, has not been able to cite any authority to show that the proposition is not an accurate one. On the contrary, he candidly admits that he cannot put his hand upon any case to show that the proposition is not accurate. I suppose he will not object to my statement that it is at best a moot point. But what has Her Majesty's Government done? Her Majesty has received from the Sultan certain powers to make laws, and in the exercise of those powers She has made certain temporary provisions that have been alluded to by my hon. Friend the Under Secretary of State with respect to the regulation of the judicial system in Cyprus. If Her Majesty has no power to bind those subjects of other States having Conventions with Turkey, of course they cannot, and will not, be bound; and Her Majesty has no power to make laws binding upon them. That is a proposition which my hon. and learned Friend will not, I apprehend, contest; and, therefore, no harm will be done. But what is my hon. and learned Friend contending for? The Cypriotes are subjects of the Sultan, and are subject to the laws of Turkey, which they have been under for some considerable time. It is not proposed substantially to alter their position; but it is the intention to make such laws as Her Majesty can properly do to regulate the administration of justice, so far as British subjects are concerned, and for those who are not British subjects or Cypriotes, and for whom Her Majesty can make these laws. What condition of affairs would be produced if my hon. and learned Friend's ideas were carried out? He says that there are States which have made Conventions and stipulations with Turkey, and that the subjects of those States are not in and by virtue of those stipulations to have justice administered to them by the Turkish Courts, but that they are to have justice administered to them by their respective Consuls. That is not altogether correct. It is only correct to a certain extent; and though my hon. and learned Friend seldom errs, he does so sometimes. The proposition is too wide; it is only applicable to disputes between the subjects of a common State. But supposing a subject of a foreign State—I speak of the general tenor of these Conventions, I do not say that there is no difference between them—if a subject of one of these foreign States commits a crime upon a Turkish subject, the provision is not that that subject of a foreign State shall be tried by his own Consul, or tried by a tribunal of his own country, but that a representative of his country shall be allowed to attend the Turkish tribunal and represent him there. In minor offences it is a dragoman who attends, and in more serious cases the Consul is allowed to go; but, nevertheless, the offender, although the subject of a foreign State, is to be tried by a Turkish tribunal, and to have justice, or injustice, administered to him by Turkish Judges. Bearing that in mind, what would be the position of those persons who are the subjects of foreign States having these Conventions if, when Her Majesty was making these Ordinances, She had excluded all those persons from the benefit of them? Her Majesty's Government erect Courts of Justice in Cyprus, framed after the model of our English Courts of Justice, where the law is administered with perfect impartiality and fairness, and where there cannot be the slightest objection to the mode in which the law is applied. Such Courts Her Majesty's Government proposes to establish; and She says to all the world outside British subjects—"You may have the benefit of these Courts." Would it not be a cruel injustice to say to the subjects of any Power which has made Conventions with Turkey—"These Courts—these excellent Courts—we are are going to establish under this Ordinance shall not be open to you. So far as you are concerned, the door shall be shut against you." But from whence do these objections come? I have said that Her Majesty's Government has no power to make Ordinances so far as these people are concerned, and that any Ordinance it might make would be inoperative. Does the objection come from those States having subjects in Cyprus? No. It comes from the Opposition Bench and from my hon. and learned Friends opposite; and in order that my hon. and learned Friends may embarrass or inflict some disastrous defeat upon Her Majesty's Government, they strike at the Government through those States. If any country thought that it would be wronged by any action of Her Majesty's Government with regard to these matters, it would very soon make a complaint, and say—"You must take care that our subjects are placed in the position in which they would be but for the Ordinance. You must take good care that if our subjects commit any offence they shall be taken before the Turkish, and not the English tribunals, and have a dragoman or Consul to represent them." These States do not say this, and personally they are quite content. If they did not urge any difficulty, their self-elected Representatives cannot be heard on their behalf. This Ordinance is a temporary measure, and it has only been made for the emergency, and may last but for a short time. If any representations come to the Government from foreign countries to say that they are dissatisfied with the nature of the Ordinance, can any hon. Member doubt but that they will be duly considered; and that the grievance, if grievance there is found to exist, will be at once removed, as it can be, without the slightest difficulty.

Sir HENRY JAMES was sure that the House would agree in congratulating the hon. and learned Gentleman the Attorney General upon some portion of the observations which he had made. One-half of the House would congratulate him upon the courage with which he stated his opinions, and the other half upon his caution. But no one could congratulate him upon his accuracy; for if the course of the debate had been followed, it would be found that while the Under Secretary of State had been saying one thing the Attorney General had been giving expression to another view. The House had been endeavouring to discover what would be the position of foreign States in relation to the administration of justice to their own subjects; and it had a right to ask what their position would be? It was not that they were fighting the battle of the foreign States, as the Attorney General had put it; and that because the foreign States had made no complaint their position was not to be regarded. On the contrary, it was wise caution on the part of the House to see what their position was, and to prevent the Government from getting into a scrape. They had got into a good many scrapes; and it appeared to him to be a wise precaution for the House to prevent them getting into any more. In the early part of the evening the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs was questioned as to the relation of foreign States to the English Court, and he stated that the Government had come to the conclusion that they should be subjected to the administration of law in the English Courts. That was the statement of the Under Secretary of State with regard to the position of the subjects of foreign nations having Conventions with the Sultan. He distinctly stated that the Government had determined upon the course they were going to take, which would subject foreign nations to the administration of justice by the English Courts.

Mr. BOURKE: I spoke as to the Ordinance itself; that is the construction of the Ordinance; the policy of the matter does not depend upon me.

Sir HENRY JAMES said, that what the Attorney General had stated was that his hon. and learned Friend the Member for Oxford was fighting Her Majesty's Government in the cause of foreign nations; but that, when any case of complaint arose, the positions of the foreign nations would be considered. But the Government had considered it, and they had made an Ordinance relating to it. The question had arisen, and the Government had provided for it. It was useless to say that when the question arose the Government would provide for it, or to say that when any representation was made by foreign nations it would be taken into account. The position of the foreign nations had been considered, and the action of the Government was that, according to their Ordinance, foreign nations were to have justice administered to them by English Courts. If foreign nations objected to the course taken, Her Majesty's Government must either yield to their representations or get into a difficulty with them. The Attorney General had taunted that Bench that it was fighting the Government over the shoulders of foreign nations; the hon. and learned Gentleman said—"Let us wait until foreign nations object, and then we can provide for them."

The ATTORNEY GENERAL (Sir John Holker): I did not say that we had made no provision for them.

Sir HENRY JAMES would ask his hon. and learned Friend one question. Did he give advice to Her Majesty's Government with relation to the position of foreign nations under the Ordinance referred to?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL (Sir John Holker): My hon. and learned Friend has no right to ask me what advice I have given to Her Majesty's Government.

Sir HENRY JAMES said, that the Attorney General's statement had been that if this Ordinance did not bind foreign nations, then they would not be bound by it. That was the result to which he arrived; but he had forgotten that the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs had been more candid, and had told the House that Her Majesty's Government had made up its mind, and that this Ordinance was framed for the purpose of binding foreign nations. He presumed that the Attorney General had been mistaken in saying that he did not know whether foreign nations would be bound by the Ordinance, and that if they raised the question then it would be decided. But if it were raised in the way the hon. and learned Gentleman contemplated, the result would very soon be seen. It was a most undignified position for that country to occupy—that the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs should tell the House one thing, and that, 11 hours after, Her Majesty's Attorney General should state to the House another. When Turkey owned Cyprus she made Contracts with foreign nations, to the effect that the subjects of those nations should be tried by their own laws and by their own Consular Courts. That night they had heard the Attorney General contend that because the reason for that contract was gone the contract itself had gone. That was the proposition which was presented to the House, and, said the Attorney General now, "You are going to have good laws administered under the Ordinance by the English Courts." But that was not the proposition of the Under Secretary of State, and it was a proposition that no lawyer in that House had a right to present to it. It was a doctrine that might in time of shift be put forward as an apology; but it was not an argument which ought to be allowed in the House. What right had this country to say to foreign nations that because it had intervened in the affairs of Cyprus the contract with Turkey was broken? This country was now saying to foreign countries—"You may decide matters between your subjects, but not between them and the subjects of other nations, or between natives and your subjects." It was useless to say that the day for the consideration of these questions would be postponed, and that it would not arise until some foreign nation protested. He thought it would come soon; but the House had better understand now what the position was, and it had better abide by the view laid down by the Under Secretary of State, that under all circumstances Her Majesty's Government would insist that the contract between Turkey and foreign nations was gone, that it had been absorbed into their Ordinance with the permission of Turkey, though certainly without the consent of any other European Power. What he wished to protest against was the view of the Attorney General, that they had not the right to declare in the face of Europe that they were going to do these things when they were really going to do them, but that they should wait until some Power protested, and then do the best to remedy the wrong done.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: I do not feel very clear as to the advantage that has arisen from the discussion of the last few minutes. Undoubtedly very abstruse arguments have been put forward by the legal authorities on one side and the other of the House; and there can be no doubt that the arguments that have been brought forward have in them a great deal of ingenuity, whether they lead to any practical or useful result or not. It certainly seems to me, looking at the matter from a practical point of view, that what has really taken place is a matter of this kind. In former times the administration of justice in the Ottoman Empire was so unsatisfactory that foreign nations felt themselves compelled to claim from the Porte special privileges and special systems of administration for the protection of their own subjects. These privileges were granted under Capitulations, the substance and meaning of which was this—that, whereas the Ottoman Porte could not be trusted or expected to administer justice in matters in which Christians were concerned fairly and properly, the Porte handed over to the Consuls of those nations certain powers which placed the administration, or a great part of the administration, of the affairs of their own subjects in the hands, not of the Porte itself, but in the hands of the Consuls of those nations. I apprehend there was a very good reason for that, for there was a very great difficulty in administering the Ottoman law in the Cadi's Courts to Christians who might be suitors there. And there were various reasons which made it the lesser of two evils that an abnormal and stringent power should be given to the Consuls of foreign countries to administer law within the Ottoman dominions. I am right in saying it was strange and abnormal, and that it came about for strange and abnormal reasons. What has happened recently? The Porte has handed over to a Christian Government—to a Government which administers law and justice on the same principles as other European nations—the Porte has handed over the administration of a certain portion of its territory to that Government. It is admitted that if there had been a complete cession of Cyprus there would not have been any question raised as between the Porte and the countries with which the Treaties have been made; but it is said that Treaties between those countries and the Porte were so binding that, as no complete cession has been made, those Treaties cannot be altered. Are you to assume that in those parts of the Ottoman Empire ceded to Russia the Capitulations are enforced? I am at a loss to know what difference there is between the cession of Cyprus to us and the cession of other portions of the Ottoman dominions to Russia; they both seem to me to stand very much upon the same footing. Looking at the nature of the transfer of the administration from the Porte to the British Government, it is a transfer for a time, and the cession is limited in point of time, no doubt; but it is not limited, so far as I understand, in point of character. It is an absolute transfer of the administration to the British Government; and there is no reservation in the transfer by the Porte to the British Government of any rights that have been granted in Capitulations with other nations. As between the Porte and the British Government the Porte was the guardian of these Treaties and Capitulations. So far as I am concerned, I do not think we have any right to look behind the arrangements that we have made. or to say what rights that have been given are binding upon us. At the present moment we are in a state of transition, and an Ordinance, which has been already described, has been prepared, and will shortly be promulgated. It seems to me that this is a state of things which is very clear and intelligible. Whether questions may arise hereafter upon this point I cannot undertake to say, because there is no saying what question the ingenuity of lawyers may not suggest. But it is curious that these suggestions come from hon. Gentlemen in this House, rather than from those affected by the matter; and I think we had better wait until we see whether any nation does complain of the loss, or puts in a claim for the restoration of its Consular jurisdiction, and is not satisfied with the system offered by our Ordinance, before we discuss these abstract questions. I feel that I ought to offer an apology to the House for venturing to trespass upon this delicate ground, as I am not learned in the law; but I cannot help being struck by the vague nature of the argument that has taken place this evening. I do not mean to say that many questions that have been put, especially some of those in the beginning of the evening by the hon. Baronet who opened the discussion, have not been questions of a thoroughly practical character; but certainly a great deal of the talk that we have heard this evening has seemed to me to be very vague. We have heard a good deal of the old questions which we have discussed over and over again—such as, "Why is it that we thought it necessary or desirable to enter into this Convention at all, and to occupy Cyprus?" A great many suggestions have been made, and we have had quotations from works of fiction, and quotations from what I may almost call fictitious reports of speeches stated to have been made in the course of the Recess. All sorts of suggestions have been made, and the result upon my mind is that so many excellent reasons have been suggested for the occupation of Cyprus that it ceases to be a wonder that Cyprus has been occupied. I wish to take notice of some observations that I am said to have made to the effect that we took Cyprus in order that it might be a sort of model farm under our management, a sort of model for the administration of the Asiatic dominions of Turkey generally I am convinced that I never said that was the reason we were occupying Cyprus. What I said was that it was one great advantage that we derived from the occupation of Cyprus that it enabled us to study the race, and to present to others a solution of problems of a most difficult character. But it is not right to look for the reason of our occupation of Cyprus to such utterances as that. If hon. Members will look at the charter of our occupation of Cyprus—namely, the Anglo-Turkish Convention of last year—they will see that it states the reasons why Her Majesty's Government are to have the Island assigned to them. It was to enable us to carry into effect certain engagements then made; and, undoubtedly, one of those engagements was that we should guarantee the dominions of the Sultan in Asia from attack by Russia; another of those considerations was that Turkey, on her side, should agree with Her Majesty's Government as to the reforms she was to make in her Asiatic dominions. Anyone who has studied Turkey knows that the reform of the Asiatic dominions of the Porte is no slight work. That work, even when undertaken in the best possible spirit, and with all sincerity, and with ample opportunities and means for the reform of a system which has been so greatly abused, is indeed a task of the very greatest difficulty. That reform cannot be brought about by merely taking some Utopian Constitution out of the works of Plato or of Sir Thomas More, or even by taking the British Constitution as a model, or the Constitution of one of our Colonies. We have to deal with existing facts—with an existing body of facts—we have to deal with these facts, and with the populations living under the system, and who have grown up under it. How you are to reform it with the least possible disturbance and bring about, not a perfect system, but an Imperial and improved system, is the great object. During the Recess I said—and I say again in this House—that it is a great advantage to us who have to give advice with regard to Turkish affairs that we should be able to study the system on a small scale, and under circumstances which enable us to realize the difficulties which the Turks themselves have to contend against. We are trying ourselves on a small scale how these difficulties are to be met, and it will enable us to give advice of a more practical character than any we could evolve from our inner consciousness. This is the spirit in which we have acted; but we are met with criticism, because there are still a great many evils existing in Cyprus. Everybody knows that, and undoubtedly we have not removed them all in six or nine months. It is because we have to act cautiously, and be careful not to root up the wheat with the tares, that much time must necessarily be expended in the work which we have undertaken. It is very easy to tell us that there are still evils which we have not yet succeeded in rooting up. Perhaps these are questions which ought to be brought before the House, and to which our attention should be drawn; and it is quite right that they should be discussed, in order that we may make the explanations that are necessary. But there are two opposite senses in which these criticisms may be made, and the two poles of criticism have been shown us to-night by the speakers on the other side of the House. The hon. Member for Frome (Mr. H. Samuelson), says that he has a good many points upon which we may be attacked, and that he will take care that we shall hear enough about them. But there is another spirit of criticism which has been very well exemplified by the hon. Member for Hastings (Mr. T. Brassey), who read to us an expression of Colonel Warren's opinion that we should have good speed in our work. That is the manner in which hon. Members might make mischievous criticism really useful; for, although they may differ from us in many points, yet they must agree with us in their hearts in the desire that we should do our work well and creditably, and for the benefit of the people of Cyprus. If there has been one generous and general feeling of acknowledgment, it has been to Sir Garnet Wolseley and those who have assisted him in performing his work. There is but one opinion as to his being the man who will do the work. No doubt, he and his colleagues are obliged to exercise some severity in putting down abuses, and it is probable that some little severity is exercised, for when persons who have felt that they are privileged to trample upon the laws are suddenly pulled up and sent to prison they naturally raise a great cry. It is an old saying that one cannot make omelettes without breaking eggs, and, no doubt, there have been eggs broken in the making of a dish which I trust will turn out most satisfactorily in the end. I will not occupy the attention of the House further by going over the ground already so well traversed by my hon. Friend the Under Secretary of State, who is so well informed upon the points which he has touched upon. I will only express my opinion that the position of the Government in Cyprus should be met in a friendly spirit, and in a legitimate endeavour to discover the means by which improvement in the administration can take place, and should not be met, as some observations made in the House to-night have shown, in a spirit of carping criticism.

Mr. HERSCHELL said, it appeared to him that the people who lived on the Island of Cyprus, now under our administration, should know distinctly under what law they were to be governed. He could not, however, but feel, after hearing what had been stated by the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, and the replies of the Attorney General and the Chancellor of the Exchequer, that the matter was still left in doubt as to whether French, Italian, and other foreign subjects dwelling in Cyprus were to be governed by their own laws, or those enacted for British subjects. This question was by no means one of mere curiosity and speculation, for the reason that before long it would infallibly present itself; and it therefore seemed to him that it would be far better to have the matter determined before any difficulty arose with foreign Governments, than to place themselves in the false position of insisting upon the enaction of laws for the subjects of foreign nations, and afterwards retreating from the position taken up. The criticisms which had been offered upon that subject could not be described as unfair, but were intended to direct the attention of the Government to possible and probable difficulties ahead, which, if the right steps were taken at the present time, might be avoided. The Chancellor of the Exchequer had stated that the reason had altogether ceased why the Treaties of foreign nations with the Porte should be insisted upon; but he (Mr. Herschell) replied that it did not at all follow that it should, therefore, be insisted that Treaties were at an end. The various nations concerned therein might take a view of the case entirely different to that. But if the Government view of the matter was well founded, there could be no difficulty whatever in getting the nations interested to assent to the abrogation of the Treaties, which, if it were obtained, would put an end to all difficulty. Again, if that view were correct—and it would be seen that it was the basis of the arguments stated by the Chancellor of the Exchequer—surely common sense would suggest, that it was better to deal first with foreign nations concerned before any difficulty arose and come to a clear understanding with them, that, with the conditions at present existing in Cyprus, the Capitulations should not be enforced.

THE SOLICITOR GENERAL (Sir HARDINGE GIFFARD) urged that the Porte had, in the completest manner, given over the entire occupation of the Island, and all power of making laws for its government and of judicial administration. The Capitulations were personal, and were made between foreign Powers and the Sultan, who retained merely Sovereignty, but no legislative or judicial powers; and who had, therefore, entirely transferred the power of exercising jurisdiction in the Courts of Justice to Her Majesty. The Capitulations seemed to him to be necessarily dependent upon the continued power of the Porte to legislate and administer law; and the moment the Porte parted with the power to legislate or administer justice the power to enforce them ceased, and the Capitulations themselves came to an end.

MR. COURTNEY wished to put the argument of the Solicitor General to a practical test. He had said that the Porte was under certain obligations to foreign Powers with regard to Cyprus; that Cyprus was, practically, assigned to us for an unlimited term; that we took the Island upon a kind of lease; and that there was also an agreement on the part of the Porte which ceded to us the right of legislating with regard to it; and that, as a consequence of this grant of legislative powers, the obligations of the Porte towards independent foreign Powers had ceased and determined. He (Mr. Courtney), in order to test the soundness of the Solicitor General's argument, wished to ask one question. The Viceroy of Egypt had the independent power of legislation for that country—his position as a feudatory of the Porte, paying a tribute or rent, being somewhat analogous to our position with respect to Cyprus. If, as he understood the Solicitor General to affirm, the obligations of the Porte towards foreigners in respect of Cyprus had ceased and determined, was it in the power of the Viceroy of Egypt also to abrogate the Capitulations existing in that country with respect to foreign subjects resident therein? If so, the Viceroy had singularly neglected his power in that respect; for he had never claimed such a right, although he had long been negotiating with France and England and the other Powers to enter on an agreement superseding the continuance of the Capitulations. He had never claimed this supposed right, and if he had, the Western Powers would certainly have never allowed the claim.

MR. DILLWYN appealed to the Chancellor of the Exchequer to state whether it was his intention to take a Vote in Supply at that time of the night? He supposed the Government required the money asked for; and he certainly did not wish to put any obstruction in the way of Business. Considering the way in which the Estimates were generally dealt with, and the sums voted on account, they would be probably asked for another Vote before the end of June, and the old story would be repeated of pushing off Supply until the last week of the Session. The system of giving so large a sum as three months' Supply on account had always appeared to him objectionable, inasmuch as it gave facilities to the Government for pursuing the un-Parliamentary course which they had adopted of late years. He was well aware that, by the present system of keeping the Government Accounts, which required that any unspent balances should be handed over to the Treasury, Her Majesty's Government could not apply any one balance to purposes other than those for which it was intended. That, of course, necessitated their coming to the House for Votes on Account. He had no doubt that money was wanted for the Civil Service; but could not help saying that he should have been better pleased had the Government limited themselves to a two months' Supply. He would, therefore, appeal to Her Majesty's Government to adjourn the debate. If the Government would consent to take two months' Supply, he should have no further objection to offer. He moved that the debate be now adjourned.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Debate be now adjourned."—(*Mr. Dillwyn.*)

Mr. SHAW LEFEVRE inquired whether the Secretary to the Treasury (Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson) would follow the course pursued last year, and make a general Statement in explanation of the Civil Service Estimates upon going into Committee of Supply? He pointed out to the House that, by going into Supply at that moment, they would shut out all the remaining Motions on the Paper. He ventured to suggest that the proposal of the hon. Member for Swansea, for taking two months' Supply, should be adopted, and that Her Majesty's Government should put down Supply for, Thursday, in order that the Motions standing in the names of hon. Members should have a chance of being discussed.

Sir HENRY SELWIN-IBBETSON said, the Government were aware of the difficulty pointed out by the hon. Member for Reading, with regard to the Motions remaining on the Paper; but it was one that would not be allowed to arise, as it was their intention to take Supply on Thursday. With regard to the other point raised by the hon. Member, he would remind him that last year no such Statement with regard to the Civil Service Estimates was made, as he appeared to think. What the hon. Member referred to was probably a Statement by the First Lord of the Admiralty, made when he was in charge of the Estimates; but it was not considered that sufficient interest attached to such Statement, and it was, consequently, not intended to be made this year. With regard to the point raised by the hon. Member for Swansea (Mr. Dillwyn), he pointed out that his object was to get a proper discussion upon the Estimates; and it was because he regretted their postponement to the end of the Session that the Vote on Account was asked for. Two Votes were taken on Account last year, he (Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson) having been obliged to come down to the House for another two months' Vote on Account, because it was found to be impossible to push on the Civil Service Estimates with sufficient rapidity to enable them to deal with the different branches of the Service. A three months' Supply would, practically, enable them to avoid a second Vote for the present year. His object had been to avoid Votes on Account, which were, in his opinion, as much disliked by the Committee as by himself. For that reason, he ventured to propose to the House to give a Vote for three months' Supply, in the hope that the necessity for further Votes on Account would be prevented. He trusted that they would hereafter be in a position to require only one Vote in the course of the year.

Lord FREDERICK CAVENDISH hoped the right hon. Gentleman would be perfectly successful in avoiding Votes on Account. The House would recollect that it was at a very late period that the Civil Service Estimates were commenced last year, during which there were two

Votes on Account which amounted only to £5,000,000. It appeared to him to be perfectly unnecessary to ask for a three months' Supply; and he could but repeat the suggestion of the hon. Member for Swansea that two months' Supply would be quite ample.

MR. MITCHELL HENRY said, that as a consequence of Votes on Account being constantly taken, the discussion upon the Estimates had been driven off to the end of the Session, when, in fact, there could be no real discussion upon them. This year, however, the Government had introduced certain new Rules, in the discussion of which four days had been consumed. One of those Rules had been broken that evening, and was about to be broken again, for the Chancellor of the Exchequer was obliged to put down Supply as a second Order of the Day. If the four days consumed in discussing the new Rules had been employed upon the Estimates, both the House and the country would have been satisfied. But as it appeared that Supply was not to be the first Order of the Day on Monday, it was clear that the time had been wasted on a perfectly useless work. The Secretary to the Treasury now proposed to take more than double the amount of money taken last year. At 1 o'clock in the morning it was not right to be taking Supply at all; and there were, besides, certain items in the Vote now asked for which related to Ireland, and to which he (Mr. Mitchell Henry) had a great objection. He quite admitted the cleverness of the Government tactics in not asking for any Vote on Account of the Queen's Colleges in Ireland, which it was, no doubt, thought would disarm the resentment of Irish Members and prevent their entering into the debate. But he doubted whether many hon. Members would support the action of the Government in that matter; for it would result that when any Vote was asked for on account of the Queen's Colleges, there could be no discussion upon important points upon which Irish Members were required to legislate. The Vote would be put off until the end of the Session, when the Government would have a big majority about them; the Irish Members would make their objections, and after occupying the House of Commons for a reasonable number of hours the Government would get their money. He inquired whether the Vote for the Queen's Colleges was to be passed for ever, for the purpose of giving the Irish people a form of education which they did not want, and which they did not like? Under the circumstances, he did not think that the suggestion of the hon. Member for Swansea was a reasonable one, and trusted that Supply would not be taken that evening.

SIR HENRY SELWIN-IBBETSON replied that there was no absolute necessity for taking the Vote for the Queen's Colleges, Ireland, early in the year.

MR. RYLANDS reminded the Secretary to the Treasury, that he had not responded to the compromise suggested by the hon. Member for Swansea. He wished to be informed whether the Government were determined to adhere to their proposal to ask for rather more than three months' Supply? The Government invariably told the House that if a Vote on Account were granted they hoped to be able to take the Civil Service Estimates earlier in the year, and that it should not be driven to the end of the Session. Yet, on every occasion on which that promise had been given, the expectation had been disappointed. Hope told a flattering tale, and the Government at the commencement of the Session imagined they would have facility for getting money which they did not really possess. As a fact, legislative measures were allowed to thrust Supply on one side; and, unless they were forced thereto by absolute necessity, the Government would not come to the House for money until the last thing. If the Secretary to the Treasury did not see his way to accept the modified proposal of his hon. Friend the Member for Swansea (Mr. Dillwyn), he must appeal to the House to adjourn this debate, as it was a matter of public disadvantage that the speeches now being made could not be reported. The statement made by the Secretary to the Treasury was most important, and it ought to be known to all Members of the House, and not merely to those in the House, that the Government had undertaken, if they got into Supply, that nothing should stand in the way of the privilege of Members on the next occasion upon which it was put down. Taking the late hour of the night and other circumstances into consideration, it would be only reasonable to adjourn the Vote to another occasion.

Mr. O'DONNELL remarked that no one had objected to the length of the discussion that evening, looking at the interest of the subjects raised. Yet it was just possible that if this discussion had been based on an Irish subject and conducted by Irish Members, the Chancellor of the Exchequer would have made his appearance at an earlier period of the evening, and would have protested against that debate as an interference with the progress of Public Business. There had been no such interference that night, for, probably, the Government was anxious to arouse and excite the country, by one distinguished officer giving one view and another distinguished officer another view on the same question. But these Estimates were really of the most debateable kind; and the question of Votes on Account required looking into. Since their attention had been attracted to the fact that mixed education did not exist in Scotland, and that Scotch education was settled according to the Westminster Confession of Faith, they had determined to go into the matter most thoroughly. Then, again, there were a number of Votes which had been increased, while others had been diminished. They had had no opportunity of learning the reason of all this by passing Votes on Account. Then, again, there was the Vote for Secret Service, to which many Members had a very strong objection indeed. The Irish Members knew the misery and demoralization which had spread and resulted from the expenditure of the Secret Service money; and, therefore, they had a special objection to it. Then there was also the question of the Fishery Board for Scotland. Last year, they had an instructive and interesting debate on the subject, and a full consideration of the reasons why Scotland should be indulged in a Fishery Board, in order that its herrings might sell better than Irish herrings in foreign countries. Among other subjects were the new Office of Public Works, the pay of the Constabulary—especially after some of their recent exhibitions—the Reformatory and Industrial Schools, the Endowed Schools Commissioners and their policy in Ireland, the Grants in aid of the Colonies, and so forth, all of which were of the utmost importance. Indeed, topics of the first importance literally bristled upon these Votes. Yet they were asked to give up all their rights of criticism in order to allow the Government to get money. Were they entitled, by their past performances and by the way in which they had carried out their promises in past years, to such an indulgence? He was inclined very strongly to support the hon. Gentleman the Member for Galway (Mr. Mitchell Henry) in any opposition to this proposal of the Government. It was all very well for the Government to say they would give them ample opportunity for discussing their grievances. What they might consider to be a sufficient opportunity, and what hon. Members might consider sufficient, would probably by no means amount to the same thing. On the whole, therefore, he thought it was far better that private Members should take care of their own interests, and see that they had proper opportunities for bringing forward their Motions, rather than trust to the promises of the Government, who had so often shown that it was unable, he would not say unwilling, to keep them.

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER: I do not think the House has a right to complain of the Government for not endeavouring to fulfil any obligation into which we may have entered with regard to the Votes of Supply. Last year, for instance, we made engagements to bring forward the Civil Service Estimates, and we kept those engagements; but, owing to the action of certain hon. Members, who always moved Amendments whenever Supply was put down, we were sometimes unable to bring on the Votes, though they were on the Paper. This year, however, by the arrangements to which the House has already agreed, we shall be in a very different position, and it will be much easier for us now to undertake to bring forward Votes on Supply on given days and to insure a discussion. With regard to the particular Votes referred to by the hon. Member for Galway (Mr. Mitchell Henry) and the hon. Member for Dungarvan (Mr. O'Donnell), we will undertake, on some given day, to bring forward the Vote for Irish Education at such a time and in such a manner as to give full opportunity for discussion. We have intentionally not taken any Vote for the Queen's College or University College, so as not to raise inconvenient discussion. As, however, we have not a Vote on Account, we must come somewhat earlier for this Vote than we shall have to do for other Votes in the list. I may add that we are prepared to adopt the suggestion of the hon. Member for Swansea (Mr. Dillwyn), and to reduce the Vote to two-thirds, taking it for two months instead of three. The Vote on the Paper, therefore, will be only for two-thirds of the amount, and all the items will be adjusted accordingly. Under these circumstances, I hope hon. Members will allow us to take a Vote to-night.

Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Main Question, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair," put, and *agreed to.*

SUPPLY—CIVIL SERVICE ESTIMATES.

Vote on Account.

Supply—*considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

£4,109,067, on account, viz.:—

Civil Services, Class I., Class II., Class III., Class IV., Class V., Class VI., Class VII., and the Revenue Departments.

Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That a sum, not exceeding £4,109,067, be granted to Her Majesty, on account, for or towards defraying the Charge for the following Civil Services and Revenue Departments for the year ending on the 31st day of March 1880, viz.:—

CIVIL SERVICES.

Class I.—Public Works and Buildings.

Great Britain :—

	£
Royal Palaces	6,000
Marlborough House	500
Royal Parks and Pleasure Gardens ..	19,300
Houses of Parliament	6,000
Public Buildings	20,000
Furniture of Public Offices	2,600
Revenue Department Buildings ..	31,200
County Court Buildings	8,000
Metropolitan Police Courts	4,000
Sheriff Court Houses, Scotland ..	1,400
New Courts of Justice, &c.	21,000
Surveys of the United Kingdom ..	22,400
Science and Art Department Buildings	3,400
British Museum Buildings	800
Natural History Museum	8,000
Edinburgh University Buildings ..	3,200
Harbours, &c. under Board of Trade ..	3,000
Rates on Government Property (Great Britain and Ireland)	44,500
Metropolitan Fire Brigade	2,500

Ireland :—

	£
Public Buildings	24,000

Abroad :—

Lighthouses Abroad	2,000
Diplomatic and Consular Buildings ..	4,000

Class II.—Salaries and Expenses of Public Departments.

England :—

	£
House of Lords, Offices	7,000
House of Commons, Offices	8,600
Treasury, including Parliamentary Counsel	10,000
Home Office and Subordinate Departments	15,200
Foreign Office	12,600
Colonial Office	6,600
Privy Council Office and Subordinate Departments	5,300
Privy Seal Office	500
Board of Trade and Subordinate Departments	28,000
Charity Commission (including Endowed Schools Department) ..	5,000
Civil Service Commission	4,600
Copyhold, Inclosure, and Tithe Commission	3,000
Inclosure and Drainage Acts Expenses	1,400
Exchequer and Audit Department ..	9,400
Friendly Societies, Registry ..	1,200
Local Government Board	64,000
Lunacy Commission	2,700
Mint	10,600
National Debt Office	2,800
Patent Office	4,700
Paymaster General's Office	4,300
Public Works Loan Commission ..	1,800
Record Office	3,500
Registrar General's Office	8,000
Stationery Office and Printing ..	76,000
Woods, Forests, &c., Office of ..	4,000
Works and Public Buildings, Office of	7,000
Secret Service	3,900

Scotland :—

Exchequer and other Offices ..	1,200
Fishery Board	2,200
Lunacy Commission	1,000
Registrar General's Office	1,200
Board of Supervision	3,200

Ireland :—

Lord Lieutenant's Household ..	1,300
Chief Secretary's Office, &c. ..	5,200
Charitable Donations and Bequests Office	400
Local Government Board	21,300
Public Works Office	5,100
Record Office	1,000
Registrar General's Office	2,600
Valuation and Boundary Survey ..	3,800

Class III.—Law and Justice.

England :—

	£
Law Charges	12,000
Criminal Prosecutions	33,300
Chancery Division, High Court of Justice	30,000

	£
Queen's Bench, &c. Divisions, High Court of Justice	10,600
Probate, &c. Registries, High Court of Justice	15,000
Admiralty Registry, High Court of Justice	2,000
Wreck Commission	2,000
Bankruptcy Court (London) ..	6,300
County Courts	73,400
Land Registry	900
Revising Barristers, England ..	- -
Police Courts (London and Sheerness)	2,400
Metropolitan Police	100,000
County and Borough Police, Great Britain (for Inspection only) ..	800
Convict Establishments in England and the Colonies	72,000
Prisons, England	133,000
Reformatory and Industrial Schools, Great Britain	65,000
Broadmoor Criminal Lunatic Asylum	4,700

Scotland :—

Lord Advocate and Criminal Proceedings	11,300
Courts of Law and Justice	10,300
Register House Departments ..	6,100
Prisons, Scotland	14,000

Ireland :—

Law Charges and Criminal Prosecutions	14,000
Chancery Division, High Court of Justice	6,700
Queen's Bench, &c. Divisions, ditto ..	4,700
Land Judges' Offices, ditto	2,000
Probate, &c. Registries, ditto ..	2,000
Court of Bankruptcy	1,800
Admiralty Court Registry	350
Registry of Deeds	3,400
Registry of Judgments	600
County Court Officers, &c.	12,600
Dublin Metropolitan Police (including Police Courts)	23,000
Constabulary	183,000
Prisons, Ireland	24,000
Reformatory and Industrial Schools ..	21,000
Dundrum Criminal Lunatic Asylum ..	1,200

CLASS IV.—EDUCATION, SCIENCE, AND ART.

England :—

	£
Public Education	640,000
Science and Art Department ..	71,600
British Museum	18,000
National Gallery	3,000
National Portrait Gallery	500
Learned Societies, &c.	4,000
London University	1,800
Deep Sea Exploring Expedition (Report)	700

Scotland :—

Public Education	133,000
Universities, &c.	3,100
National Gallery	400

Ireland :—

Public Education	150,000
Endowed Schools Commissioners ..	150
National Gallery	400
Queen's University	- -
Queen's Colleges	- -
Royal Irish Academy	350

CLASS V.—COLONIAL, CONSULAR, AND OTHER FOREIGN SERVICES.

	£
Diplomatic Services	35,000
Consular Services	40,000
Colonies, Grants in Aid	8,000
Orange River Territory and St. Helena	500
Suez Canal (British Directors) ..	350
Suppression of the Slave Trade ..	1,200
Tonnage Bounties, &c.	2,300
Cyprus, Military Pioneer Force ..	- -

CLASS VI.—SUPERANNUATION AND RETIRED ALLOWANCES, AND GRATUITIES FOR CHARITABLE AND OTHER PURPOSES.

	£
Superannuation and Retired Allowances	75,000
Merchant Seamen's Fund Pensions, &c.	5,000
Relief of Distressed British Seamen Abroad	5,300
Pauper Lunatics, England	- -
Pauper Lunatics, Scotland	- -
Pauper Lunatics, Ireland	40,000
Hospitals and Infirmaries, Ireland ..	3,000
Savings Banks and Friendly Societies Deficiency	- -
Miscellaneous Charitable and other Allowances, Great Britain	800
Miscellaneous Charitable and other Allowances, Ireland	800

CLASS VII.—MISCELLANEOUS, SPECIAL, AND TEMPORARY OBJECTS.

	£
Temporary Commissions	4,500
Miscellaneous Expenses	1,200
Total for Civil Services ..	£2,754,400

REVENUE DEPARTMENTS.

	£
Customs	161,000
Inland Revenue	316,000
Post Office	562,000
Post Office Packet Service	128,000
Post Office Telegraphs	187,667
Total for Revenue Departments	£1,354,667
Grand Total ..	£4,109,067"

MR. SHAW said, he wished to refer to one expression which had fallen from the Chancellor of the Exchequer. The right hon. Gentleman seemed to think that the Queen's College and the Queen's University Votes were the only ones which Irish Members wished to discuss. His opinion, on the contrary, was that their particular business in Parliament was to look after the raising and the expenditure of money, and that the passing of Bills was a very secondary consideration. For his part, he did not think the House would suffer very much if it did not pass any Bills for the rest of the Session. There were a great many questions which he and his Friends intended to discuss very fully, and for that reason he was glad that the new Rule had been adopted, for it gave them fuller opportunities than before of entering upon these discussions. Amongst other Grants that he wished to see discussed was that for the London University and for the Scotch Universities. It struck him as most extraordinary, seeing that Scotch Gentlemen should come there year after year, and showed most determined hostility to the reasonable demands of the Irish for University education, while, at the same time, they were asking the House to put its hands into the pockets of the ratepayers to pay for Divinity Professorships, and Ecclesiastical Professorships in their own University. He hoped these items would come on at a reasonable time for discussion, for he certainly had made up his mind to move the rejection altogether of the London University Vote and the Scotch University Vote. While the House was voting money for endowing Scholarships in London and Scotland, it refused to give the Irish people any share in the amounts they contributed towards the taxes. He was told, however, that the Government had agreed to the request of the hon. Member for Swansea (Mr. Dillwyn); and, for that reason, he should offer no opposition to the present Vote.

MR. ANDERSON, with reference to the remark made about the Glasgow University, said, that he should be very happy to support a similar grant to Ireland under similar conditions. It must be remembered, also, that a very large sum was received locally, and that the Government only supplemented that sum by a smaller sum in aid of the local subscriptions.

MR. MITCHELL HENRY was delighted to hear the declaration of the hon. Member who had just sat down, and he would take care that the hon. Member was reminded of it in due time. His speech had shown how necessary it was that Irish Members should take every opportunity of informing the House on the subject of Irish education; for, notwithstanding the number of debates which they had already had on this subject, and notwithstanding the fact that the hon. Member was generally very astute in mastering such subjects, he had yet altogether failed to apprehend one of the reasons which intensified the feeling of annoyance and injustice now rankling in the mind of every Irishman. That feeling was that they had paid out of their own pockets £250,000 for their own University, and they had asked in vain for a supplementary grant, to a reasonable extent, out of the Exchequer. Their position in Ireland was exactly the same as that of the Scotch Universities. The people of Ireland, it was true, did not profess to have a great affection for the Westminster Catechism, and preferred a different kind of religious faith. But that was no reason why the merest justice should be refused to the Irish people; and yet that was exactly what the House of Commons continued to do year after year. It was this which had forced them to subject all Departments of Public Business to the strictest criticism, in order to induce the House to consider this matter of education, though they would much rather have preferred to do this work in a different way, based on the justice of reasonable concessions.

MR. CALLAN said, that so far from the Irish Universities being in exactly the same position as the Glasgow University, they were in a far worse condition. Instead of raising nearly £250,000, they raised during the last 15 years nearly £500,000, and they had been refused subsidies and grants in aid which had actually been granted to Glasgow. There were other matters, however, to be considered besides. Could this question be discussed at 1 o'clock in the morning? The proposal of the Government not being satisfactory, it would be far better to report Progress; and, for his part, he would certainly be inclined to propose a Motion to that effect.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER said, he certainly had intended to answer the hon. Member for Cork (Mr. Shaw); but other Members had intervened with observations, and, consequently, he had been prevented, because he did not wish to interrupt them in what they wished to say. He had been, also, rather misunderstood. In his previous remarks he did not say that the Queen's University and the Queen's College were the only Votes in which the Irish Members were interested, for he knew they were interested in a very large number of Votes that were about to be submitted. What he did say was that he knew, by the experience of last Session, that a considerable number of Irish Members felt so strongly in regard to these particular Votes that they would not allow even a Vote on Account to pass without a full discussion on the whole subject, and without raising on such a Vote—which, of course, was not a final settlement, but only a grant by the Government in order to enable them to carry on their Business for a certain time—the whole question of the principle of these Colleges. He knew that there were other Votes which ought, of course, to be discussed; and he would do his very best to give fair opportunity for such discussion.

Mr. O'DONNELL said, he thought they might congratulate themselves on their very fortunate position, for now that the hon. Member for Glasgow (Mr. Anderson) found that he had been mistaken as to the endowment of the Irish Universities, he was quite certain to act up to the promise he had made. There was such an immensity of ignorance on this important subject that he was not surprised these facts had escaped the attention of the hon. Member for Glasgow. Merely to endow a Catholic University would not be fair, and would not place it on the same level as others, for it had only received its Charter from the Pope. He would not enter into the subject now; but he would say that the Irish Party were determined to pursue this question of education into all its ramifications, and the manner in which they had been treated, and the manner in which the question of Christian education in this country was being treated, convinced them of the necessity of doing all in their power to oppose endowment of what was really a new form of religion existing under the name of secular education, and which was none the less a sect that it disputed all recognized dogmas of the existing religions. He must strongly protest against endowing, out of the pockets of Christians, new-fangled theories of immoral ethics supported by scientific speculators.

Mr. SHAW LEFEVRE said, he was glad to find that the House was not going to take the Vote for military pay in Cyprus. That was a very novel Vote, and the Government had exercised a very wise discretion in passing it by. It had already been explained that it was not put down to the Army Votes because it would not be legal to put it there. He did not quite understand, therefore, how it could be legally put down somewhere else. He would venture to suggest that that Vote should not be taken at a late hour, and that full notice should be given of the subject, in order that the House might fully discuss this very novel proposition.

Mr. DILLWYN said, it was quite understood that the Government were taking a lump sum for the Civil Service and Revenue Departments both?

Sir HENRY SELWIN-IBBETSON replied, certainly.

Vote *agreed to.*

House *resumed.*

Resolution to be reported *To-morrow;*

Committee to sit again upon *Wednesday.*

POOR LAW AMENDMENT ACT (1876) AMENDMENT BILL.—[Bill 44.]

(*Mr. Mellor, Mr. Merewether, Sir Charles Forster, Mr. Mundella, Mr. Serjeant Simon, Mr. Hibbert, Mr. Torrens.*)

COMMITTEE.

Bill *considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

The CHAIRMAN explained that there were certain Amendments on the Paper put down by the hon. Member for Glasgow (Mr. Anderson) which could not be moved. It was a Bill intended merely to amend a particular Act applying only to England, and it would not be in accordance with the Rules of the House to insert Amendments in Committee, which would have the effect of amending or repealing the Scotch law, without first receiving an instruction to that effect from the House. The hon. Member might have made a Motion with that view before; but not having done it in the House, it was now too late to do so.

Clause 1 (The provisions of S. 23 of the Divided Parishes and Poor Law Amendment Act, 1876, not to apply to moneys to which a pauper or pauper lunatic may be entitled as a member of friendly or benefit society).

MR. COURTNEY said, he should propose to omit all the clause after the word "relative" in line 15. He had been wholly unable to understand the use of the second part of the clause. Altogether, the measure was a remarkable one; and, in spite of the arguments by which it had been pressed upon the House, it appeared to him to be unprecedented in principle. He was willing, however, to admit the first part of the clause, strange as it was. The effect of this first part was that a man might secure payments to himself; and if he became bankrupt or insolvent, that those payments should go to his wife or some other relative. That was a principle which had never been admitted in English law. A man had no power to settle money to his own use, and in the event of bankruptcy or insolvency to the use of his wife or other female relative. Such a provision would not be allowed in the case of a rich man, and it could not be upheld in this case, on the ground of some supposed analogy to marriage settlements, or to settlements by a solvent person, made to take effect immediately. But the second part of the clause had not this poor defence. In that case it was provided that where a man had no wife or female relative dependent on him his sick money should remain in the hands of the Society, and the Guardians should not be repaid their expenditure, unless they had given notice beforehand. He did not at all understand why this provision was inserted in the Bill, for it seemed to him the first part of the clause provided everything that was asked for. Failing some explanation, therefore, he should beg to move the omission of the words.

MR. MELLOR said, the Bill was only intended to restore the law to the position which it occupied before 1876; and, therefore, he thought the hon. Member was wide of the mark in his criticisms, and would not be justified in pressing his Amendment.

MR. GOSCHEN wished to ask the President of the Local Government Board what had become of certain Amendments which he put on the Paper some time ago? He was under the impression, he presumed erroneously, that Her Majesty's Government took an interest in, and had certain opinions concerning, this Bill. He thought, also, that those opinions had been embodied in certain Amendments which were placed on the Paper. To his great astonishment, however, these Amendments vanished, and the explanation given was that the hon. Member for Ashton (Mr. Mellor) had sent these Amendments down to all the Friendly Societies in the country; and, as a consequence, these Amendments had been removed. He ventured to think it was absolutely without precedent that the Government should put Amendments on the Paper and then run away from them, not on account of the opposition in the House, but because the Amendments had been sent to parties in the country to be considered. The matter required explanation, and seemed to him to be a piece of almost unparalleled weakness on the part of the Government. He objected, also, to this policy of not showing their hand to the House openly with regard to this Bill. He should be curious to know the reasons why these Amendments were not to be pressed. He hoped his right hon. Friend (Mr. Sclater-Booth) would indicate the course which the Government proposed to take. He was afraid his hon. Friend behind him had taken a tremendous task upon himself in proposing to discuss this Bill at half-past 1 in the morning, when their masters out-of-doors had settled already what the fate of this Bill was to be. He hoped the Government were inclined to deal seriously with this question, otherwise he would be inclined to let this measure pass just as it stood, and let the Government take the responsibility of the proceedings.

MR. SCLATER-BOOTH said, the right hon. Gentleman opposite, after making some very severe observations in regard to these proceedings, had concluded by intimating his acquiescence in the relegation of this question to the Friendly Societies out-of-doors.

MR. GOSCHEN said, he was sure the right hon. Gentleman would not wish to misrepresent him. He distinctly said that must happen, if the Government did not take the matter seriously in hand.

MR. SCLATER-BOOTH said, his course on this subject had been very simple. Some three weeks ago, he placed certain Amendments on the Paper which, in his judgment, would have the effect of insuring the passage of the Bill through the House of Lords. Whether it would pass without those Amendments remained to be seen. The Government had supported the Bill last year in the House of Commons, and did their best to carry it in the House of Lords, but failed, because that House quarrelled with the words "pauper or" in the Bill. The Amendments which they made the hon. Member for Ashton would not accept, and, as a consequence, the Bill fell through. He thought his hon. Friend might have accepted the Amendments which he had proposed without any sort of compunction, or any mischief being done to his case. He put these Amendments on the Paper thinking that they would result in a settlement of the matter, because they would place the measure in such a way before the Lords that they would consent to pass it. His hon. Friend, however, instead of accepting these Amendments, postponed his Bill in order to ascertain whether they would be acceptable to the Friendly Societies, and finding that was not likely to be the case, the Government now stood in the same position as last year. They acquiesced in the Bill, and supported it as far as they could, and the hon. Member must take his chance of getting it through the House of Lords. As he had said, the question was not a very difficult or important one. Nothing in the clause prevented the Guardians from withholding relief from any man who was receiving aid from a friendly or benefit society, and it did not seem to him to be a question of very serious importance. He had pointed out to his hon. Friend the Member for Ashton how he thought the Bill might be improved; but he would not accept the Amendments, and, therefore, the Government had nothing more to do with them. As to the Amendments of the hon. Member for Liskeard (Mr. Courtney), the second part of the clause was necessary, because, according to the principles of the Poor Law Amendment Act, money given by way of relief was given absolutely, and there was no power of recovery at all, except the relief were given on loan. According to the Act of 1866, money expended for a pauper lunatic was held to be money expended as a debt; and his proposal was to restrict the procedure before a magistrate to the case of a debt already incurred. He thought that was a reasonable thing to propose; but his hon. Friend would not accept it, and, therefore, the Government had nothing more to say.

Mr. GOSCHEN said, the only point which he could gather from the remarks of his right hon. Friend was that, though the Government did not entirely approve of the Bill, yet they were going to support it in the House of Commons, and would endeavour to pass it through the House of Lords. Why was this? Because there was a considerable cry for this Bill out-of-doors. The right hon. Gentleman, indeed, had said this matter was not very important; but it was not satisfactory to him, or, indeed, to the House of Commons, that the Government should deal with a matter to which great importance was attached out-of-doors, and by the Press, in this way. He had called attention to this Bill out-of-doors, at the cost of very considerable unpopularity to himself; but he was not an Obstructionist, and when he saw it was not possible to prevent the passing of this measure, he could do no more than call attention to its provisions, and the spirit in which they were dealing with it.

Mr. SCLATER-BOOTH, said, his right hon. Friend always liked to have the last word; but he must repudiate the charge which he had made. He had said this Bill was not quite satisfactory; but, as a matter of fact, it was proposed with a view of correcting a provision in the Act of Parliament, which was the work of the hon. Gentleman the Member for Ashton. The original Bill of 1876 did not contain these objectionable clauses, and they were moved at the instance of that hon. Member. Having got into great trouble with his constituents through this proposal of his, he was now endeavouring to amend the Act in which those clauses were inserted. A great and very exaggerated feeling existed among the Friendly Societies on this subject; and the Government thought it best not to waste time in stopping its progress, or in attempting to throw it out, when what was objectionable in it was of an extremely unimportant, mild character. The principle of the original Act remained the same, however; because the Guardians, even if this Bill should pass, would by no means always give relief.

Mr. GOSCHEN asked whether he might understand that this Bill simply repealed the objectionable clauses moved by the hon. Member for Ashton-under-Lyne?

MR. SCLATER-BOOTH, said, as a matter of fact, the Government did not feel themselves called upon to deal with a matter of this kind between Guardians and paupers receiving relief.

Amendment *negatived.*

Bill *reported,* without Amendment; to be read the third time *To-morrow.*

MOTIONS.

GENERAL POLICE AND IMPROVEMENT (SCOTLAND) PROVISIONAL ORDER (INVERNESS) BILL.

On Motion of The LORD ADVOCATE, Bill to confirm a Provisional Order under "The General Police and Improvement (Scotland) Act, 1862," relating to the burgh of Inverness, *ordered* to be brought in by The LORD ADVOCATE and Mr. Secretary CROSS.

SALE OF FOOD AND DRUGS ACT (1875) AMENDMENT BILL.

Select Committee on the Sale of Food and Drugs Act (1875) Amendment Bill *nominated* of Mr. SCLATER-BOOTH, Mr. RITCHIE, Mr. ISAAC, Viscount BARRINGTON, Sir WILLIAM WELBY-GREGORY, Mr. CLARE READ, Sir GRAHAM MONTGOMERY, Mr. STANSFELD, Mr. WHITWELL, Mr. P. A. TAYLOR, Mr. BIGGAR, Mr. CHAMBERLAIN, and Mr. ANDERSON:—Power to send for persons, papers, and records; Five to be the quorum.

House adjourned at
Two o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Tuesday, 25th March, 1879.

MINUTES.]—PUBLIC BILLS—*First Reading*—Consolidated Fund (No. 2)*.
Third Reading—District Auditors* (30), and *passed.*

SOUTH AFRICA—LORD CHELMSFORD.

STATEMENT.

EARL CADOGAN said, that their Lordships would, perhaps, allow him to make a short statement in reference to a matter which formed the subject of discussion in the House on the previous night. His right hon. Friend the Secretary of State for the Colonies was asked this afternoon, in "another place," whether he could produce any communication from Sir Bartle Frere similar to that which was alluded to in the despatch of Lord Chelmsford dated February 9? His right hon. Friend replied that he had no official communication to produce; but that he had received a confidential telegram, dated the 28th of January, 1879, an extract from which he would now read, with their Lordships' permission. Sir Bartle Frere wrote—

> "Late events have impressed me with the great risks we run should anything happen to Lord Chelmsford. He is very strong, but much exposed to danger, and we should stand still if he were to knock up. There ought to be at hand a second in command capable of taking up his work in all departments, if necessary, as Provisional Governor and High Commissioner, as well as General."

SOUTH AFRICA—THE ZULU WAR—SIR BARTLE FRERE.

RESOLUTION.

THE MARQUESS OF LANSDOWNE rose to move the Resolution of which he had given Notice—

> "That this House, while willing to support Her Majesty's Government in all necessary measures for defending the possessions of Her Majesty in South Africa, regrets that the ultimatum which was calculated to produce immediate war should have been presented to the Zulu King without authority from the responsible advisers of the Crown, and that an offensive war should have been commenced without imperative and pressing necessity or adequate preparation; and the House regrets that after the censure passed upon the High Commissioner by Her Majesty's Government in the despatch of the 19th of March 1879, the conduct of affairs in South Africa should be retained in his hands."

The noble Marquess said: My Lords, when I placed my Resolution upon the Notice Paper in its original form, I did so with two objects. In the first place, it seemed to me that the circumstances under which we had become involved in a war with the Zulu nation were such as to make it desirable that Parliament should have an opportunity of expressing its opinion with regard to them; and, in the second place, I desired further to elicit from Her Majesty's Government, whose utterances up to that time on the subject had, perhaps, not been very distinct, some clear and unambiguous opinion with regard to those circumstances. Since I gave that Notice, however, Papers have been laid before Parliament, in which the conclusions of Her Majesty's Government with reference to those circumstances are clearly set forth. When I became aware of the nature of those conclusions—when I learned that Her Majesty's Government had publicly censured Sir Bartle Frere for the policy he had pursued, in a manner which, disguise it as you may, will be regarded in this country and in the Colonies as a withdrawal of Her Majesty's Government's confidence from the High Commissioner—I felt that I had no alternative but to alter the terms of my Motion, and to invite your Lordships, not only to concur in the censure which Her Majesty's Government have passed upon the High Commissioner, but also to affirm that your Lordships regretted that, after the censure passed upon that officer, the conduct of affairs in South Africa should be left in his hands. I was surprised when I learned that my Motion, as it originally stood, was to be met by an Amendment from the noble Viscount opposite (Viscount Cranbrook) which, if it meant anything, meant that, while all others were to be at liberty to record their judgment on the affairs of South Africa, the House of Lords alone was not to express its opinion upon them. I was not less surprised when I learned that my Motion, as amended, was to be met in another way—an Amendment the signification of which appears to me to be that Her Majesty's Government on the 25th of March entirely disagreed from the opinions which they had expressed on this subject on the 19th of the same month. My Lords, there is one part of my Resolution to which I hope that the negative of the noble Viscount will not apply. No arguments are necessary in order to induce your Lordships to agree with me in affirming that we are willing to support Her Majesty's Government in all necessary measures for defending the possessions of Her Majesty in South Africa. Fortunately, our apprehensions for the safety of Her Majesty's subjects in that part of the Dominions are not so grave as they were a few weeks ago. The heroic resistance offered by our soldiers, even when overwhelmed by numbers, and the gallantry displayed by a small body of our men at Rorke's Drift, are so conspicuous, that it now seems improbable that the enemy, whatever might have been their intention formerly, will attempt to cross the British Frontier. Nevertheless, it is impossible not to feel that the condition of affairs in South Africa is a most serious one; and till that condition has been altered, till the disaster which has befallen us has been repaired, till public confidence has been restored amongst our Colonists, it will be necessary for Her Majesty's Government to relax no efforts in order to place their safety beyond dispute. In making those efforts Her Majesty's Government will receive the cordial support of all parties. I will pass at once from this subject, with regard to which there is no controversy, to the other matters involved in my Resolution.

My Lords, so much has appeared in the numerous Blue Books which your Lordships have had an opportunity of reading with regard to the early history of our relations with the Zulus, that I do not propose to detain the House long with reference to that subject. Your Lordships are aware that at the beginning of the present century the Zulus are described as having been "a petty tribe of small account among their little neighbours;" their power was consolidated by two bloodthirsty Chiefs whose names were still bye-words in the South African Colonies. The second of those Chieftains was succeeded by a milder-mannered Monarch named Panda, who was upon the throne when, in 1840, the English took over the Colony of Natal. Some years before the death of Panda, Cetewayo, the present Ruler of Zululand, had virtually become supreme; and upon Panda's death, in 1873, he appealed to the English to recognize him as Panda's successor, and expressed a wish that a representative of the English Government should attend the ceremonies which were about to take place. At that time, certain so-called promises were exacted from Cetewayo with regard to his future conduct as King of the Zulus. I briefly recapitulate these facts, because I wish to dwell particularly upon two points touching our relations at that time with the Zulu people. The Zulus were always a military nation. Within a few years of their first consolidation as a nation, they were described as being a compact military machine; and I believe I am right in saying that, from those days down to the present time, the genius and the traditions of the people have been essentially military. That is one point which I particularly desire that your Lordships should bear in mind. The next point that I wish to impress upon your Lordships is that throughout the tendency of the Zulu people has been to lean rather towards than away from their English neighbours. The principle of that allegiance was never very clearly defined. It did not rest upon the assertion of superior might on the one hand, nor upon the acknowledgment of it upon the other—but it rested upon a vague feeling on the part of the Zulus that they had nothing to fear from us as long as they treated us with consideration, and that they had a good deal to fear from us if they failed to do so. Such was the position of affairs in Zululand until a very short time ago; and as lately as 1876 the Zulu King was described by Sir Henry Bulwer as inclined to draw more closely still, if possible, the ties which bound him to the English people. But immediately after that date, a complete change appears to have taken place in the demeamour of the Zulu Sovereign towards us. His attitude became defiant, his military preparations increased, a general feeling of insecurity spread throughout those parts of the Colony which border upon his dominions; and it was confidently predicted that the moment was at hand when a general rising of the Black population of South Africa might be expected. What was the explanation of this change in the attitude of the Zulus? I have heard only one suggestion in explanation of it, and that is that this change is to be attributed to the annexation by this country of the territory known as the Transvaal Republic. I do not desire, at the present moment, to discuss the policy of that annexation; but I wish to point out to the House what the results of that annexation have been. In the first place, it has altered the estimation in which the English nation had hitherto been held by the Zulus. We had till that time been regarded by them as disinterested neighbours without ideas of our own aggrandizement; the annexation of the Transvaal placed us at once upon the level of those Dutch Colonists whose encroachments had rendered them the objects of the bitter hatred of their Zulu neighbours. Another result of the annexation was that we found ourselves obliged to move a considerable body of troops up to the very confines of the Zulu territory. It is not very unnatural that a suspicious Sovereign like the Zulu King may have regarded with alarm the fact that his powerful neighbours were gradually encircling him; that their troops were stationed close to his Frontiers; and that they were placing themselves, in regard to a dispute to which I shall presently refer, in the shoes of his hereditary enemies, the Dutch Boers. But besides the general charges made against Cetewayo, there were other occurrences for which he was held responsible, and which disquieted the mind of the High Commissioner and his colleagues. In the first place, his conduct towards the Christian converts within his kingdom was such as to attract attention. The number of Christian victims who incurred the displeasure of Cetewayo is, I believe, very much exaggerated; and, as far as I am aware, the cruelty of the Monarch extended, not only to Christian converts, but to all classes and ranks of his subjects. Still, no doubt, the missionaries found that their work did not progress in his dominions; many of them left the Zulu Kingdom in disgust, and from apprehension for their personal safety. Cetewayo made no secret of his belief that a "Christian Zulu" was another expression for a "spoiled Zulu." Again, in the autumn of 1878, it happened that two of the wives of a Chief having fled from their lord, and having crossed the British Frontier, they were pursued by the sons of Sirayo and re-captured, and eventually, I believe, met with a fate which, under such circumstances, is not unusual in a country in which there are no Courts of Law. Then another so-called outrage was committed upon the persons of two civil engineers named Smith and Leighton. These officers were surprised by a party of Zulus, and, so far as I can learn, were deprived not of life and limb, but of their pipes and pocket-handkerchiefs, and then allowed to return in safety. I touch briefly upon these so-called

Zulu outrages, because all I would insist upon in regard to them is this—that two views, a very indulgent view on the one hand, and a very exaggerated and severe view on the other, were taken of them, and that the High Commissioner leant throughout in the latter direction. Such being the relations of the English and the Zulus, I would ask your Lordships, what was the obvious policy for our representatives in South Africa to pursue? Was it their policy to defer a collision or to precipitate it? I submit that their policy should have been to defer a collision as long as possible. And I will tell you why I think so. The moment appears to me to have been a very unpropitious one for us to attempt a struggle with the Zulu nation. In the first place, affairs within our own boundaries were not in an altogether satisfactory condition. Then an attempt had been made to establish a Confederation of the South African Colonies. That attempt had broken down. An attempt had been made to form a Colonial Force, which had been only partially successful. Besides, we had two little wars in the South African Colonies which must have produced a very unsettled effect on the White population; and finally, by the annexation of the Transvaal, we had very much enlarged the area over which we were open to attack without any corresponding addition to our defensive strength. On the other hand, the moment was one that must have suited the Zulus exactly. They had a highly-organized and drilled army. Their only weak point was that the stern military despotism of Cetewayo had produced a great tension, and that there was within the State a considerable section of the subjects of the King who would gladly have seized a favourable opportunity for liberating themselves from his severe rule. Under these circumstances, an English invasion was a godsend to the military party in Zululand. It was sure to produce the one result Cetewayo desired by rallying all parties around the King. This was precisely what occurred. There was another reason why the moment was an unpropitious one for us. When we took over the Transvaal there was an old standing quarrel between the Zulus and the Dutch residents in the Transvaal territory. There was a tract of country south of the Pongolo River to which a claim had been laid by both the Dutch and the Zulus, and an arbitration had been invited by Cetewayo. When we became masters of the Transvaal Cetewayo did not decline an arbitration. The award of the Commissioners was placed in the hands of the High Commissioner in June, 1878. This was an opportunity of convincing the Zulus of our desire to live on friendly and equitable terms with them. The award having been communicated to them, we could have waited to see whether it produced the desired effects, and meantime have taken any steps which might have seemed necessary to increase our strength for defensive purposes. What was the course pursued by the High Commissioner? In the first place—although he received the award in the month of June, he kept it for six months in his pigeon-hole; and, in the second place, when he did communicate it, it had assumed a shape in which I doubt whether its authors would have recognized their offspring. It was no longer a message of peace, but a declaration of war. I will ask leave to call your Lordships' attention to the terms embodied in the award. In the first place, the rights of the Dutch settlers in the disputed territory were reserved to the exclusion of the rights of the Zulu Sovereign. That territory appears to have been singularly favoured by nature, and to have been particularly valuable for grazing purposes. The first condition attached to the award had the effect of explaining to the Zulus that, although in theory the territory was to be given back to them, nevertheless somebody else was to have the enjoyment of the land. The second condition was that the King was to fulfil to the letter the promises he was supposed to have made on the occasion of his installation. With regard to those promises, I should like to quote the opinion of an important witness—the Colonial Secretary—who said that it would appear that the power of imposing obligations on the Zulus relating to their internal government, which Sir Theophilus Shepstone seemed to have claimed on Cetewayo's coronation, was rather a concession to his personal influence than a recognition by the Zulus of the authority of the Government of Natal. It seems clear that these informal promises were not considered by the Government at the time as promises on the exact performance of which they were entitled to insist. The third condition was that the authors of those so-called outrages to which I have referred should be surrendered. With regard to this, I will only say that Sir Henry Bulwer's opinion is that a national reparation would have been preferable to a personal one, and more easily obtained than that on which the High Commissioner insisted. The fourth condition was that the Zulu King should disband his Army. My Lords, was not such a condition as this likely to shipwreck the negotiations? The Zulu Army was the pride and plaything of this savage despot, and to ask him to disband his well-armed and well-drilled battalions was to demand a concession he could not have made. The next reservation was that he should recall the missionaries who had left his country. Now, on turning to the Papers, I find that the noble Earl opposite, who was lately Colonial Secretary (the Earl of Carnarvon), had distinctly explained to the Natal Government that it was not our desire to insist on the recall of the missionaries to the dominions of Cetewayo. I should like to read your Lordships a few words of the noble Earl's. He says—

> "I request that you will cause the missionaries to understand distinctly that Her Majesty's Government cannot undertake to compel the King to continue to maintain the missionaries in Zululand, and it is desirable for them to understand that they cannot be supported there with armed forces."

These seem to be wise words, and I regret they were not acted on by the High Commissioner. The last condition insisted on was that there should be a Resident at the Court of Cetewayo, whose duties were to be to watch over the fulfilment of the coronation promises, to tell the King when he might call out the Army and when he might not, and to watch over the interests of the missionaries. My Lords, the noble Earl the Prime Minister has lately, in two or three of his diplomatic appointments, shown that he could be superior to Party ties. But I hope that when the noble Earl comes to fill the appointment of Resident at the Court of Cetewayo he will reserve the appointment for one of his own supporters. Such were the terms of Sir Bartle Frere's Ultimatum. Now, my Lords, I should like to ask your Lordships this question—Were they intended to be accepted or not? For my own part, I can come to no other conclusion than that these terms involved a declaration of war. It is true that the High Commissioner, writing some time afterwards, asks triumphantly "whether conciliation and compromise can go further than this." My Lords, where was the conciliation and where was the compromise? My Lords, the High Commissioner had been warned, first by Sir Theophilus Shepstone and then by Sir Henry Bulwer, that these terms would not be accepted; but he was deaf to their warning, and, accordingly, that came to pass which they and everyone else must have anticipated—the terms were shown to the Zulu Envoys (who, it is said, belonged to the Peace Party); but they shook their heads when they read the conditions, and departed without holding out any hope that the King would entertain them.

I have given your Lordships already some reasons why, in my opinion, it was unwise for the High Commissioner to precipitate the collision. I will now give another reason. The terms imposed amounted to a declaration of war, and the war was an offensive one. I know it is not always easy to distinguish in cases of this kind between that which is offensive and that which is defensive. It may sometimes be necessary, when there is reason to expect that your enemy is going to strike you, to anticipate him and strike him first. But do not imagine that this was merely a case of occupying vantage ground in the enemy's country. That may have been the original idea present to Sir Bartle Frere's mind, for, writing in December, he says—

> "It has been asked, why place the troops in such positions on the Zulu border? The object of doing so is to prevent the risk of the repetition by the Zulus of their old habit of making devastating attacks."

That is practically saying that the British troops had been moved over the Frontier for defensive purposes. But this idea was soon lost sight of. What, my Lords, was really the purpose with which the troops were moved? I will ask your Lordships to turn to the despatch of January 16, in which Lord Chelmsford explains that he had encountered difficulties owing to the state of the roads, and that it was impossible at that season to make any rapid advance into "the heart of Zululand." He said that "a modification of the plan of the campaign will be necessary;" but he considered his original idea of "driving the Zulus as far as possible to the North-Eastern part of their country" still sound, because the columns could "clear and subjugate" the country between the Buffalo and Tegula Rivers. There, my Lords, you have the real purpose of the expedition. It was not the purpose of taking up two or three strong positions on the other side of the British Frontiers for the purposes of defence that war was contemplated, but a war of invasion, having for its object the dispersion of the Zulus to their further border, and, according to Sir Bartle Frere's own words, used in his despatch of January 27, "defeating the armies and putting down the military strength of the Zulus." If these, my Lords, are "defensive" operations, what, I should like to know, are "offensive" ones?

That being the case, the war being, as I have shown your Lordships, one of invasion and subjugation, the question arises how far the preparations of the High Commissioner were adequate? Now, in September, the High Commissioner wrote to the Colonial Office asking for reinforcements, on the ground that the "concessions" he was about to make should appear as the gift of a superior Power; and he explained that the whole force at the disposal of Lord Chelmsford was less than Sir Garnet Wolseley had considered necessary for the defence of the Colony against a Zulu outbreak even before our responsibility was extended by the transfer of the Transvaal. Those reinforcements, however, were refused by Her Majesty's Government; and, in spite of the refusal, Sir Bartle Frere—knowing that our Forces were less than Sir Garnet Wolseley considered necessary, even for merely defensive purposes, and before the Transvaal was transferred—sent the ultimatum to the Zulu King. He acknowledged receipt of the Colonial Secretary's despatch, refusing the reinforcements, on the 10th of December, and in acknowledging it he makes the terrible confession that he was about to embark this country in hostilities against the Zulu nation with means which, in his own judgment, were insufficient for the successful prosecution of the war. Here are his own words—

> "The force we have now at or disposal is not as large as we thought necessary, though we have called up every available company in South Africa, and anticipated all the suggestions contained in the last paragraph of your Despatch now replied to.
>
> "But in the absence of reinforcements we must do our best with such means as we have, and if devotion to Her Majesty's service can compensate for deficient numbers I have no fear for the result."

And yet, in the face of this admission, he writes in his last despatch that there was

> "No reason whatever for supposing that the force at our disposal was too small for the task attempted."

My Lords, the High Commissioner's mind was made up from the first. He never hesitated; he was determined that there should be war, and sooner than recede from his purpose he did not shrink from hostilities even when he must have known the risk which they involved.

Sir Bartle Frere's mind was made up: what was the mind of Her Majesty's Government? It would be impossible, within reasonable limits, to follow all the Correspondence that passed between the Colonial Office and the High Commissioner; but I will remind your Lordships that, in the spring and summer of last year, the Government received from the High Commissioner a series of most alarming despatches, to the effect that, in his opinion, a collision between the English and the Zulus could not be delayed; that things were going from bad to worse; and that it was absolutely necessary that something should be done. These despatches were received by Her Majesty's Government, and, as far as I am able to discover, they were acknowledged almost without comment. During all those months I cannot find a word suggesting that Her Majesty's Government had a policy of their own in this matter. The High Commissioner had a policy, and I am sorry to say that I think it was a wrong one—but the Government had none. In the autumn his despatches became more urgent still, and he made an appeal for reinforcements. My Lords, Her Majesty's Government refused that appeal. I can only arrive at one conclusion with regard to that refusal. The reason why Her Majesty's Government would not trust the High Commissioner with more troops was because they were beginning to be afraid of the use to which he was likely to put them. They were afraid to put a knife in his hand, for fear he might cut his fingers with it. But what were the terms of the refusal? They told the High Commissioner to approach the Zulus in the spirit of forbearance and compromise—that all the information they had received justified the hope that they would so be able to avert the serious evil of a war with Cetewayo, and that they could not but think that the forces that had been given would suffice to meet any emergency that might arise. What was the use of telling Sir Bartle Frere to exercise forbearance? He had told Her Majesty's Government over and over again that, as far as his opinion went, the time for forbearance had gone by. Her Majesty's Government should have trusted the High Commissioner, or have recalled him. On the 1st of November a still more urgent appeal arrived—so urgent, that this time Her Majesty's Government would not take the responsibility of refusing it. They sent reinforcements; but they sent them with another caution—namely, that the troops should not furnish the means for a campaign of invasion, but should be used for protection to the lives and property of the Colonists. The Government, it would seem, my Lords, had become suspicious; and their apprehensions were justified by the event. On the 19th November they learnt for the first time that the boundary line was to be communicated to the King in the shape of an Ultimatum; they learnt something of it, but they did not the whole, because, by an unfortunate accident, the inclosures did not accompany the despatches as they ought to have done; but they learnt that one of the conditions had reference to a British Resident being at Cetewayo's head-quarters and another the disbanding of the Zulu Army. Her Majesty's Government approved, on the whole, Sir Bartle Frere's action; and the Colonial Secretary wrote to him that, so far as they were able to judge, his action in the matter met the requirements of the case with which he was authorized to deal. The revelations were not, however complete till the 2nd of January, when Her Majesty's Government were in full possession of what had been done by the High Commissioner. At that time the Ultimatum had been nearly three weeks in the hands of the Zulu King, and only 10 days afterwards the English forces crossed the Tugela River. Even then the Secretary of State for the Colonies was not alarmed at what had been done, though he expressed his regret that the High Commissioner should have given an answer that precluded him from communicating with Her Majesty's Government. The Secretary of State for the Colonies, in his despatch, said that he did not desire to question the policy adopted. I do not know if Her Majesty's Government wish to adhere to that opinion. The Government appear to have been a long time making up their minds. The words I have referred to were written on the 23rd January, the facts having come to their knowledge on the 2nd. On the 23rd, after three weeks' time for consideration, they did not question the propriety of the High Commissioner's acts. It is not till eight weeks later that they are able to arrive at a determination. They say—

> "The terms dictated to Cetewayo by the High Commissioner were such as he might not improbably reject, even at the risk of war."

"The result which they had anticipated has," they say, "occurred." The Zulu King has refused the terms offered to him, and the further prosecution of the demands has been placed in the hands of the military authorities. And then follows the final and deliberate judgment of the Government upon the conduct of the High Commissioner—

> "The forces at your disposal were adequate to protect Natal from any serious Zulu inroad; and to provide for any other emergency that could have arisen, during the interval necessary for consulting Her Majesty's Government upon the terms that Cetewayo should be called upon to accept; and they have been unable to find in the documents you have placed before them that evidence of urgent necessity for immediate action which alone could justify you in taking, without their full knowledge and sanction, a course almost certain to result in a war, which, as I had previously impressed upon you, every effort should have been used to avoid.
>
> "The communications which had passed between us as to the objects for which the reinforcements were requested and sent, and as to the nature of the questions in dispute with the Zulu King, were such as to render it especially needful that Her Majesty's Government should understand and approve any important step, not already suggested to them, before you were committed to it; and if that step was likely to increase the probability of war, an opportunity should certainly have been afforded to them of considering as well the time as the manner of coming to issue—should it be necessary to como to issue—with the Zulu King. And though the further correspondence necessary for this purpose might have involved the loss of a favourable season for the operations of the British

troops, and might have afforded to Cetewayo the means of further arming and provisioning his forces, the circumstances rendered it imperative that, even at the risk of this disadvantage, full explanations should be exchanged."

Could any censure be more complete or more decisive? Far from not "questioning the propriety" of the High Commissioner's conduct, Her Majesty's Government now condemn it in every particular.

Now, my Lords, I think I have so far substantiated the propositions contained in my Resolution. I have endeavoured to show that the Ultimatum was calculated to produce immediate war. I have shown that it was presented to the Zulu King without authority from the responsible Advisers of the Crown. I have shown that the war was an offensive war, and I have shown that it was commenced without necessity and without adequate preparation. It now remains for me to address myself briefly to the one other proposition which last night was added to the Resolution as it originally stood. I could have wished that in a discussion touching upon matters of principle so important any personal considerations might have been avoided. But the action of Her Majesty's Government has made that impossible. The office which the High Commissioner holds is one of great difficulty and great importance. He is the Representative of Imperial discipline and Constitutional authority in the South African Colonies. I have endeavoured to show to your Lordships that he has shown himself indifferent to discipline and superior to Constitutional authority. Her Majesty's Government have formally censured him; the reassuring expressions with which the censures conclude cannot take away from the effect of the censure in this country, as well as in the South African Colonies. Will it not be said of the High Commissioner that Her Majesty's Government trusted him but scantily before, and that they do not trust him at all now? It is not for me to speak of Sir Bartle Frere's high character, of his abilities, of his brilliant career. These are well-known. No one questions that, whatever errors he has committed, every step he has taken was taken because he believed it was the best in the circumstances. But what it is my duty to point out to your Lordships is that if such conduct as that of the High Commissioner is overlooked in this country—if Parliament shows any indifference with regard to it—then the whole of our Colonial system will have to undergo alteration. It has been incidental to that system that English administration has been found in all parts of the world in contact with independent races—races whose ideas of civilization and morality differ widely from ours. Hitherto our endeavour has been to extend our influence, not by fire and sword, but by the example of free institutions, by just administration, by good government, by the assimilating influences of culture and education. If these good practices are to be given up —if in our eyes independence is to be a crime, if all over the world the Representatives of this country are to be allowed the arbitrament of peace and war—then I am afraid the day will come when, if it be said that the sun never sets on the Dominions of the Queen—it will be said also that it never ceases to look down on the strife and suffering for which our policy will have made itself responsible. The noble Marquess concluded by moving the Resolution.

Moved to *resolve*, That this House, while willing to support Her Majesty's Government in all necessary measures for defending the possessions of Her Majesty in South Africa, regrets that the ultimatum which was calculated to produce immediate war should have been presented to the Zulu King without authority from the responsible Advisers of the Crown, and that an offensive war should have been commenced without imperative and pressing necessity or adequate preparation; and the House regrets that after the censure passed upon the High Commissioner by Her Majesty's Government in the despatch of the 19th of March 1879, the conduct of affairs in South Africa should be retained in his hands.—(*The Marquess of Lansdowne.*)

VISCOUNT CRANBROOK: My Lords, the speech which the noble Marquess has just delivered has certainly not been distinguished by any virulence of expression, either towards this side of the House, or, indeed, towards Sir Bartle Frere himself; and in continuing this discussion I shall, so far as I am concerned, endeavour to follow his example. My Lords, the noble Marquess objects to the course which I have taken with respect to his Motion. He says that inasmuch as I gave Notice that I would meet the former part of his Motion by moving the Previous Question, he was very much astonished to find that the whole of the

Motion, as it now stands, is to be met by a direct negative. I should, however, imagine that the noble Marquess is almost alone in entertaining that feeling of astonishment. For I venture to say I have, in the whole course of my experience, never seen a Motion which bore so much the appearance of a trap for the unwary as that of the noble Marquess as originally couched. But he has thought fit to improve upon it—no doubt, after consultation with his Friends in "another place"—with a view, I suppose, to secure that united Party vote on this occasion which it was found impossible to obtain if the Motion were permitted to remain as it was in the first instance framed. But it has since been so altered as to secure that object; and, that being so, it need not be wondered at that I also have changed my course as to the best way of meeting it.

My Lords, in the Resolution as originally drawn up, the House was invited to express its readiness

> "To support Her Majesty's Government in all necessary measures for the purpose of defending the possessions of Her Majesty in South Africa."

Upon such a proposition as that, I presume, there would be an unanimous vote in both Houses of Parliament. It then proceeded to express a censure; but it was left entirely open who were the persons to be censured for the course which had been pursued. The character of the Motion has now, however, been entirely changed. Instead of leaving it as it was originally, an open question as to the person to be censured, by an addition which has been made to it the House is asked to declare that it

> "Regrets that after the censure which has been passed upon the High Commissioner by Her Majesty's Government, the conduct of affairs in South Africa should be retained in his hands."

It is perfectly clear, therefore, who they are against whom the Motion is directed. It is directed against the Government; and no option has been left to us except to meet it with a direct negative—for the Previous Question is had recourse to only when a Motion does not raise a fair issue. Had the first Resolution been meant as an attack on the Government, it ought to have said so. If it was intended to attack Sir Bartle Frere and not the Government, then it would have been easy so to have framed the Resolution as to show that it was intended to attack him and not the Government, and to have thus afforded his Friends an opportunity of defending him. But the Resolution was of that vague and dangerous character which is meant for the purpose of obtaining the largest number of votes without committing anybody to anything. It is now, however, evidently directed against the conduct of the Government; and, that being so, we have determined to meet it in the only way in which we ought to meet it, and that is by a direct negative.

And now let me say that I do not complain of the statement which the noble Marquess has made with respect to the history of events in South Africa, although I think he left out some facts that are very material to the consideration of the case. But, first, with respect to this Resolution, I take no exception to its expression of regret

> "That the ultimatum, which was calculated to promote immediate war, should have been presented to the Zulu King without authority from the responsible advisers of the Crown."

It is upon that point, and that point alone, that the censure of Sir Bartle Frere turns. Observe that the Resolution, while it does not propose to pass a censure on the character of Sir Bartle Frere, his intelligence, or his faithfulness in the discharge of his duty, implies that he was too impetuous, and that even if war were inevitable he took a responsibility on himself in declaring it, which he ought not to have done without having first consulted the Government. The Government has, in the despatch of the Secretary of State, said the same thing. But in fairness to Sir Bartle Frere, let me ask, what was the state of South Africa when he first went out there? For all that we have heard from the noble Marquess, one would suppose that there had been no war in that quarter before, and that everything was going on quite smoothly until the Government sent Sir Bartle Frere with the powers of High Commissioner. I would, however, remind the House that there was a war already raging, although, perhaps, not on a great scale. The whole of the change which had occurred in South Africa was due to the successful war waged by Secocoeni against the Boers. When they were compelled to retire before his arms, great excitement began to prevail throughout the whole of South Africa, which has not yet ceased, and which may bring upon us far greater calamities than those of which we have as yet heard. The Boers, for the first time in their history, seemed to have lost the character of their race, and it appeared as if the new weapon with which they were armed had placed the Natives on an equality with Europeans. It was that that led to the change. Nor is it to be wondered at that the Black race should desire to regain their superiority, and to assume a high place in South Africa. We, however, had a duty imposed upon us by our position there from which we could not shrink, and that was to defend the Colonies which had been allowed to grow up there under our protection, and to see, at all events, that they were not swept away by the failure of the Boers to maintain their position. Sir Bartle Frere arrived at the Cape in 1877. At that time war was going on with the Kaffirs—Lord Chelmsford had just gone out. That war was concluded about the month of June in that year; for I find that on the 30th of July the vote of thanks of the Parliament of the Cape of Good Hope was given to Lord Chelmsford for having brought it to a successful issue. Well, the noble Marquess says that at that time the award with respect to the Transvaal was going on, and was concluded in June. Now, in that he is quite mistaken—he has misread the Papers altogether if he thinks so. The High Commissioner appointed by my noble Friend the Secretary of State for the Colonies was to arbitrate the question—the Commissioners were the persons to collect the facts. Well, he says, the High Commissioner having received the award, thrust it into his pigeon-hole, and took no notice of it for six months. My Lords, that is not the case. Sir Bartle Frere had his duties at the Cape—he had his duties connected with the Transvaal—and it was not till September he arrived at Natal. The question had affected Natal with respect to this boundary between the Boers—between the Transvaal and the Zulu country. As soon as Sir Bartle Frere arrived at Natal he gave his attention at once to the completion of the award. There was no delay on his part. Whether or not he added to it is quite another point; but with respect to the recommendations of the Commissioners, Sir Bartle Frere's duty was to come to a conclusion upon them. He did come to a conclusion upon it; that conclusion is embodied in the very despatch to Cetewayo, and was as to boundaries the very same as that which the Commissioners had come to. Now, as to the point to which the noble Marquess referred when he mentioned the persons who had invested their money there, and were engaged in agricultural operations there. My Lords, the noble Marquess opposite has said when Griqualand was taken over, we recognized the rights of those persons who were there to receive certain compensation. So far from it being taken by force, the people were treated with respect and forbearance; and so it was that Sir Bartle Frere thought it was right, in settling the boundary between the Transvaal and Zululand, that provision should be made that men who had *bonâ fide* followed occupations and made investments in this territory, while it was under dispute, should, when it was assigned to another party, not suffer in their pecuniary interest, and that care should be taken that they should not suffer. No doubt, that would be unacceptable to Cetewayo; but it laid down a very good principle in itself—that political sovereignty does not necessarily interfere with private rights. When Europeans are *bonâ fide* settled there, provision should be made for their compensation if they are thrust out, and if they remain then provision should be made for their protection. We, in our turn, should take care that the same privilege should be accorded to the Zulus, and that they should be treated with the same forbearance. That is my answer, then, with respect to the reservation which Sir Bartle Frere made with respect to the award, not as expressing an opinion upon the details, but stating the grounds upon which the High Commissioner acted.

The noble Marquess says there were no grounds for any apprehensions at that time with respect to the Zulus, and he mentions certain things which happened, and says that it was very bad advice which was given. I am not going to dispute that point; but the Government did everything in their power in the shape of offering advice, and they gave directions that the war should be avoided; and when the noble Lord says the Government was silent with respect to its policy, I may say that up to the time Sir Bartle Frere went to Natal, in September last, there was not in any of his Papers anything calling upon us to prepare for war with the Zulus. It appeared to him, however, at last, that the Zulu war was imminent; and it was only late in the year, I quite admit, that Sir Bartle Frere was saying over and over again—as everybody else was saying in South Africa—that the minds of the African races were so much elated by their success against the Boers that there might at any time be a rising in any part of South Africa. Looking to the Zulus as the great military nation which is looked up to by all the minor Chiefs, they were the most likely to raise such an insurrection. There were good reasons for suspecting them. For instance, Secocoeni was inclined at one time to make compensation; but when a messenger came from Cetewayo he withdrew the offer. Cetewayo had messengers going into many parts of Africa; and it is only natural to suppose that they were going there for the purpose of exciting the minds of the Chiefs, and provoking a general rising against the White races. Besides that, Cetewayo had himself used extremely threatening language. It is not correct to say that up to that time he had shown no sense of animosity towards us. In the message which he sent back in reply to some remonstrances on the murder of some young girls because they would not marry the elderly men in his army, what did he say? He said that he was as good as the Governor of Natal; that if they called that killing he would kill a great many more—and altogether displayed the bloodthirsty spirit of a mere savage. He showed, at any rate, that he had no great respect for the British Government. The noble Marquess has said that the war was due to the annexation or transfer of the Transvaal. The effect of the transfer, on the contrary, at least in the first instance, was distinctly to put off war. Before the transfer Cetewayo was moving into that country. He said himself to Sir Theophilus Shepstone that he intended to drive the Boers out of their country; and there can be no doubt that the army which he had assembled would have gone into the Transvaal and have swept away the Boers, and would have desolated the whole country—for before the annexation the Boers had no means of resistance against such force as he would have brought against them. As soon, however, as we took possession of the territory, he told Sir Theophilus Shepstone that he would not invade it; and that shows that, so far as the Transvaal is concerned, so far from promoting war, it had just the opposite effect—it soothed the feelings of Cetewayo, and he withdrew into his own territories. It would be absurd, however, not to make the admission that up to this time Cetewayo had played the Boers against the English, and the English against the Boers, and that he was ready to make friends with either the one or the other, as might best serve his own purposes. But when the two territories became united, no doubt, Cetewayo felt that he was prevented from attacking the Boers, and, in fact, shut out from gratifying the desire he had expressed of what he called "washing his young men's spears." His object was to invade some country in order that his young men might have occupation. When you consider that these young men are not allowed to marry until they have "washed their spears" in blood, it is easy to see that they were ready to act with him in order that they might put themselves practically in the position of marrying and finding peaceful occupation at home.

My Lords, I now come to the Ultimatum, as it has been called. I feel as strongly as the noble Marquess that the Ultimatum ought to have been submitted to Her Majesty's Government; I think the terms of it are such that if it had been submitted to Her Majesty's Government it might, in some respects, have been modified. That Ultimatum not having been accepted, we are no longer bound by the exact terms of it, and in any of our future relations with these people we are not bound to act according to the Ultimatum. But I am bound also to add that there are circumstances connected with that Ultimatum which would, no doubt, make the war not an unjust war. Now, I take the first case. I do not say it is a sufficient cause, but it is a case of war. That was the carrying off of two women out of the Zulu territory and putting them to death. It would have been far better to take adequate compensation, and to have had the men who had committed the deed given up, than to make the circumstance a *casus belli.* With respect to the case of the surveyors, I do not think there was really much in that at all. At the same time, Cetewayo acknowledged he had done wrong, and offered, I think, 100 cattle as compensation for it. But there are other subjects of greater importance than those just alluded to. There is the question of the Army. The noble Marquess said the time would have come when Cetewayo, but for the Ultimatum, would have disbanded, if not the whole, a large portion of his Army. Whether it was wise or not to include together the questions relating to the Army in the Ultimatum is another question; but the time would have come when we should have been obliged to summon him to disband, if not the whole, at least a large portion of his Army, which was certainly threatening the Frontiers of our Colonies. It would be impossible to leave the Colony of Natal for ever in the condition to which it was reduced. What was the condition of Natal at the time the Ultimatum was sent? Large armies had appeared on the other side of the river, close to the Colony, amounting to 10,000 men each. Therefore, the Colony was practically in a state of siege. Every farm was abandoned — women and children were sent to the sea coast or taken into towns; the towns were put into a state of defence; every property was becoming a ruin; and if you were to have a Colony at all, it was simply impossible for things to go on as they were. I am not, by what I am saying, changing one word as to my feeling that the Ultimatum ought to have been submitted to Her Majesty's Government; but I think, at the same time, it is only fair to Sir Bartle Frere that it should be known exactly what the position of affairs was under which he sent the Ultimatum, and I observed that the noble Marquess felt confident that Sir Bartle Frere acted with the most conscientious motives. What I say is that the time must have come, at a period not long after the time at which these events were happening. With a large Zulu force constantly hovering on its borders, it was not possible that Natal should be left unprotected for any length of time. The greatest necessity existed that everything should be done to avoid a war, if practicable; but if Cetewayo would not disband or allow his followers to return home, and take steps to show that he was not going to attack the Colony, as supposed, then these offensive or defensive operations against him were necessary. The noble Marquess says that the operations consequent on the Ultimatum were taken without adequate preparation. I doubt if we are the best judges of the adequacy of the preparations, for we do not know the state of public opinion before the occurrence of our sad disaster. Sir Bartle Frere wrote that there was no reason to suppose that our army was too small for the task that was attempted; but that a larger force lessened the chance of opposition. This was written long after the first reinforcements had arrived, and not when speaking of defensive operations. Your Lordships will observe in the Papers, I think at page 280, that Lord Chelmsford sets out a defensive scheme for Natal. He goes deliberately into it. That was before the reinforcements. After the reinforcements he somewhat changed his plans. He said—

> "I must occupy positions, whether on one side of the Tugela or the other to prevent the Zulus invading the country; but it may involve offensive operations."

We must not confound the two periods. The first period was when there were no reinforcements at all, and when the operations were purely defensive; but afterwards, when reinforcements arrived, the proposal to cross the river was set on foot. Now, the noble Marquess has abstained entirely from entering into any question of the military operations, and I shall follow his example in that respect. If he had gone into that question, I should have been prepared to say what the Government view on that point is; but as he has not said one word, I think I shall best consult your Lordships' convenience by following his example. The noble Marquess says that the Government despatch of January 23, 1879, is different from the despatch which has recently been sent. He says that that despatch was written upon documents obtained on the 2nd of January. That is an entirely erroneous supposition on the part of the noble Marquess. It was, in fact, written on Papers which had only just arrived, and your Lordships will see that in the margin the documents referred to were of dates as late as the 12th and 13th of January. Your Lordships will see what my right hon. Friend says in the 3rd paragraph. He says—

> "That it is impossible for the Government to examine the whole of the Papers; but I may observe that the communications which were previously received from you have not entirely prepared them for the course you deemed it necessary to take;"

and then he goes on to say that the applications made were based on the invasion of Natal by the Zulus, and he adds—"With the information that the Government has," he was "not in a position to question the propriety of what had been done." My right hon. Friend wrote back, so that the letter might go by the next mail, and a great number of documents were not consulted or considered before the writing of the despatch. Anyone will see that my right hon. Friend reserves his opinion until the Government had full information, and had full possession of everything that Sir Bartle Frere had done. They would not condemn, because Sir Bartle Frere seemed to have great authority on his side. He seemed to have consulted all those acquainted with the subject, and the Government reserved their views until they were in possession of all the facts. What my right hon. Friend said to Sir Bartle Frere practically was this—"Avoid this war, if possible. Use the troops given you for defensive purposes. They are not given you for invasion." If we had done anything else—if we had given encouragement to Sir Bartle Frere—I trust we should not be base enough to rely on a despatch not in harmony with what had gone before. It is because we gave the instructions which I have stated—it is because we acted on the principle of taking defensive measures, that the despatch of March 19 was written, and it is in harmony with what went before. We were against this war being precipitated. We were against anything but defensive measures; and Sir Bartle Frere is blamed for having precipitated the attack and taken upon himself the responsibility. He was blamed for that, and that alone; and when he is charged with all sorts of breaches of Constitutional Law, and so on, I think that some consideration should be given to the position in which he is placed. There is no telegraph to the Cape or to Natal. He was nearly a month from home. He was charged with a commission different from an ordinary Governor of a Colony; and he was authorized, beyond that, to take defensive measures against an irruption of Zulus. In the measures which he took, no doubt, he took them as the best defensive measures. I think there are many occasions when a movement in advance is the best possible defence; but that was not what the Government understood from despatches they received. Now, my Lords, I come to what is the kernel of this Motion.

My Lords, the noble Marquess condemns the Government in that, having censured Sir Bartle Frere for acting with precipitation, for taking responsibility on himself which belonged to the Government alone, they have left him in the position he occupies in South Africa. My Lords, it is one thing to censure; it is another thing to recall. A censure is, if I may say so, a correction of a fault, a recall is a punishment which degrades and depresses the man to whom it is applied. Now, I am the last man to say that the Government ought to hesitate, if they found an inefficient servant—one who has risked the lives of our soldiers and fellow-subjects, and who has carried on his policy in a way which shows that he is not a man to be trusted—to recall or supersede him. But the acts of Sir Bartle Frere are not the acts of inefficiency. He was not sent to South Africa solely on the ground of military operations, but very much the reverse. He was sent out for a purpose which has been by no means disposed of, as the noble Marquess seems to suppose. He was sent out to bring about, if possible, the Confederation of the different States in South Africa by conciliatory measures, to unite South Africa in one body, with such protection for the Natives as would bring them into the condition which the noble Marquess wishes—protected and encouraged in the arts of peace, and prevented indulging in the arts of war. That great work as yet remains unaccomplished, and surely you will not say that you are to throw over a great project for the benefit of mankind because difficulties present themselves in carrying it into effect. This was a project carefully thought out and carefully undertaken.

It may be that different interests prevent the union we desire; but surely it is worth trying—that of applying the same law to the Natives, the Boers, and the English—to unite them altogether. It might be a union difficult to consolidate and maintain; but it was desirable to effect it, if possible. The Ultimatum having been sent to Cetewayo, and he not having complied, can it be supposed that the proper policy was to sit quiet and do nothing? The fault that we find is with the sending of the Ultimatum in the first instance. That necessitated all the rest.

The noble Marquess said he would not say anything in opposition to the character or position of Sir Bartle Frere. It is very easy, in vague, general terms, to say of Sir Bartle Frere that he is a man of the highest character, of refined intellect, and strictly honourable and conscientious in every respect; but Sir Bartle Frere has been selected for positions which showed that he is a man who, if he had operations to conduct, of whatever kind, ought to be well qualified for them. He was Chief Commissioner in Scinde between the years 1850 and 1859; and it cannot be necessary to speak of the services which he rendered during the Mutiny, for he showed not only capacity, but the greatest possible courage, for he denuded himself of troops for the benefit of those at a distance. That may or may not have been a mistake; but if it was, it was a mistake which benefited others, and has, at all events, been approved. Since that time he has been on the Council of the Viceroy of India; he was for five years Governor of Bombay; then he was on the Council of the Secretary of State for India at home; and he was sent, in the time of the late Government, to Zanzibar, where he conducted a most delicate and difficult mission, which showed that he was a man whose capacity and intelligence could be thoroughly trusted, and whose heart was also in the right place with respect to the Natives of Africa. When he came back, in 1872, he was called to the Council by the late Government, and, I might add, that when the illustrious Prince, who is at present in this House, visited India, no one was thought more fit to be in attendance upon his Royal Highness than Sir Bartle Frere. It may be that we ought logically—I cannot say morally—to deprive ourselves of the services of a man of this great capacity, who has been studying the work in which he is engaged with the greatest care during two years in South Africa, and send out in his place a new man to learn his lesson and begin again the work which Sir Bartle Frere has so far done. When he went out, what was the condition put upon him? We had at the Cape a Ministry thwarting the policy of this country, impeding the military operations, and acting so as practically to destroy the Colony which they affected to serve. Sir Bartle Frere, by a conciliatory and at the same time firm attitude, brought about a different state of things, and, by means of a new Ministry, has put the Cape Colony in a position in which, I venture to say, in the whole course of its existence it never was before. His policy has brought the Colony into harmony with this country; and—more than that—the Colony has made pecuniary sacrifices such as it has never made before—it has made sacrifices in men—and it has also shown a deep interest in one of its neighbour Colonies. All this we owe to the conciliatory policy and the intelligence which Sir Bartle Frere has brought to his task. Again, I say that when he went into Natal he found a state of things which was in itself very threatening and very alarming. He found a Lieutenant Governor, of whom I would speak with the greatest respect, and whose admirable despatches I have read with the greatest interest—I mean Sir Henry Bulwer—who was to a great extent opposed to his policy. But what was the end of it? Sir Henry Bulwer approved his Ultimatum in every particular, and approved also all the different demands which he made upon Cetewayo—and are you, therefore, to use Sir Henry Bulwer as an adversary of Sir Bartle Frere instead of as a convert to his opinions? Sir Henry Bulwer saw that the black cloud hanging upon the horizon of Natal must burst soon, and he felt that the time had come when the Colony must be protected in some way or other. He therefore fell in with the views of Sir Bartle Frere—rightly or wrongly is not the question—and encouraged him to present the Ultimatum. Sir Theophilus Shepstone also, who had previously taken a different view, was brought round by the arguments of Sir Bartle Frere. And, in addition to these, Bishop Colenso, who has been supposed to be the particular friend of the Zulus, and whom I do not claim as an entire supporter of Sir Bartle Frere, felt that the time had come at which to demand the disbanding of the Zulu Army, and some of the other matters included in the Ultimatum of Sir Bartle Frere.

Much has been said out-of-doors with regard to the policy of the present Government which is not accurate. It has been said that our policy has been one of extending and annexing territory, and I know not what. We have, no doubt—you may call it Imperialism or what you please—had a policy; but it has not been one of either annexation or extension of territory. Our policy has been to make safe the territory we have; and if, as is sometimes the inevitable result of such policy, we have been obliged in certain cases to protect our Frontier, that has not been done with a view of making a larger Empire, but of retaining that which we are bound to maintain and occupy. What we desire in this South African business is that the English and the Dutch Colonists should be relieved from an incubus which is weighing upon them and preventing them from prospering. We desire that the Native States shall be brought into a condition much more beneficial to them than that in which they exist at present. I do not know whether your Lordships have observed what is said with respect to the Zulus who live within Natal—how very amenable to discipline they are, how industrious, and how much their desire is to live peaceably with their neighbours; how they enjoy the fruits of a peaceful life, and are desirous to live in peace if possible. There is no reason why the bloodthirsty tribes who submit to Cetewayo should not be brought into a higher condition of civilization, and so brought, it may be, possibly by the sword. Everyone will agree that, after what happened in that disaster which was no disgrace—a disaster which has fallen so heavily upon many families in this country, but upon which they can look with pride, as every man who fell, fell while doing his duty to his country—we have to retrieve that disaster. In doing this, we shall not act for the sake of vengeance, but in order to bring about in South Africa a state of things such as becomes the dominions of a great country like this; and not to yield to the threatenings and intimidations of the surrounding tribes, but to bring them into such submission as will tend to give happiness, peace, and security to our Colonies. This is no time either for boasting or faintheartedness. This country is well able to take care of itself; but the Government at home have a right to expect that they who have an eye over every part of the world should have the privilege and power of deciding upon measures which are vital to any one of the Colonies. Still, if a man in a position similar to that of Sir Bartle Frere, in the exercise of a high sense of duty, makes a mistake, and engages in something you would rather he had not done—if he be a man of great capacity, fitted to bring to a conclusion the work he has undertaken, let us correct him, but with moderation, and not condemn him absolutely, as is proposed by the Resolution which has been moved.

LORD BLACHFORD said, he had listened attentively to the speech of the noble Viscount (Viscount Cranbrook) without having been able to discover whether the Government thought the policy of Sir Bartle Frere wise or unwise, and the war in which he had involved the country just and necessary, or unjust and unnecessary. He understood that they thought it precipitate; but was it precipitate only because he acted without orders, or because he acted wrong? On that difference the whole force of their censure depended. The noble Viscount had stated truly that the army of the Zulu King constituted a serious danger to the Colony of Natal, which it was most advisable to mitigate or remove. But, for an operation so delicate and hazardous, it was necessary to watch opportunities, and to choose a favourable time and manner of proceeding. He desired to give his own reasons for thinking that the time and manner of requiring the disbandment of the Zulu Army were ill-chosen, and that the war which followed was unwise and unnecessary. In 1843, Natal was declared a British Colony, divided only by the River Tugela from the Zulu Kingdom—a Kingdom not so great or cruel as it had been, but by far the most warlike and powerful of those parts. The Zulus had their ways, and very bad ways they were. Life was cruelly destroyed, property was lawlessly taken away. Little could be said for the habits of the Government or people, except that they had been worse. But with us, though their force was overwhelming, there were always at peace. On that point the testimony was uniform and unequivocal. They not only were our friends, but they acknowledged a kind of superiority. The present King, Cetewayo, was especially attached to us. He did not, indeed, owe us his throne—as was sometimes said—he owed it to a great victory, in which he killed his rival brother and 3,000 of his adherents; but he was content to receive it from us. A Natal officer advised and witnessed his nomination as Heir Apparent. And the same officer—Sir Theophilus Shepstone—entered the country, at the request of the Zulu people, to invest him, at the death of his father, with the Royal dignity. It was no slight thing to have remained at peace with a barbarian neighbour for some 35 years—and that, although occasions of discontent were not wanting in the continual stream of refugees who sought security in Natal from the violent rule of himself and his Chiefs. The cause was evident in itself, and recognized by himself and his people. We had no "forward policy;" we did not want anything which was not ours. When our boundary was once settled, we showed no disposition to extend it. We even refused invitations to do so. We showed no disposition to grasp authority. Rather we declined it when it was thrust upon us. When in 1873, on the occasion already referred to, Sir Theophilus Shepstone entered Natal to invest Cetewayo with the Royal authority, everything was done "at the request of the people." "Have not I entered Zululand at the request of the Zulu nation to instal their King? Have you not requested me to proclaim new laws? Have we not agreed that the life of a man or woman, high or low, is the property of the country?" and so on. These were the questions which Mr. Shepstone asked, and which King, Chiefs, and people answered in the affirmative. It was due to this confidence in our forbearance that even when Cetewayo was most irritated with the Administrator of the Transvaal, was most discourteous in his language, and was probably encouraging his subjects in an underhand way to take the law into their own hands in a disputed territory, of which hereafter, he never desired to quarrel with Natal. These being our relations with the Zulu King and people, what was the state of the nation itself? In the first place, the law was the law of the strongest, and it was by that law that the succession to the throne was decided. That was very important in considering the probable stability of a formidable Power. The first Monarch was murdered by his brothers, and one of them, Dingaan, seized the throne. Panda revolted against Dingaan, who fled and was murdered in a foreign country. Before long his sons quarrelled for the succession, and peace was only restored by a battle in which Cetewayo's rival and 3,000 of his people perished. Wars of succession were recognized by the Natives as an almost inevitable evil on the death of a Sovereign. Here was one element of self-destruction. Then the mass of the people were groaning under the tyranny of the King and Chiefs; and the Army, which comprised almost all the male adults, could not collect for drill without fighting and bloodshed. Again, the Kingdom was divided against itself. One of Cetewayo's brothers, Ohame, was already intriguing with us, and offering to escape from his brother's dominions if he could. The elder and wiser part of his people were in favour of our influence, and opposed to the war, and complained that the country was to be sacrificed to save one or two malefactors. And now, such being our own traditional relations with the country, and such its actual condition, what had we to do but to wait? And if we desired to avert the natural course of dissolution, what would be the surest mode of doing it? Surely, to put forward such an unprovoked and unjust demand—unprovoked and unjust, that was, in the eyes of the people—as would stir the feelings of every Zulu who was proud of his country, and unite the whole against an external enemy. Such, he need hardly point out, was the disbandment of the Zulu Army. He asked, not only whether it was possible that that demand could be accepted, but whether it could fail to enlist against us that whole nation in which, if we had not been determined on a quarrel, we might have counted on a large friendly party—which, in no long period, must have fallen to pieces from its own intrinsic defects, and which, in the ordinary course of events, a disputed succession would have delivered into our hands? But it was said that to wait thus on events was to trust to the chapter of accidents. It was not so. We did not rely on the chapter of accidents when we reserved to ourselves all the happy chances which that chapter contained. As in any other book which was worth reading, we did but refuse to turn over the leaf till we had got to the bottom of the page. If he was asked what Sir Bartle Frere had to say to all this, he was ashamed to say he did not know. He had studied the High Commissioner's despatches, and recognized their literary skill, their vivacity, their suggestiveness, and their exuberance; but when he attempted to grapple with them as arguments, he felt like a man who was defending himself with a stick against a cloud of locusts—he might knock down one, and knock down another if he could hit them, but "The cry is still, They come;" sometimes in skirmishing order, sometimes in compact groups—but always in multitudes. Sometimes it was Sir Garnet Wolesley's military instinct, sometimes it was the opinion of every educated man with whom Sir Bartle Frere had conversed—and sometimes it was his own—sometimes it was an accumulation of rumours and indications, the significance of which disappeared on anything like careful inspection; but, on the whole, their very multitude made them unassailable. But, whatever their intrinsic value, they did not appear to have convinced Her Majesty's Government, whose replies were, from beginning to end, a series of cautions, qualifications, and protests. But, further, not only was there this general reason for waiting to see what would happen, but there were particular reasons for avoiding unnecessary embarrassment. If you were at peace with one neighbour, your hands were free to take your own course with another. But if you were already entangled in a dangerous and troublesome war, your strength, and your reputation for strength, were alike impaired, and you were tempted, perhaps obliged, to make disadvantageous or discreditable concessions in other quarters. Now, at the present moment, full freedom of action was particularly necessary with regard to our new acquisition of the Transvaal. The late Secretary of State for the Colonies (the Earl of Carnarvon), it was well known, sent out Sir Theophilus Shepstone as an Envoy to that Republic, with powers which enabled him to take possession of it, if he should be satisfied that a sufficient number of the inhabitants wished it. Looking to the expressed opinions of the noble Earl, there could not be the slightest doubt that these very large powers were only intended to avoid legal or technical objections, and that Sir Theophilus Shepstone was not intended to use them unless he was satisfied that the people really desired it. Sir Theophilus Shepstone reported that the inhabitants did desire it, and that he had effected the annexation. But the evidence of that desire was such that Her Majesty's Government could scarcely have accepted it, except under the pressure of some grave apprehension. He believed that it was a mistake to have yielded to that apprehension. But the error, if now persevered in, was likely to become more than an error. Her Majesty's Government had now received a protest against annexation, said to be signed by more than 7,000 out of some 8,000 burghers. And a mass meeting of thousands of farmers had plainly declared to the High Commissioner that, unless their independence was restored, they would refuse to aid what they considered as a usurping Power, even in the defence of their own country. It was evident that the alleged desire for annexation had never existed. And now the consequences were becoming clear. In all his Correspondence about South African affairs, the late Secretary of State had constantly protested against the enormous acquisition of territory which the Boers had declared themselves to have made, and the policy of unrelenting force by which they had made themselves hateful to the Black population. But Sir Theophilus Shepstone, pressed, of course, by the necessity of procuring some appearance of acquiescence in his proceedings, seemed to have led the Boers to expect that we would enforce by the sword all those intolerable claims, and thus destroy that reputation for justice which had formed a main element in our strength in South Africa; while the High Commissioner, in treating with the delegates of the Dutch mass meeting, found himself obliged to invite them to that which, of all things in the world, the English Government had been most anxious to avoid—a war of colour.

At least, that was the only construction which could well be placed on the following sentence—

> "He (the High Commissioner) reminded M. Joubert of what he must know very well—that this was not a war between the English and the Zulus, but between Cetewayo, as the Ruler and champion of all Native races, and the White races—Dutch as well as English."

That we should be driven to such ruinous expedients was surely enough to show the special inexpediency of adding to our Transvaal difficulties by involving ourselves, at this time, in a great Native war. It followed to consider the particular cause of quarrel. Some 15 years ago, the Zulus got into a quarrel with the Boers about a strip of land which ran along their common Frontier. It was almost impossible to be sure of the truth in respect of such transactions; but, in the opinion of four English Commissioners of Inquiry, the leading facts were these. Panda and Cetewayo—one or both—for purposes of their own, had assumed to convey, and the Boers had assumed to accept, a tract of land, which all of them well knew belonged to the Zulu nation, and could not be conveyed without their consent. When the nation understood what had been done, it stoutly repudiated the concession. The Boers began to occupy the territory on one side, the Zulus on the other, and it became clear that trouble would come of it. We employed ourselves for some years together in begging the Zulus to keep quiet. The Zulus employed themselves in begging us to interfere. At last arbitration was effectually resorted to, and these four officers of our own determined that the land belonged to the Zulus; that Cetewayo had no right to dispose of it; that as part of the land had been occupied by the Dutch without serious protest, the claim of the Zulus should be considered as extinguished by their own *laches*, but that the part which—though granted out by the Dutch—had not been occupied at all, or occupied under continual protest, should remain Zulu property, the dispossessed Dutch being compensated, if at all, by the Government which sent them thither with bad titles. That was a distinct recommendation, likely enough to settle the question and restore peace, for it was out of this question that all Cetewayo's ill-humour had arisen, and the award was one which to all appearance he and his people would have accepted. But when it was referred to the High Commissioner, he first kept it back for months, while Cetewayo's suspicions were aroused by the movement of ships, by the stoppage of his supplies of arms, by the movement of troops, and by the rash announcement of general designs to disarm the Natives. And he also determined to nullify the whole grace and importance of the award, by a provision that all the Dutch should retain their so-called proprietary rights under the protection of a British Agent. Against this decision Bishop Colenso protested. And having generally expressed an opinion adverse to the cogency of Sir Bartle Frere's arguments, he (Lord Blachford) felt obliged to call attention to his mode of dealing with this question. First, he treated the award of the British Commission as founded on a legal technicality—the mere omission of an unmeaning ceremony—

> "Owing," he says," to a defect of legal formalities, the land claimed by the Zulus has never legally become Transvaal territory."

The legal formality which was wanting on that occasion was nothing less than the consent of the true owners—the people. A man who had his property sold over his head was, at that rate, to be told, when he reclaimed his own, that no doubt the seller omitted the ceremony of obtaining his consent to the sale—but that that was a mere "legal formality"—with which a British Court of Law would dispense. That seemed a strange conception of justice. But still more extraordinary was the mode in which the High Commissioner dealt with the question whether the Zulus had kept up a steady protest against this invasion of their rights. He denied the fact.

> "I find nothing on record from Panda," he says, "except vague grumbling about 'Boer encroachments.' Cetewayo, who must have known the whole circumstances of the incomplete cession, made no formal complaint that I can find till Sir Theophilus Shepstone's visit to him in 1873, when he must have felt comparatively secure on the throne, and had nothing to lose by challenging the Boers' right to the land he had promised and made over to them. . . . But I cannot at all regard his procedure in 1873 as a 'protest or appeal to our Government seeking redress for wrongs.' In point of fact, I can find nothing like an appeal to us, except for connivance at his attacking the Boers."

And with regard to later proceedings, he said—

> "The offers to arbitrate originated with the Natal Government, and were by no means willingly accepted by Cetewayo after he had taken the law into his own hands."

The High Commissioner "finds nothing on record." Where did he look? The documents were, of course, in the proper department at Natal. But they were collected by Sir Henry Bulwer, and formed the inclosures to his despatch of January 29, 1876, which was printed in the opening pages of Parliamentary Paper 1961 of 1878, for the convenience of those who wished to find them, and certainly not least for convenient reference by Colonial Governors. He would quote some passages from these documents, because they had a significance of their own independent of their bearing on the High Commissioner's statement. In 1861, the messengers of the Zulu King made complaints which had evidently reference to this transaction. Complaints of a more specific kind were repeated in 1865, when Panda, the father, said that—

> "He had not given them the land, but that Cetewayo had given them some to bribe them to deliver up his remaining brother Umtonga to him four years ago; that now he and the Zulu people were beginning to see the effect of this act, he himself repudiated all connection with it, but seemed to imply that he would take no steps in the matter because, as the young man had got into the difficulty, he must get out of it as best he could."

Then, in 1869, came a fresh complaint, not now from Panda and Cetewayo, but from the Zulus, saying that even if Cetewayo had made the grant the Boers knew very well he had no authority to make it. The Zulu people then begged for arbitration; but they also begged that the English would take a strip of the land for themselves, so that they should have nothing to do with the Dutch—

> "Because," they said, "they have been neighbours of the Colony of Natal for so many years separated only by a stream of water, and no question of boundary or other serious difficulty has ever risen between them and the Government of Natal. They knew that when the boundary was fixed by agreement with the English there it would remain."

The same request for arbitration was pressed again in the same year. And in 1870, Panda and Cetewayo were still more urgent, "because," they said prophetically, "they fear that longer delay will cause serious difficulties to arise." In 1872, Cetewayo complained again, and said that he had taken no step to right himself because he held the written promise of the Governor to arbitrate. All these representations were before the investiture of 1873, to which the High Commissioner referred as the commencement of protest. On that occasion, Cetewayo declared that the Zulus would rather die than submit to the Boers in this matter. In 1876, he reiterated his complaints—the Dutch having assumed to levy taxes on his subjects settled in the disputed territory—and begged that the boundary might be defined, as otherwise there would certainly be fighting. On this came the annexation of the Transvaal, by which the British Governor became not only judge of the dispute, but party to it. Mr. Shepstone, who, as protector of Natives, had hitherto advocated the Zulu claims, changed his mind on becoming Administrator of the Transvaal; and Cetewayo, as might be expected, quarrelled with him, transferring his appeal and his allegiance, such as it was, to what he called the "man at Natal." The man at Natal proposed sending to England for Arbitrators. And observe the answer. Cetewayo thanked the Lieutenant Governor for his words—they were all good words—but before sending across sea, he would be glad that the Lieutenant Governor would take up the matter by his own representatives. If that failed, then he could send across the sea for other people. He agreed that the ground in dispute should not be occupied; he disclaimed the idea of hostility against the Transvaal, now British, and would be glad to have a White man placed on the border to keep the peace. And when he received the news of the actual appointment of the Commission, our own messengers told us that his Council seemed all like men who were told they might put down a great weight, and Cetewayo said that "now he would be able to sleep." Compare this narrative with the statement of the High Commissioner, who, implying that he had searched the records, declared that he did not find in them any specific complaints before 1873—that he did not find at any time whatever any appeal to us except for our connivance in attacking the Boers, and that the King accepted unwillingly the offer of arbitration made to him. And what was the result to which, by this kind of reasoning, the High Commissioner was led? The empty Sovereignty he affected to restore to the King, nullifying even this restricted concession by placing him between a British Resident and a Dutch proprietor. But the substantial right of property, the beneficial use of the land which alone was valuable to the people, he handed over to the Dutch farmers, whose rights were at present such that Bishop Colenso told them he had known *5s.* offered for a farm on paper, and Sir Theophilus Shepstone that they were lost and won at billiards. It was impossible not to feel that this metamorphosis of waste-paper land-grants into proprietary rights guaranteed by the British Government, involving, on Bishop Colenso's calculation, an increased value of some 2,000 per cent in Boer property, was one of the processes by which the Dutch farmers were to be bribed out of their independence at the cost of the Natives. There seemed reason to suppose, however, that even to that the Zulus would have submitted, rather than face a war with England, if they had been really invited to do so. But no such invitation was really given. It was idle to say that they were really invited to do that or to do anything else. Various complaints were put forward—various concessions demanded. Border outrages were swollen into national insults—the internal reforms agreed upon in the presence of Mr. Shepstone were distorted into promises—the security promised to missionaries was exaggerated into a promise of immunity to their converts. And matters of that kind were represented as occasions of war, contrary to the expressed opinions of the English Government. But on all these details concession was made useless and impossible by the demand, which must have convinced every Zulu that they were to perish—the demand that those who were to be subjugated should first make themselves helpless. There was something pathetic in the official description of the behaviour of Cetewayo's Envoys when they learnt the terms of the High Commissioner's Ultimatum. On the first items, they wrangled as men who wanted to get all they could. When they heard about the army, they ceased wrangling, as men who saw it is no use, and went home dejected. And in the Parliamentary Papers of this period we met with scattered indications which showed that the matter was quite understood. Cetewayo had ordered the collection of some cattle, for some purpose of restitution. He countermanded it, saying it was no use, as the English were determined to destroy him. And he was reported to have said that, if he must die, he would first cause a destruction in Natal which should be remembered. He might, perhaps, if he had chosen, have been as good as his word. He (Lord Blachford) would add a few words on a matter of less importance, but nearer home. Whatever might be the opinion of Her Majesty's Government on the main question, whether the war was in itself just, or advisable, or necessary, this was certain—that, while disclaiming all the reasons which the High Commissioner had given for it, and censuring him for entering upon it without their authority, they continued to him their entire confidence, and desired to have the advantage of his experience and ability in conducting to a successful issue the enterprize which he had taken on himself to begin in spite of them. Now, it seemed to him that a practice was growing up which was very dangerous to the Public Service—that Governors took on them to disobey the instructions they had received, and that if it was inconvenient to reverse what had been done the officer obtained not only condonation, but distinction. He ventured to think that orders, or, at any rate, wise orders, were to be obeyed; and that if they were not obeyed the Imperial Government might continue to be very Imperial, but would soon cease to be a Government. Might he venture on a light illustration? Many years ago he had a musical friend, much in the habit of leading those quartettes which were now so common, and who complained that one of his co-executants was always behind-hand—which, it must be admitted, was not the present case. Being asked what he did by way of remedy, "I play," he said, "the right note, in the right time, as loud as ever I possibly can. The immediate effect is appalling"—and a similar proceeding in Africa might, no doubt, entail some inconvenience—"but," he said, "it brings everybody right." Now, it appeared to him, on the present occasion, that Her Majesty's Government had played the right note; but he thought they had not played it in the right time, and he was quite sure they had not played it half loud enough.

THE EARL OF CARNARVON: My Lords, the noble Lord opposite, who just now did me the honour of disputing with me the right of speaking (Lord Stanley of Alderley), has warned me that he is prepared to impugn the whole of my conduct when I was in Office. As, however, I believe there never was an occasion in this House when I was in Office that he did not rise to take exception to something I had done, I think I may anticipate readily most of the objections he will be likely to make. I hope, therefore, he will not consider that I have been wanting in courtesy in pressing my claim to speak.

My Lords, I have been mixed up with many of the affairs touched upon to-night, and have been referred to more than once by name, so that I hope I may be allowed for a short time to trespass upon the attention of the House. I will address myself first of all to the Resolution which has been moved. The Resolution condemns Her Majesty's Government nominally, but Sir Bartle Frere in reality, for the steps he has taken, the Ultimatum he delivered, and the war in which he has engaged. My Lords, I am not here to defend every word and act of Sir Bartle Frere; but I should be untrue to him and to myself, if I abstained from saying that I think he has had, at the present crisis, somewhat scant justice; and, but for the unfortunate disaster at Isandula, I do not believe he would have stood in need of defence here to-night. I am not in a position to draw upon official information in this matter; all that can be said officially in his defence I must leave to Her Majesty's Government—but I do know the circumstances in which he went out at my earnest instance to South Africa, and the intentions that animated him. I also know the acts which he has since done, the successful work in which he has been engaged —for it has been successful—which, up to a certain point, he has achieved. My Lords, it may be, perhaps, that he has been impolitic in pressing the Ultimatum on Cetewayo; it may be—though I am not prepared to admit it—that the war has been undertaken without sufficient preparation—and it is certain that in the commencement that war has not been successful; but I would venture to press earnestly on your Lordships, because it is an essential feature in the affair—that the war, at all events, is not an unjust war. I will not go through the terms of the Ultimatum. I will not enter into the question whether he was justified in demanding the disbanding of the Zulu Army; but if he believed that the Army of Cetewayo was a real source of danger to the Colony, I do not think that less than that could have been asked with due regard to its safety. Nor will I follow my noble Friend who spoke last in his argument as to the award on the disputed territory. With regard to that award, so far as I understand the matter, both parties, the Boers and the Zulus, are dissatisfied with its terms; and, therefore, I submit to your Lordships that if both parties are pretty nearly equally dissatisfied, the probability is that something not very far from justice has been arrived at. As regards the case against Cetewayo, he accepted his Crown under certain conditions, which were for the benefit of himself, his people, the Native States, and the Colony of Natal. It is idle to say that he acceded to those conditions as a mere matter of Court ceremonial. Those promises were the equivalent of protection given by us, and those have been openly and flagrantly broken. For a long time past an armed truce has existed, and the Army of Cetewayo has been a standing menace to the European community in his neighbourhood. When I resigned the seals of the Colonial Office, somewhat more than a year ago, I felt that the position of affairs was as precarious as it could possibly be. It was only necessity at home, and the critical outlook on the Continent, which compelled the Government here to hold their hands, and to temporize. Several times in this debate, and out-of-doors, Sir Henry Bulwer has been invoked as a counter authority to Sir Bartle Frere. I have not had the means of looking up all the Papers on the subject. I have, however, come across some confidential communications to me by Sir Henry Bulwer in 1876, in which he speaks in the strongest possible terms of the dangerous and threatening attitude of Cetewayo. Your Lordships will also find in the Parliamentary Papers that in August, 1878, Sir Henry Bulwer wrote—

> "That for the last eight or nine months there has been the danger of a collision with the Zulus at any moment;"

and, again, in November, 1878, he says that the system of government in the Zulu country and the disposition of the present King were so adverse to a better order of things that they would be justified in deposing him. After that, I think we cannot say of Sir Henry Bulwer that his authority runs counter to that of Sir Bartle Frere. But why quote the opinion of English Governors, however able, when we have the principal himself confessing to the offence? Read, and observe, rather, the words of the King, in answer to some remonstrances which Sir Henry Bulwer addressed to him in regard to the massacre that was perpetrated upon some women and children. He asked—

> "Why does the Governor of Natal speak about my laws? Do I come to Natal to dictate to him? Go back and tell the English that I will now go on on my own account. Tell the White men the Governor of Natal and I are equal—he is Governor of Natal, and I am Governor here."

I would ask your Lordships to consider whether, when, 18 months ago, he used language like this, Cetewayo was, after all, so amenable to English influence and so disposed to square his plans and views with ours, as my noble Friend who last spoke would have us believe. I will now consider the case as it bears on Sir Bartle Frere. I wish the House to remember the circumstances in which he has been placed, and with what he has had to deal. In addition to what I have stated, there were other indications of the hostility of the Zulu King—the missionaries were expelled, the farmers driven away, and the English settlers were ordered to leave their farms in a neighbouring territory — mark this — where the Zulus really exercised no authority. The correspondence was broken off; the roads were closed; movements of Zulu troops took place on the Frontier; and everywhere there was a feeling of unrest and dissatisfaction. Nor was this all; for everywhere along the vast Frontier, and beyond that Frontier, where English influence extends, in every tribe the messengers of Cetewayo were exciting revolt or disaffection to English rule. All this shows that the issue of peace or war really rested upon the point of a needle. Then comes the question—Was it such a case of emergency as to justify Sir Bartle Frere in declaring war? You must first look at what the High Commissioner says. He repeats, over and over again, that there was no time to refer the matter to the Home Government. They, indeed, have adopted a different view, and I think it would have been better if the question had been left for their decision—at the same time, it is perfectly clear that the state of affairs was most threatening, and that we were upon the edge of hostilities. Sir Bartle Frere asseverates his belief that there was no time for reference to the Home Government, and we should at least give him credit for what he says himself. Perhaps we have not sufficiently considered the peculiar situation in which Sir Bartle Frere was placed, and the duty of the Government in rare but possible circumstances. In a case of this sort, it is fair to remember the antecedents of a man, and my noble Friend who spoke on the part of the Government went through the long roll of Sir Bartle Frere's brilliant public services. From early youth to manhood, and from manhood to advanced age, his has been an unblemished career of public trust and public service. He has always borne the character of a humane, upright, and just man; and I should be slow to believe—especially in a doubtful case like this—that such a man would turn round on himself and be false to his best history. It was for these high qualities that I recommended him to the Crown and urged him to go to the Cape. When he went out he went in advanced age, with very little reputation to gain, and with much to jeopardize. He went, not on a mission of war, but on a peaceful mission—to consolidate our South African Colonies. I honestly believe, therefore, that when he went out to South Africa he did so with as few dreams of conquest or annexation as I had when I urged him to go out. I may here say that, only a few days ago, when looking over some Papers on this subject, I came accidently across a letter of Sir Bartle Frere's, which he addressed to me after I left Office, and I do not think I shall be committing any breach of confidence if I venture to read one sentence from it to the House. He wrote it on the 4th of May last year—and I am the less unwilling to read it because, so far as it goes, it is a tribute to the services of Lord Chelmsford. He says—

> "Thesiger is doing all and more than I hoped for; but he has the really hard part of his task yet before him. It is a real pleasure to work with him. I only trust that peace may be kept in Europe, and that he may be allowed time to set us in order, and prevent wars for the future —the real function, to my mind, of a good, civilized soldier."

This is, I believe, a true expression of Sir Bartle Frere's inner mind, and certainly they are not the words of a man bent on war, annexation, and conquest. What will be the conclusion of Sir Bartle Frere when he reads the despatch which my right hon. Friend the Secretary of State has thought it right to address to him, and when he sees the interpretation which is placed upon that despatch, it is not for me to say. If, indeed, he were to accept the interpretation which is too frequently put upon it, there would be, I think, but one course open to him to take as a man of honour. But if, on the other hand, my interpretation of the despatch be the true interpretation, it seems to me that Sir Bartle Frere is not censured for the terms of the Ultimatum which he delivered to the Zulu King, for his policy, or for any step which he took, in fact, except this—that he did not refer the question of peace and war home to the Government in time to enable them to pronounce an opinion upon it. That I understand to be the meaning and substance of the despatch; and if that be so, I sincerely trust Sir Bartle Frere will not deem it to be his duty to resign the great trust which he now holds in South Africa. It may be, as my noble Friend opposite says, that he has committed an error—a great error, if you please; but of this I am quite certain—that, looking beyond this war—looking not only to the good government of South Africa, but to the relations between it and this country, the loss of the services of Sir Bartle Frere at this moment would be an irreparable loss. I know of no other man who can, equally with him, make his way through the tangled labyrinth of South African policy, and who has so good a chance as he has of solving matters in a satisfactory way either for South Africa or for this country.

But, my Lords, another subject of great importance has been touched upon more than once this evening, and frequently alluded to out-of-doors. My noble Friend who spoke last (Lord Blachford) dwelt upon the history of the annexation of the Transvaal. I regret to find that his tried judgment in these matters should be at variance with the course which I took, and for which I was responsible. I am therefore anxious to explain to your Lordships the main outline of the transaction. I am, however, placed in a position of some difficulty in dealing with it. It is now more than two years since it occurred, and I am debarred from all reference to official communications. I have to rely solely and entirely on my own memory and on the aid of some few Papers which I happen to possess. It appears to me, I may add, somewhat hard that two years should have been allowed to go by before the annexation is impugned, and that now, after a silence which condoned, or after speeches which actually approved the act, I should be called upon after that lapse of time to defend a transaction which, when it took place —it may be said without exaggeration— seemed generally to be acquiesced in. But let me tell the House what actually occurred. Very soon, indeed, after I received the seals of the Colonial Office —in the year 1875, I think—my attention was anxiously directed to the affairs of South Africa. I will not trouble your Lordships with the barbarous names or the untoward events which occurred in Natal. The House will remember that there was an outbreak which led to bloodshed, and what may not be unfitly described as a very perilous crisis. Then followed great difficulties with the Orange Free State; and these, again, were followed by others not less serious with the Transvaal Republic; and, lastly, controversies, complicated, difficult of solution, and even angry in character, with the Cape Government itself arose. It was then I proposed to the Cape Government the scheme of Confederation. It raised, as your Lordships may recollect, a great storm. Ultimately that storm was soothed; but still a great and difficult question remained to be dealt with—the question of Native policy. I am speaking now of the latter part of 1876, when, after much opposition and many difficulties, I was able to procure the assembling of a Conference in London representing almost all the States and Colonies in South Africa. There is no doubt that that Conference would have arrived at a satisfactory conclusion with regard to a most important question—the introduction of the sale of arms—but that the Cape Government refused, through their Prime Minister, their co-operation; and, inasmuch as uniformity in such a case was obviously essential, the measure broke down. But in all these different cases, many and great as were the difficulties, they were practically being surmounted one by one, and a better hope of securing for South Africa a sound and reasonable system of government was in sight. But at that moment appeared upon the horizon that black cloud which has since assumed such dimensions. The Transvaal Republic, in its greed for land, encroached on Native rights and embarked in hostilities. War ensued, horrible barbarities were committed, the Natives gained the ascendancy; the Boer Army was beaten, the Transvaal State fell into confusion — collapsed — and utter bankruptcy followed. Throughout the whole of those difficulties it became my duty, on the part of the Government, over and over again, to give the most serious warning to the Transvaal Republic; but those warnings having been disregarded, and the state of affairs every day growing worse, we despatched Sir Theophilus Shepstone to South Africa, than whom there was no man more competent by experience, knowledge, and wisdom to deal with such a case. He went out, but for a long time he took no action. He was armed with a Commission which recited, in the first place, the grievous disturbances which were taking place in South Africa, to the great peril of peace and the safety of the Colonies. But the Commission went on to provide that, if the emergency should be such as to render it necessary to secure their peace and safety, he was provisionally to administer the territories, under the control of Her Majesty's Government, in case the inhabitants, or a sufficient portion of them, or the Legislature, should wish it. It was necessary, under the extremely grave circumstances of the time, to give this power; but it was one only to be exercised in the event of the emergency becoming such as to threaten the safety of all South Africa. Unfortunately, matters grew worse; complications of a very serious nature arose. Attacks were made by the Zulus on the Transvaal. They crossed the borders, and considerable slaughter ensued. The President of the Republic despatched an agent named Rudolph, who had great weight with those wild tribes, to negotiate; and upon his mission, for a time, the whole question of peace and war hung. Rudolph, however, failed in his negotiations, and then the state of the case in the Transvaal was simply this; and I prefer giving it in Sir Theophilus Shepstone's own words rather than quoting from memory—

> "The Government is powerless to control its White citizens or its Native subjects; it is incapable of enforcing its laws or collecting its taxes. The Treasury is empty, the salaries of the officials have been for months in arrear, the White inhabitants are split into factions, the large Native populations within the boundaries of the State ignore its authority and laws, and Cetewayo is anxious to seize upon the first opportunity of attacking. . . . The thrilling intelligence has gone through all the immense masses of Natives that the relative positions of the White and the Black man have become seriously changed."

Such was the state of affairs when, after repeated warnings from me, from the Governor of the Cape, and from Sir Theophilus Shepstone, the Transvaal lay at the feet of the Zulus. It was, then, only at the last moment—on the 12th of April—that Sir Theophilus Shepstone exercised to the full the authority with which he had been provisionally intrusted, and annexed the Transvaal to Her Majesty's Dominions. And how was that annexation received? Why, with almost universal rejoicing. I have here a telegram which is taken out of the Papers laid before your Lordships' House, in which Sir Bartle Frere says—

> "Great majority, Boers welcome change, convinced of impossibility of self-government. Not a single disturbance. Troops crossed Frontier, are being conveyed in Boers' waggons. Boers, spectators, and pleased officials everywhere offer services."

I must commend that telegram to my noble Friend opposite. But I am not surprised at the change that has taken place. It is in the course of human nature that the very men who welcomed so lately that annexation should be the first now to repudiate it, when the danger which they dreaded is—thanks to that annexation—past. It is said that the annexation was a high-handed act. I am absolutely at a loss to know how those words can be used. There was nothing high-handed about it. But then, I am told, as I gathered from my noble

Friend opposite (Lord Blachford), that the annexation had been resolved upon to press on the scheme of Confederation in South Africa. Speaking for myself, I can say that that is wholly without foundation. In annexing the Transvaal the question of Confederation never entered my mind, still less was it a motive inducing me to such a policy. It was, on the contrary, opposed to my systematic efforts of the previous two years to conciliate the Dutch population in South Africa. But it was not a question of policy; the simple truth is that there was no alternative except that of annexation, as a matter of self-preservation. Let me ask your Lordships what would have been the result if there had been no annexation? It is not fair to read past events by the light of present events. You must try to put yourselves in the position of those who had to act two years ago, when that annexation took place. I do not hesitate to say that if there had been no annexation the result would have been the same, or rather worse. You would not merely have had the Transvaal on your hands, but war, bloodshed, and rapine in Natal, the British territory adjoining; and, possibly, in the Orange Free States. It is the greatest possible mistake to suppose that we could have left this dispute to be fought out between the Boers and the Zulus. You cannot separate the Transvaal from Natal. In Natal, as in the Transvaal, you have a large Dutch population, with all the ties which a common race and language and feeling create. But there is a further complication of interests. The Transvaal has not only a Dutch, but an English population, who, all that time, were stretching out their hands, and imploring us to intervene to preserve them from ruin, as men who had never renounced their allegiance to the Queen and to this country. From the moment the Boers failed in their war, war with the Zulus became inevitable, for we could not have stood by to see the Transvaal overrun by barbarians—we should have been bound to interfere. I readily admit that the annexation involved responsibility; at the same time, those who would have declined to accept that responsibility would have been unfit for their position. But it is said we took their territories against the will of the inhabitants. Let me remind your Lordships of a few facts, and see if you can possibly reconcile them with such a theory. At the time of the annexation, no less than 2,500 men out of 8,000—that is to say, more than a fourth—petitioned for Sir Theophilus Shepstone's intervention and protection. He went with an escort of only 25 mounted police. There was a regiment, but it never crossed the Frontier. There was not an angry word spoken, not a shot fired, not a drop of blood shed. There was, no doubt, a Protest by the President; but, if your Lordships read the Papers, you will see that it was obviously a formal Protest. I maintain, then, that annexation saved, for two years, the Transvaal from the horrors of war and rapine—and saved, not only the Transvaal, but Natal, the contiguous country, and all the English, from the horrors of war. It has been said to-night that we ought to have waited and watched. No one would have preferred a waiting and watching policy more than I; but the overwhelming emergency that then occurred compelled us to some action. I will read two lines to your Lordships from a book which has been recently published by one of the prominent actors in South Africa, a very distinguished officer, than whom there is no one who was in a better position for appreciating the subject, I refer to Sir Arthur Cunynghame. He says—

> "The great danger of attack on the Republic by the Zulu King was averted, just in time, by the annexation of the Transvaal. Had Cetewayo attacked the Boers, the intimate acquaintance which I subsequently made with the country assures me that the Transvaal Republic would have become a scene of bloodshed, fire, and rapine from one end to the other."

My Lords, I will say but very little more. I felt it my duty to say what I have said with regard to Sir Bartle Frere. I also felt that the question of the annexation of the Transvaal had been so much mixed up with these matters that it would probably be best that I should offer an outline—though a very brief one—of the causes which led to a measure which was reluctantly adopted, and the importance of which I never disguised from myself. But there is one great question on which I would ask leave to say a few words more—I mean the future policy of this country as regards South Africa. It is a great misfortune that in quiet times no one will take the trouble to attend to these questions but those whose special duty it is. But as soon as trouble or war arises, then we hear, on all sides, hasty, inprudent, and ignorant proposals. Further, those who are conversant with Colonial subjects will know that each Colony has its own difficulties and its own problems to solve; but I venture to say that the difficulties and problems of South Africa are the hardest of all. I will not go through the minor difficulties, but I will take the liberty of pointing out three difficulties of first-class importance. They hardly exist in any other Colony; they certainly do not exist in combination in any Colony. First, you have, not only a vast Native population in all stages, from semi-civilization down to barbarism, but you have an inexhaustible swarm of warlike Native Tribes, pouring down from the North; secondly, you have this temptation—the curse of all European communities surrounded by an inferior Native population—to make use of that population under some of the innumerable and often veiled forms of slavery. It is always latent, and it has only been the determination and vigour of English rule and authority that has kept it down. And, thirdly, you have the antagonism of race between the Dutch and English nationalities. You have there a divided sentiment, traditions, religion, language, feeling; and in those divisions you may find the key to much of the difficulty of South African government or mis-government. As these are the three principal difficulties, I will go on, and say there are three things which, in my opinion, an English Government can never do. England has a traditional policy in the control of Native affairs, to which the honour of the Crown is pledged—the religious instincts of the British people are pledged—and from that policy of benevolence to the Native Tribes under British rule England, so long as she continues to exercise her rule, cannot depart. She cannot abandon that. Secondly, England has given responsible government. I do not say whether that gift was a wise one or not; but it has been given. It cannot, in my opinion, be recalled, qualified, or altered. Thirdly, England has—in one part of South Africa, at least—a great military and naval station. The Suez Canal is often spoken of as of paramount value to this country as regards our Eastern possessions. I do not undervalue it; but I say, so long as England retains her supremacy of the seas, the naval and military station at Cape Town is of quite as much, if not more value than the Suez Canal can ever be. As I have taken upon myself to name these three difficulties and these three things, so I will go one step further, and say there are three objects which I think are to be desired. First, I hold it a duty to conciliate in every way we can the Dutch population. It had been my object to accomplish this, and I had succeeded in great measure; and I trust that policy will not be lost sight of, because, at this moment, there are questions which are of an aggravating and perplexing nature. Secondly, it is essential to secure an uniform Native policy. Observe, I say, a Native policy, because these different States may very well retain whatever individuality of national character or particularity of legislation they may prefer internally; but it is clear that if you are ever to look for some effective check upon the recurrence of these wars, it must be in the direction of a uniform Native policy. The absence of such a policy has been one of the causes of these late disorders. And, lastly, I admit, though Confederation is of many forms and kinds, and degrees, still I believe that in some union of the European communities lies the best chance of promoting the interests of the European communities and of the Natives themselves—perhaps, also, the best guarantee against the recurrence of these miserable wars. When the issues of this debate pass away, great as they are, and the war is brought to an end—and I cannot doubt to a successful end — then this great question of South African government, both as regards itself and as regards the relations of South Africa to England, will remain; and whether or not the Government carry out, as I trust from the remarks of the noble Lord they are disposed to do, the policy of Confederation, I hope there is one thing they will not do, and that is to allow the relations of this country with South Africa to drift. I trust they will have clearness of vision and courage enough to seek some clear and distinct policy, founded on a real knowledge of the political and social condition of that most difficult country;

and, having once apprehended it, pursue it unflinchingly to the end.

Lord STANLEY of ALDERLEY: My Lords, the noble Earl who has just sat down complained that two years have been allowed to pass without the annexation of the Transvaal having been impugned, but there has been no opportunity of doing so till now; and as the Colonial Office constantly lays its Blue Books before the House in the month of August, there must be loss of time and delay. Most men are now convinced that the present unfortunate war has been caused by the annexation of the Republic of the Transvaal, in spite of the Protest of its President, ont he pretext that their encroachments on the Zulus and other Kaffir Tribes endangered the peace and safety of the South African Colonies. But when this annexation was carried out, Sir Bartle Frere, instead of redressing the grievance of the Kaffirs, proceeded to attempt to reduce the Zulus to subjection, and to incorporate them in British territories by his Ultimatum. Even if the peace of Europe and Asia had been undisturbed, and no British interests in danger, sound policy would have counselled leaving the Transvaal Republic and the Zulus to balance one another, instead of risking imposing on the people of this country the heavy burden of a war for the sake of obtaining more lands for the Boers, as was admitted by Sir Bartle Frere last February, when he urged on the Boers that this contest had arisen more for their interests than ours. This has been owing to the impatience of the noble Earl the late Secretary of State for the Colonies (the Earl of Carnarvon) to çarry out his scheme of South African Confederation, and to his incurable greed for extending the limits of the Colonies. I say incurable, because the ill-success of the noble Earl's attempts at annexation in the Malay Peninsula, which caused a burdensome and inglorious war, has not deterred him from a repetition of these proceedings in South Africa. Now, the noble Earl pursued his designs of aggrandizing the dominions in South Africa at a time when the peace of Europe and Asia was disturbed, and when it was necessary that Her Majesty's Ministers should be able to devote the whole of their energies and all the resources of the country to the dangers which threatened British interests in the East. But the noble Earl did not write to warn the South African Colonists that they must carefully avoid anything which might lead to disturbances, as the Government had then more important matters to provide for. Even when the noble Earl received a South African deputation on the 2nd January, 1878, he neglected to give them any fresh warning. He left undone those things which he ought to have done, and he also did those things which he ought not to have done; for his speech to that deputation was his first public and overt act of secession from his Colleagues, and the act by which he commenced his subsequent course of thwarting the Prime Minister, hampering his action, and paralyzing the country. For the noble Earl went out of his way to address this South African deputation, of all men, upon the Eastern Question, and to cut the ground from under the feet of the Prime Minister in the negotiations then pending, by sneering at what he named "so-called British honour," and by saying—"There is nobody insane enough in this country to desire a repetition of the Crimean War." No doubt, the noble Earl meant, and his hearers certainly would understand, by this, that in no case would England go to war with Russia. If the words "Crimean War" are to be taken in their limited technical military sense, certainly nobody is insane enough to desire a repetition of the blunder of landing an army on the least vulnerable portion of the Russian territory, where they were shut up in a trap, by the omission to occupy and close the Isthmus of Perekop. By this speech the noble Earl thwarted the Cabinet, and the results of his policy are that the country is paralyzed, whilst the state of things in Europe and Asia is more menacing than at the commencement of last year. But whilst this policy of aggrandizement was contrary to morality and expediency, the method of the noble Earl was equally bad. When he had decided on annexing the Transvaal and depriving the Dutch Boers of their independence, he selected Sir Theophilus Shepstone for this task. Now, Sir Theophilus might be a far better man than he is, and yet be the last man that the noble Earl should have employed. Sir Theophilus Shepstone was identified with the Zulus; he had advocated their claims against the Boers, and was looked upon by them as their father. To send Sir Theophilus to take charge of the Boers and of their interests was, therefore, to put him into an unfair and an impossible position. It would be impossible for a counsel to do justice to himself, if he appeared first for the plaintiff and then on appeal for the defendant. The result was that the Zulus were greatly exasperated at Sir Theophilus's changed disposition towards them, and at his blowing hot and cold out of the same mouth. It had the effect of making the Zulus feel that the British Government had changed its sentiments towards them. Not only was the appointment of Sir Theophilus a mistaken one with regard to the Zulus, it was equally objectionable in what concerns the Boers; for Sir Theophilus, when sent to the Transvaal, did not entertain friendly feelings to the Boers; and if the noble Earl was bent on depriving the Boers of their independence, it was a mistake, when once that was done, to keep the sore open by the continued presence of the Administrator who had taken away their independence, instead of sending a new official to conciliate them. I have before taken occasion to complain of the ambiguous phraseology of the noble Earl's despatches, and of the uncertainty of the meaning of the instructions he issues to his subordinates in the Colonies. There is an unusual instance of this in the noble Earl's despatch of July 22, 1877, to Sir Theophilus Shepstone, C. 1883, No. 16, page 16, with respect to his treatment of the Boers—

> "It would be my earnest desire to prove to the Dutch inhabitants of the Transvaal that the increased prosperity, and the other advantages attendant upon British rule, would not be accompanied by any changes in the customs and laws of the country to which objections would reasonably be made."

This paragraph is deceptive to the eye and ear; it seems to promise the Boers that their laws and customs should be unchanged; but closer analysis seems to show that the Colonial Office reserves the right to alter these laws at its pleasure. To write such instructions, winding between pitfalls, is not the art of a statesman; but there is a personage in the "Pilgrim's Progress" who would have excelled in this style of composition—Mr. Facing-both-Ways. The noble Earl, in justifying the annexation of the Transvaal in a former speech to the House, said

> "That the Zulu King had shown undoubted signs of hostility, and made a movement on the borders."

Now, Cetewayo himself, and many of his chief Imdunas, are said to have declared that this very army was assembled on the borders of the Transvaal at the request of Sir Theophilus Shepstone himself, at a time when it appeared likely that the Boers would rise against the British Government. This statement is made by a civilized Zulu who lives in Natal; he made it after a visit to Zululand to Bishop Colenso. It is quite conceivable that Sir Theophilus Shepstone may have thought that such a demonstration of the Zulus would be useful to overawe the Boers. I would ask the noble Earl whether his attention has been drawn to this statement on the part of the Zulus, which corroborates a similar statement made by the Transvaal delegates in August, 1878, to the Colonial Office. The noble Earl complained, on the first night of the Session, of the conduct of the Portuguese in allowing arms to pass from Delagoa Bay to the Zulus; but the noble Earl is the least qualified to make this complaint against the Portuguese, for two reasons. Mr. Dunne, though receiving a salary from the Natal Government, was the means of introducing these arms to the Zulus; and this fact was brought before the noble Earl by the Aborigines Protection Society as long ago as July 1877; but the noble Earl did not at once put a stop to these proceedings of Mr. Dunne, as he might have done, though the information was confirmed by Sir Henry Bulwer. In the second place, the noble Earl does not do well to complain of any such smuggling, when he remembers that, in 1877, he undertook to remedy the complaints of the Spanish Government caused by the constant smuggling carried on from Gibraltar; yet the moment that the smugglers raised the cry of freedom of trade he abandoned his intentions and promises, and nothing has since been done in that matter. I now come to Sir Bartle Frere's share in the responsibility of the authorship of this war. In the mass of documents presented to Parliament, there do not appear any instructions authorizing Sir Bartle Frere to press the Zulus to the extremities to which he reduced them by his Ultimatum. But the Blue Books show a pre-determination on his part to force on a war, and to write down the Zulus. Every act of violence on the part of the Kaffirs is painted in the blackest colours, the cruelties of the Boers are passed over in silence. He writes much about the slaughter of some women; but he omits to dwell upon the explanation of it given by his informant, the magistrate, Mr. Osborne, that rum was at the bottom of that affair. There is much in his despatches that can only be described as sanctimonious and sensational writing. For instance, he wrote on the 24th January, 1879, that Cetewayo was forming "celibate, man-destroying gladiators," terms which might equally have been applied to our own soldiers when long service existed. He makes much of the phrase of "the young men washing their spears in blood;" but that phrase is no more reprehensible than that of "fleshing maiden swords;" or the well-known dictum of "keeping the Bombay Army in wind." Sir Bartle Frere also puts forward the usual plea of military tyrants—that he is not making war upon the Zulus, but only against Cetewayo. When Napoleon Buonaparte had his camp at Boulogne, he could not speak of the Constitutional Sovereign of England; but he proclaimed that he was coming to free the people of England from the aristocracy. The Prussians said that they were only making war on Napoleon III.; but his capture at Sedan did not stay their march. And now this plea is put forward for the English nation in South Africa and in Afghanistan, where it has already been proved to be false. However, it is unnecessary to say more of Sir Bartle Frere, since it is clear from the Blue Books that he has not only precipitated a war on his own motion and authority, but that he has done so in spite of contrary instructions from Her Majesty's Government. But here, again, the late Secretary of State for the Colonies is primarily responsible; for had it not been for the laxity with which he tolerated similar excesses, and the going beyond their instructions on the part of the Governors of Singapore, Sir Andrew Clarke and Sir William Jervoise, Sir Bartle Frere would not have ventured upon the unjustifiable course which he has pursued. The Colonial Governors have been trained to put their blind eyes to the telescope whenever the Government signals caution, and this ought to be put an end to.

EARL CADOGAN: My Lords, I am in some difficulty in endeavouring to follow the noble Lord (Lord Stanley of Alderley), who has just sat down. I was unable distinctly to hear his remarks; but, so far as I could gather them, they appeared to me to have been directed chiefly to an attack—which I might almost call personal—on the late Secretary of State for the Colonies. My noble Friend is able to defend himself, and, no doubt, will take the earliest opportunity of doing so. I think it would be for the convenience of the House that I should direct attention, not so much to the conduct of the late Secretary of State for the Colonies, as to the Resolution of the noble Marquess opposite. I, for one, must say that I heartily rejoice that the noble Marquess should have seen fit to alter his Resolution by the addition to it which he placed on the Paper last night. The Resolution we have had before us for the last few days—I may say weeks—was "without form and void"; "darkness" was certainly on the face of it; and it was not until last evening that any clear light was shed on the intention of my noble Friend in regard to the Motion of which he had given Notice. The addition he has now tacked on to that Motion has had one great advantage—namely, that it has not only placed before the House a clear issue on which a decision can be taken, but it has afforded an opportunity to the Government, and to my noble Friend who followed the noble Marquess (Viscount Cranbrook), of meeting that Resolution with a direct and emphatic negative. My noble Friend the Secretary of State for India has so thoroughly stated the case on behalf of the Government that there are very few points on which I need touch; but representing, as I do, the Department which is chiefly concerned in these transactions, I hardly like to give a silent vote on the question. The noble Marquess said to-night that the first clause of his Resolution was one to which no one could object; and I must say I heartily concur in that opinion. But I must remark that the noble Marquess did not enlighten us as to the meaning which he himself attached to the words of that part of the Resolution. These words are—

> "That this House is willing to support Her Majesty's Government in all necessary measures for defending the possessions of Her Majesty in South Africa."

That expression is not only a vague one, but it has been used on more than one occasion by Sir Bartle Frere himself. In a despatch dated the 5th of November, 1878, Sir Bartle Frere said—

> "These are briefly the grounds for my belief that the reinforcements we have asked for are the least that can be required to give a reasonable assurance of success in any operations which may be necessary."

Again, writing on the 2nd of December, 1878, Sir Bartle Frere said—

> "It seems to me worse than folly to shut our eyes to such facts, and quite unnecessary to seek other justification for whatever measures may be necessary to enable us and all who belong to us to sleep in absolute peace and security against foreign outrage within our own border."

When, therefore, the noble Marquess asks us to pass a Resolution affirming that we are prepared to take all necessary measures for the defence of our possessions in South Africa, it is not unfair to ask what are the necessary measures to be adopted for that purpose? Do these measures include such an act as that of sending the Ultimatum to which reference is made in the Resolution? That act of Sir Bartle Frere, in sending the Ultimatum without consulting Her Majesty's Government, has met with the unqualified disapprobation of Her Majesty's Government. But it does not appear to have been thoroughly understood that the disapprobation expressed in the despatch of the 19th of March only refers to that point—namely, to the fact that the Ultimatum was forwarded without asking the previous sanction of the Government. Therefore, when the noble Marquess says that the censure passed by the Government was a censure upon the whole policy of Sir Bartle Frere, he overstates the case. With regard to the Ultimatum itself, its various clauses have been discussed provisionally in despatches by the Secretary of State for the Colonies; and the position of the Government in regard to that Ultimatum is that they have reserved for further consideration the various matters included in it, which must be the subject of discussion when the war is over and the terms of peace come to be arranged.

My Lords, the next clause of the Resolution is the one which conveys, perhaps, the severest censure on Sir Bartle Frere. It assumes that the war had been commenced "without imperative and pressing necessity." But I think it only fair to remind my noble Friend that there is considerable difficulty in forming an opinion on matters which occur in a distant country like South Africa with the amount of information we have at our command. If I wished to urge caution on any of those who are prepared to pass a judgment on such a question as this, I should be content to quote two sentences which were uttered on the first night of the present Session by two Members of your Lordships' House, who are, perhaps, more than any others, qualified to pronounce an opinion on these subjects. My noble Friend the Secretary of State for the Colonies under the late Government (the Earl of Kimberley) said that of all the affairs which fell under the management of the Colonial Office, there were none more difficult to understand or manage than those of South Africa; and my noble Friend the late Secretary of State for the Colonies (the Earl of Carnarvon) added, that of all men he knew of in the world who were fitted to form an opinion upon the various questions which came up for discussion in reference to South Africa, there were none whose opinions he would value more than Sir Bartle Frere, Sir Theophilus Shepstone, and Sir Henry Bulwer. It is obvious how difficult it must be for us at a distance to understand the various circumstances which have to be taken into consideration, and how enormous must be the advantage of being on the spot, in forming an opinion, or selecting a course of action, on an occasion like that under discussion. There is no complete analogy between dealing with savage and distant nations and with European States. If we are to be guided by the opinions of others, it should surely be by those who, by their actual presence at the scene of operations, and the intimate knowledge they have acquired of the country and people with whom they have to deal, are best qualified to assist us in forming a just and right conclusion; and I confess that if I were asked to express an opinion as between the authority of those three men whose names have been mentioned and the authors of the Resolutions in this and the other House, I should not hesitate to decide in favour of the former. We are not asked in this matter to take the opinion of Sir Bartle Frere unsupported. The noble Viscount the Secretary of State for India has reminded your Lordships that Sir Bartle Frere was supported in his opinion by those best qualified to judge on the spot, and that he had received the concurrence of Sir Theophilus Shepstone, Sir Henry Bulwer, and Bishop Colenso; and he might have added that Sir Arthur Cunynghame and Colonel Lanyon had expressed views to much the same effect. Such are the opinions of the authorities in South Africa, and I hardly know whether your Lordships will think me justified in offering one further testimony in addition to those; but I am anxious to read a portion of a private letter which I received on Saturday last a letter from a gentleman who has lived in Zululand, who is personally acquainted with Cetewayo, and who knows, and has at various times inhabited, Zululand. I am not at liberty to give the name of the writer; but I should be happy to show the letter to any noble Lord who desires to see it. He says—

> "So long ago as 1862, 1863, and 1864, during each of which years I spent some months in Zululand, I was thoroughly impressed with the improbability of Natal and the Zulus continuing as two independent Powers for any great length of time. The Zulus were then on the best possible terms with Englishmen, and they looked up to us with quite a superstitious respect; and I believe that most Englishmen who had dealings with the Zulus thought that a peaceful annexation would come about in a few years as the population of Natal grew denser. In 1870 and 1871 I again spent a short time among them, and the difference in their behaviour was very marked. Familiarity with White men had done a great deal towards decreasing the respect in which they were held by the Zulus. The Zulus, too, were then beginning to get guns and powder, and they thought that the possession of a gun made them equal to a white man. Though they were still very friendly, they made no secret of their belief that man for man they were as good, or better, than Englishmen, and many things that I heard convinced me that a Zulu War was only a question of time. But for all that, it would be absolutely impossible for me to produce any proof of the saying of the Natives on which my opinion was formed. I cannot help thinking that it must be almost, if not quite, as impossible for Sir Bartle Frere to bring forward any proof of the correctness of his opinion that Cetewayo meant fighting us."

And in a later part of his letter, the writer says—

> "I doubt very much if we Englishmen realize the suddenness with which we should have been attacked, or the awful destruction of life that would be inevitable, if the Zulus took the initiative and crossed the Tugela. I know nothing personally of Sir Bartle Frere, but I sincerely believe that the war must have broken out before long in any circumstances, and that had we waited until the Tugela dried up to the shallow level of the South African winter, the Zulus would have overrun Natal, and the loss of life would have been unequalled since the Indian Mutiny."

But whatever differences there may be upon matters of opinion, there are certain facts which I think cannot be disputed. There can be no doubt that a military Power such as that of the Zulus, controlled by a savage monarch like Cetewayo, has lately threatenend danger, directly or indirectly, to the whole of the Colonies of South Africa. We have been told, and shall be told again, that this danger has existed for several years, during the tenure of Office of the late Government, and that it is only now, under the aggressive rule of the present Government, that this danger has assumed its present form. Now, my Lords, there are two conditions which I believe have materially altered and increased that danger. The first is that the Zulus have been of late years armed with weapons of precision which they did not possess before. As I had the honour of saying in your Lordships' House a few days ago, the arming of the Zulus commenced after the annexation of Griqualand, owing to the wages at the Diamond Fields being chiefly paid in arms; and ever since that the trade in arms has materially altered the condition and the military status of the Zulus. Then the other circumstance which contributed to bring about the greater danger from this military Power was the boundary question. We are told that the annexation of the Transvaal is responsible for the present state of things, inasmuch as, by the annexation of the Transvaal, we rendered ourselves responsible for the quarrels and liabilities of that Republic. I can only say, for myself, that I believe if the Transvaal had not been annexed by my noble Friend, the boundary question would have settled itself very rapidly; and would have been settled in this way—that Cetewayo would have swept away all boundaries whatever between his State and the Transvaal, and would have cleared all the White population out of that territory. This would inevitably have dragged Natal into a war, in which we should naturally have been concerned. Therefore, I think my noble Friend the Secretary of State for India was perfectly justified in the statement he made—that, so far from the annexation of the Transvaal having accelerated the present war, it had actually delayed it for two years.

My Lords, it has not been denied, and I certainly will not attempt to deny it, that the Ultimatum issued by Sir Bartle Frere was one, as the noble Marquess (the Marquess of Lansdowne) stated, that was calculated to cause war. But there is one point with regard to Sir Bartle Frere's action which has not been alluded to, I think, to-night—namely, that he tacked the conditions which form the Ultimatum on to the award which he delivered on the boundary question. Sir Bartle Frere has explained very clearly his reasons for doing that. I have made the following summary of the reasons which Sir Bartle Frere has given in his despatch of the 24th of January last for attaching the Ultimatum to the award:—

> "That the award alone would have been regarded by Cetewayo as a proof of weakness; and as it only gave him part of what he asked would have elicited no gratitude. That if Cetewayo had learned that, after the award was given, other demands were to be made, it would have been fatal to his future trust and confidence. That it was necessary to guard the rights of *bonâ fide* grantees in the disputed territory and provide for their protection and safety."

On the whole, taking into consideration all the circumstances and the overwhelming weight of evidence, I cannot avoid the conclusion that war with the Zulus was inevitable. If you had not had a war, you would have been driven to one of two alternatives—either the Frontier of the Transvaal must have been in a constant state of defence, and that state of defence would have involved probably the keeping of 10,000 British troops in Natal; or you must have left the inhabitants to shift for themselves and live subject to a dread of annihilation and the chances of a frequent renewal of disturbances and wars of invasion on the part of the Zulus. As to the assumption which is contained in the Resolution of the noble Marquess, that this war was undertaken without adequate preparation, I waited for the speech of my noble Friend to see whether he intended to charge Her Majesty's Government with refusing sufficient troops for carrying on the war, or whether he wished to fix upon Sir Bartle Frere the charge of having undertaken the war without adequate preparation. I understand the charge is not against the Government, but against Sir Bartle Frere. Well, Sir Bartle Frere has explained in his last despatch, dated the 12th of February, which I had the pleasure of laying before the House last night, his reasons for thinking he had sufficient troops to undertake the war. He says—

> "Again, it may be said that, before attempting to coerce Cetewayo, the presence of a larger force in the field should have been secured. To this I can only answer that, though a larger force might undoubtedly have lessened the chance of successful opposition, there was no reason whatever at the time to suppose that the force at our disposal was too small for the task attempted. I will not dwell on what might have been the case had orders been obeyed, and had things happened otherwise than they did happen. I stand on the broad fact that I sought information in every possible quarter, and had, and have, no reason whatever to suppose that there was anything rash in the undertaking."

My Lords, I now come to the last paragraph in the Resolution of the noble Marquess. The censure conveyed in the despatch of the 19th has been explained by the noble Viscount the Secretary of State for India. That censure was not directed against the policy of Sir Bartle Frere, it is limited to a disapproval of the action he took in issuing the Ultimatum without consulting the Council. But the policy of Sir Bartle Frere must be considered as a whole; we must not look at it simply with a view to Zulu affairs; but we must consider the influence it may have on the whole of South Africa. There are larger issues involved than even that of the Zulu War; and, although our attention is absorbed by that war at this moment, and by the terrible disaster which has taken place in connection with it, we must not blind ourselves to the fact that there are other, and even more important considerations which should influence our decision upon the Motion now before the House. I was grieved to hear the noble Earl opposite express a doubt as to the possibility or probability of Confederation being carried out in South Africa. My opinion is—and I believe

I may say it is the opinion of Her Majesty's Government—that Confederation is not only most desirable, but possible; and I can assure the House that we shall use our utmost endeavours to bring it about. Confederation will involve, we hope, self-defence, which will remove the liability under which we labour of spending our blood and money upon these wretched Kaffir quarrels in South Africa. If it has this result, I can only say that, not only shall we have found a justification of the policy of Sir Bartle Frere, which the noble Marquess was arraigning to-night, but that we shall before long learn to appreciate the value of the objects for which we have made such great sacrifices.

My Lords, I do not wish to detain the House any longer; but I cannot sit down without asking your Lordships to consider what will be the effect of this Resolution if it should be passed. This Resolution expresses a series of regrets. Regret, in itself, is a mild term; but Parliamentary regret is censure, and Parliamentary censure can have but one result. It must lead to the reversal of the policy which it regrets, or to the recall of the Official who is the object of the censure. There may be some noble Lords on both sides of the House who, regardless of the consequences of passing the Resolution, are prepared to vote for it, simply in order to express their disapproval of the somewhat hasty action of Sir Bartle Frere. But I hope they will clearly see the result of their action. I will not say that it would be impossible to settle the affairs of South Africa on a satisfactory basis if Sir Bartle Frere were recalled; but I am quite sure that by such a step a great blow would be inflicted on our power and interest in South Africa. Sir Bartle Frere has not only shown great energy and ability in all the difficult negotiations in which he has been involved since his arrival in South Africa, but he has acquired an influence there which it would be very difficult to equal and impossible to replace. Sir Bartle Frere arrived in South Africa on a peaceful mission, his chief object being to carry out the Confederation of South Africa; and he set about his task in a manner which no one can say gave any promise of warlike action. He had not been there long before he found himself face to face with wars on all sides. In all these difficulties was traced the hand of Cetewayo; and it soon became evident that if the work for which Sir Bartle Frere had been sent out was to be carried to its legitimate conclusion, Cetewayo's power must be crushed. In conclusion, I must express an earnest hope that your Lordships will pause before you vote for the Resolution, which, if passed, will probably lead to the resignation of the Government, and certainly to the recall of Sir Bartle Frere. The Government it may be possible to replace by another which, in the opinion of some noble Lords, would be at least its equal; and therefore they may not, perhaps, regard this as a matter of great importance. But if Sir Bartle Frere were to be recalled, I can only say that a result will be brought about which will have a deplorable effect upon the future of South Africa, and cannot fail to prove a misfortune, therefore, to our own country.

The Earl of KIMBERLEY: My Lords, the whole of this discussion has been carried on in a very temperate spirit, and I hope that it will continue so to be conducted. The noble Viscount who spoke on behalf of the Government alluded, indeed, to some more exciting topics, when he said that some persons regarded the present calamities in South Africa as being due to a general policy of annexation and aggression on the part of Her Majesty's Government, and strongly denied that the Government were influenced by any such policy. I should be quite prepared to contest the truth of the statement that a policy of aggression and annexation has not been the policy of the Government; but the present case is so grave, and so unfitted to be made the subject of Party recrimination, that I shall avoid any reference to that question. My Lords, the question before us cannot be understood without reference to the events of the last few years in South Africa, and especially to the annexation of the Transvaal Republic. Anyone who has attended to South African affairs must be of opinion that this annexation has had a very large and important influence upon the present situation. It has been asserted very strongly in some quarters that the annexation was entirely without justification; but I am bound to admit that, although it is exceedingly doubtful whether that policy has been a wise one, there are many reasons which ought to be carefully considered before coming to an adverse conclusion. It is perfectly true that at the time my noble Friend the late Colonial Secretary (the Earl of Carnarvon) consented to the annexation, a state of affairs had arisen in the Transvaal which was of a most alarming character. The Boers had been reduced to great extremities: their defeat by Sikukuni had produced a very serious feeling among the Natives in South Africa, and there was a great danger of an invasion by the formidable Zulu nation, on account of the boundary dispute. If the Boers had been overwhelmed, it cannot be doubted that the safety of our Colonies would have been imperilled. The question, therefore, presented itself as one of self-preservation; and although I can hardly doubt that Her Majesty's Government must have considered it undesirable to undertake large new responsibilities in South Africa, they decided that, in all the circumstances and amid all the difficulties they had to choose from, annexation was the least dangerous course. I believe that at the time I did not myself express any opinion on the subject—the only remark I made was that no steps of that kind should be taken without the full concurrence of the Dutch inhabitants of the Transvaal. I think it cannot be doubted now—although it was by no means clear at the time—that this consent was not obtained. I have great respect for the abilities and public services of Sir Theophilus Shepstone; but the evidence of the Blue Books proves that he was grievously mistaken in his view of the temper of the inhabitants of the Transvaal. It was perfectly natural, in the circumstances, that my noble Friend the late Colonial Secretary should have come to the conclusion he adopted; but it is probable that if Sir Theophilus Shepstone had taken a juster view of the situation, he would have arrived at a different conclusion. The Commission of Sir Theophilus Shepstone empowered him to take possession of the territory if a "sufficient number" of inhabitants consented; but I think it is impossible that a sufficient number of inhabitants could have approved of the annexation, for I cannot imagine that there could have arisen in so short a time such an extraordinary change of feeling in the Transvaal. At the same time, I cannot entirely acquit the Government of all blame for the calamitous result of the annexation. I have long thought that they were very unwise in not immediately sending out considerable reinforcements to the Transvaal. When we determined to take over the Transvaal, we necessarily took over with it great responsibilities, and those responsibilities could not be discharged without an adequate military force. If you were not prepared to send out that military force at once, you ought never to have set your foot in the Transvaal territory. The very ground on which you annexed the territory was the inability of the Boers to defend themselves, and the danger to our Colonies that arose from their weakness. You were, therefore, bound to take speedy measures to fulfil your promises to the Boers; but you did nothing of the kind. It is very possible that the presence of a sufficient European Force would have altered the state of feeling throughout the Native population in South Africa, and that it might, to a considerable extent, have conciliated the Boers. But, as it was, you incurred all the dangers and risks of the annexation without any of the advantages you might have derived from it. From the time of the annexation till lately, no attempt was made to subdue Sikukuni; and when you did attempt it, it was with so inadequate a force that you suffered defeat. If you had at once sent out an adequate European force to bring Sikukuni to account, and had shown the Boers that you would fulfil your promises, it is possible, I repeat, that the result might have been different. As to the effect of the annexation on the Zulus, I think it will be admitted on all hands—except by Sir Bartle Frere—that up to the time of the annexation the Zulus were friendly. I think it important to bear the old friendliness of the Zulus in mind, because, if advantage had been taken of their friendly temper, the whole complexion of affairs might have been altered. At first, when we annexed the Transvaal, Cetewayo showed no resentment against us. On the contrary, he sent the following friendly message to Sir Theophilus Shepstone:—

> "I thank my father Somtsen for his message. I am glad that he has sent it, because the Dutch have tired me out, and I intended to fight with them once, once only, and to drive them over the Vaal. You see my Impis are gathered.

> It was to fight the Dutch I called them together. Now I will send them to their homes."

Unfortunately, Sir Theophilus Shepstone soon became more Boer than the Boers, and lost his influence with Cetewayo, without gaining the confidence of the Boers. As Cetewayo expressed it, "Shepstone wishes to cast me off; he is no more a father, but a firebrand." Sir Bartle Frere, so far as I can judge, was never of opinion that there was any friendly feeling whatever between the Zulu King and ourselves, and even based the whole of his policy on that assumption. He said that

> "If there had been any real friendship, nothing that had occurred in the Transvaal would have influenced it."

Now, for nearly 40 years, we have been the neighbours of the Zulus, and yet, when I was at the Colonial Office, and for a long period before, the inhabitants of Natal were able to sleep peacefully with no further guard than the wing of one regiment. There was, in short, friendly feeling enough for the maintenance of peace for that considerable length of time. To pass on to the immediate question, I should be very sorry if the Motion were decided with reference only to a single point and not to the entire policy of Sir Bartle Frere. The fault of that policy seems to me to have been the attempting too many different things at the same time. In the first place, Sir Bartle Frere had on his hands the work of Confederation. I am in favour of Confederation in principle; but I always feared that the Government were premature in pushing it forward, and I thought that the manner in which it was propounded to the Colonies was injudicious. I abstained, however, when the Bill was before Parliament, from saying anything which could prejudice the measure, which, as I have said, I approved in principle, and the success of which I should have welcomed. At all events, Sir Bartle Frere had no easy work before him. He had also to deal with a Kaffir War; and no sooner was that finished, than he set about annexing the whole territory lying between Natal and the old Colony. Meanwhile, he was endeavouring to disarm the Natives. Thus he had several difficult tasks to perform at once; and, by way of adding to his burdens, he chose the moment for a quarrel with the Zulus. Disarmament is a most important affair, and if not carried into effect with caution may lead to Native outbreaks. It appears, from the latest news, that the Basutos, a tribe hitherto very friendly to us, are in a dangerous condition; another piece of intelligence is that the Fingoes, another friendly tribe, are grievously offended at the disarmament. Such intelligence shows that throughout the Native population an unpleasant feeling prevails, caused by the disarmament. Clearly, with all these troubles on his hands, Sir Bartle Frere was not very fortunate in the choice of his occasion. Instead of adopting the policy of conciliation and compromise, wisely inculcated upon him by the Government, Sir Bartle Frere pursued a precipitate and violent policy. With regard to Sir Bartle Frere personally, I feel the force of every word said by the noble Earl opposite (the Earl of Carnarvon) as to his amiable qualities, and his long and distinguished public service; but when the safety of a great Colony and the lives of Her Majesty's troops are concerned, private merit, however conspicuous, cannot outweigh a serious error of judgment. The noble Earl has spoken of the concurrence of opinion between Sir Theophilus Shepstone, Sir Henry Bulwer, and Sir Bartle Frere. The former, undoubtedly, agreed in some important points with Sir Bartle Frere; but as for Sir Henry Bulwer, the Parliamentary Papers are full of cautions from him as to the policy of the High Commissioner. At last, no doubt, he succumbed to the influence of Sir Bartle Frere, and expressed concurrence in his policy—nor is it to be wondered at, if he thought it no longer right for him, as a subordinate, to be constantly opposed to his superior. What I complain of is that Sir Bartle Frere, when he found that the Zulus were inclined to forsake their friendly attitude towards us, forthwith ceased to take a calm and judicious view of the whole situation such as a man in his position ought to have taken. His despatches show a mind excited almost beyond belief, magnifying approaching danger in a most extraordinary way, and anticipating an immediate onslaught on the part of the Zulu King. He talks of the Zulus as "celibate gladiators," and the Zulu Army as a "frightfully efficient manslaying machine." I need not refer to the case of the surveyors, for it is too trumpery a matter. With regard to the carrying off of the two women, it should be remembered that border forays are of constant occurrence; and if they are to be regarded as insults to the British nation, scarcely a month will pass in South Africa in which there will not be an occasion for war with some tribe or other. As to the so-called Coronation promises, which have been placed in the forefront by Sir Bartle Frere, as obligations which we were bound to enforce, even at the cost of war, nothing in the Papers so much astonished me as the idea that they constituted an engagement between us and the Zulu nation. There was certainly nothing further from the intention of the late Government than to enter into such engagements; and if I had thought that any such engagement had been undertaken, I should not have lost a single mail in disavowing Sir Theophilus Shepstone's proceedings. I observe that the present Colonial Secretary takes the same view, for in writing to Sir Henry Bulwer concerning the missionaries who had claimed protection in Zululand, in virtue of the promises made at the Coronation, he says—

> "It is obvious that the position of Sir Theophilus Shepstone in this matter was that of a friendly counsellor, giving advice to the King as to the good government of the country."

He adds—

> "Her Majesty's Government cannot undertake the obligation of protecting them (the missionaries) in Zululand."

Reference has been made, in the course of the debate, to the boundary dispute between Cetewayo and the Transvaal, which is a very old one. I will only say that it is obvious that Sir Bartle Frere was disappointed at the award with respect to it which was made by the Commission, and that he never intended to conciliate Cetewayo. I come, in the next place, to what appears to me to be the gist of the whole matter—the call on Cetewayo to disarm—for such a demand, it must have been quite clear, would lead to the instant breaking out of hostilities. Sir Bartle Frere was, no doubt, misled, as his despatches indicate, by the opinions which he unfortunately heard on all sides, to the effect that at the first touch the whole Zulu organization would melt away. Sir Bartle Frere is a distinguished man, and he has a plain and intelligible policy. He was of opinion that Cetewayo was powerful; that he was becoming more powerful; and that his power must be diminished. From the policy which that idea led him to adopt, he seems never to have departed. For my own part, I look upon the aggression upon Cetewayo as being unjust and impolitic, as being calculated to involve this country in disaster, and certainly to create a most unfavourable impression as to the nature of our rule in the minds of the Natives of South Africa, whom it ought to be our endeavour to conciliate. Sir Bartle Frere has, however, apparently taken quite a contrary view, and one, I may add, which is not at all in accordance with his antecedents, because he had always been supposed to be favourable to the coloured races. In my opinion, the course which ought to have been pursued was to accept the award, and carry it honestly into effect: if the Boer farmers were injured by it—as I have no doubt they were—to compensate them, and as a proof of our friendship to Cetewayo, to hand over the territory unfettered by conditions which virtually nullified its restoration. Such a policy might not have resulted in maintaining peace; but, be that as it may, I regret that a chance was not given it. Sir Bartle Frere, in his eagerness to pursue a showy policy, forgot the true interests of the country. Why should he not be recalled? Other Governors as eminent, nay, more eminent, have been recalled. For example, the late Lord Ellenborough, a man certainly not inferior in ability or position to Sir Bartle Frere, was recalled from India. I am not at all disposed to accuse Her Majesty's Government of sharing the views of Sir Bartle Frere; but I think Sir Bartle Frere has some reason to complain of the vacillating course they have taken with regard to their own policy. In October last, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach wrote a despatch to Sir Bartle Frere, instructing him, by the exercise of prudence and the spirit of forbearance, to avert the serious evil of a war with Cetewayo. It is quite evident that at that time Her Majesty's Government were of opinion that it was only necessary to defend the Colony from attack. When that despatch reached Sir Bartle Frere he was in the Colony of Natal. He was then on the point of despatching his Ultimatum. In the despatch of October, Her Majesty's Government altogether refused to send any reinforcements to Sir Bartle Frere. Sir Bartle Frere, having received that despatch, replied, and then proceeded to act. A more contemptuous reply than that of Sir Bartle Frere was, I think, never addressed to a Secretary of State. Sir Bartle Frere said, in his reply—

> "I am not, of course, aware what information may have reached Her Majesty's Government other than what has passed through me. But I confess that, looking back to the information I have had the honour to submit to Her Majesty's Government during the past 12 months, I can find little ground for any such hope of avoiding a war with Cetewayo."

That reply was dated the 10th of December. On the next day, having received a positive refusal of the reinforcements which he had himself pronounced indispensable, he sent an Ultimatum which was calculated to produce immediate war. What confidence can be placed in a Governor who acts in this manner? On this act I base my opinion, that it is absolutely necessary that Sir Bartle Frere should be recalled—if a Governor can do that once, he may do it twice. Her Majesty's Government, however, changed their mind, and sent reinforcements, which fortunately just arrived in time; but they expressly repeated that these reinforcements were not to furnish the means for any aggressive operations. Then the Government turned round and seemed to be half disposed to approve the aggressive policy of Sir Bartle Frere. When they received the news of the Ultimatum, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach wrote in January—

> "I do not desire to question the policy you have pursued in a difficult and complicated condition of affairs."

Then they changed again after the news of the disaster at Isandlana, and came to the conclusion that Sir Bartle Frere was deserving of censure for not having communicated with the Government before he decided to send the Ultimatum—a conclusion in which I entirely concur. But I wish your Lordships to consider in what position Sir Bartle Frere has been left. The Government have first censured him, then they have said in the same despatch—

> "They have no desire to withdraw in the present crisis of affairs the confidence hitherto reposed in you."

And then, after expressing confidence in him, they have tied his hands by requiring him not to take any step as to peace without previous consultation with the Government at home. The words used are so remarkable that I will read them to the House; they are in Sir Michael Hicks-Beach's despatch of March 26—

> "It is my wish that, as far as possible, you should avoid taking any decided step, or committing yourself to any positive conclusion respecting any of them, until you have received instructions from Her Majesty's Government."

I should like to know if the noble Marquess opposite, or any noble Lord, would, for 10 minutes, occupy such a position as Sir Bartle Frere is made to occupy? I cannot conceive any man of honour, or who has regard for his own reputation, or the interest of his country, submitting to be bound by the expressions in this despatch—expressions of the most marked distrust of the individual and his policy. This Governor, whom you will not recall because you have confidence in him, you have bound hand and foot by this despatch. You had the proverbial three courses open to you. You may approve a Governor and support his policy; you may censure and recall him; either of these courses might be defensible. The third course is to censure and at the same time withdraw your confidence from a Governor, and this, which appears to me wholly indefensible, is the course which Her Majesty's Government have, in fact, pursued with Sir Bartle Frere. For these reasons, I heartily support the Resolution.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY: My Lords, the speech which we have just heard from the noble Earl is one which it is very tempting to make under the circumstances, and one to which in one sense and for one reason it is not easy to reply. The noble Earl, instead of confining himself to the issue before the House, adopted the easier plan of wandering over all Sir Bartle Frere's administration, picking out a point here and a point there for censure, and trusting that, as he was dealing with the acts of an absent man, it was not likely a sufficient answer could be given to his criticism. But your Lordships are not asked to-night to decide on a large and general question; you are asked to decide on a narrow issue which is put before you in the Motion of the noble

Marquess—whether Her Majesty's Government is or is not to be censured for not having recalled Sir Bartle Frere. It was well enough known to the House that Her Majesty's Government is not entirely satisfied with the conduct of Sir Bartle Frere. They have expressed, in explicit but not harsh language, the points with regard to which they feel they have cause to complain; but I wish that the extent to which they have expressed themselves should be clearly understood. They have passed no opinion upon the policy of Sir Bartle Frere. They do not think that the very crisis of a difficult and dangerous war is the moment for declaring such an opinion. But they have expressed their opinion upon one point which could not be delayed. In the government of a vast Empire such as this, where great powers must be reposed in distinguished officers in every quarter of the globe, where there is always temptation to which the distinguished officer of any Government is exposed, of considering only the particular country with which the officer has to deal, and not sufficiently remembering the circumstances of the Empire at large, it is absolutely necessary at the earliest moment, not only with reference to this one particular officer, but in the interests of all the servants of the Crown, that this lesson should be read to them—that Her Majesty's Advisers, and they only, must decide the grave issues of peace and war. It was necessary, my Lords, that we should record that judgment, and in recording it we have passed no censure. Noble Lords opposite have too rapidly assumed that we have censured the conduct or policy of Sir Bartle Frere. We have confined, as I have said, our censure or our blame to one particular point, which it is essential to notice in order to maintain the discipline of the public servants of the entire Empire; but we have no desire to express any opinion at present upon the grave issues of policy which his conduct raises. There are several reasons why we should not do so, and, in my humble opinion, why your Lordships should not do so either. In the first place, it is not calculated to strengthen the hands of those who, in difficult circumstances, are maintaining abroad the interests of your country, the safety of your countrymen, and the honour of your flag, if you criticize too narrowly every minute point which may be raised as to the origin of the war. In the second place, you must bear in mind that, in dealing with the vast hordes of barbarians who lie within and around the Frontier of these South African Colonies, you cannot be guided by the principles which guide you in diplomacy with a European State. You cannot be guided by precisely the same kind of prudence. If you have been successful more than any other race in dealing with populations of this kind, and in imposing the Empire of England by the force of a handful of men over vast multitudes of human beings, it is not because you have picked your way carefully between this danger and that; it is because, in the words of another man who spoke in the midst of another crisis, your policy has been "Boldness, boldness, and always boldness;" and if Sir Bartle Frere has for a moment exaggerated that policy, if he has so improved and extended the lessons of his Indian experience that he has allowed his courage to verge into rashness—I do not say it is so—but if it is, you must remember that the quality out of which that rashness arises is the quality which made your Empire great; and if ever you teach to your Governors that courage is a dangerous quality, your Empire will be gone. For these reasons, I deprecate deeply at the present moment not only criticism but discussion of the conduct of Sir Bartle Frere. I would rather that a more familiar subject—the conduct of Her Majesty's Government—were dealt with. The noble Earl (the Earl of Kimberley) has stated that it was only by accident that Her Majesty's Government was included in the Motion, because there is a desire not to injure us. My Lords, we feel all the consideration which the noble Earl has shown to Her Majesty's Government, and we feel deep gratitude for the kindness of the temper with which he has approached this question; but, at the same time, I must demur to some of the criticisms that he has used. In the first place, he says that we have changed our point of view; that we have changed our minds since January with respect to Sir Bartle Frere; and on what does he found that charge? He founds it on the fact that the Colonial Secretary says in one despatch that he will not question the conduct or policy of Sir

Bartle Frere. Now, that is precisely what I am calling upon your Lordships not to do now. I ask you not to question the policy of Sir Bartle Frere. We do not think it right, save on the one matter to which I refer, to enter upon this question of Sir Bartle Frere's policy at this time, for by that means the hands of our agents may be paralyzed, and the objects of their policy neutralized. Our views on this matter have not changed. We still think that the question had better be reserved. Then the noble Earl complains that the attitude adopted towards Sir Bartle Frere is one likely not to be attended by satisfactory results. He makes that charge on the last despatch in the Blue Book, and the last sentence in that despatch, and he said that it was an unheard-of disgrace that was imposed on Sir Bartle Frere—that it was treating him with the want of confidence fatal to its usefulness—that we had told him "he was as far as possible to avoid taking any decided steps, and not to commit himself to any positive conclusions respecting any questions until he received the instructions of Her Majesty's Government." My Lords, I admit that words to that effect have been addressed to Sir Bartle Frere—not only are those words fitly addressed to Sir Bartle Frere—they are words I would address to every negotiator in every part of the world who has to deal with the conclusion of peace. I would write them down as the Standing Orders of the State, to guide Her Majesty's servants. I am sure that the noble Earl opposite would not have permitted any negotiator to take a decided step, or commit himself to any positive conclusion without the approval of the Government to which he belonged. When he was negotiating with the United States—a more important and powerful and civilized Power than that over which Cetewayo rules—the noble Earl would not have permitted a negotiator to act without instructions; and I have always heard that the telegrams controlling the negotiators on that occasion cost as much as £30,000. I am sure if anyone had been behind the panel, and heard the instructions given by the noble Earl to his Colleague beside him before he left, it would be found that he was told not to commit the Government without consulting them on the subject. Of course, there is the question as to whether it is always possible to do so. If the state of things is such that Sir Bartle Frere is obliged to come to conclusions with Cetewayo without consulting the Government, those instructions leave him perfect liberty to do so; but he is responsible afterwards. But, telegraph or no telegraph, the instruction which should be given is the same—before committing the country in important points the Government should be consulted, if possible. Now, my Lords, the real question we have to decide is whether the course we have found it necessary to pursue in taking notice, on the part of Sir Bartle Frere, of a disregard of the authority of the Imperial Government, has laid upon us the obligation to recall him. My Lords, this is not a question of individual feelings, but of what is best to be done. We are told that we ought to recall him, because, under the circumstances, it must be most disagreeable to him to retain his post. I have known Sir Bartle Frere for many years, and I have a higher idea of his patriotism than to think that he will receive what we have felt called on to say other than in a proper spirit. We have assured him that he still retains our confidence, and that assurance he will believe. He will have to consider the question as we have had to consider it—as a question affecting the honour and interests of the country. I have no doubt, after he reads his despatch, he will not ask the question, "Do my wounded feelings require I should return home?" but "Do the interests of the country permit that I should return home?" And that is the spirit in which the Government have acted towards him. We have had many things to consider. Sir Bartle Frere has mastered the details of a difficult question, which it is necessary to dispose of. If he were to leave his important post, the new man who might take his place would require, perhaps, many months before he could master those details. Sir Bartle Frere has an intimate knowledge of all the circumstances which led to the Zulu War, and of the best way of overcoming the forces of the Zulu King. He has all these details in his hand. They cannot be tossed over to another man. Sir Bartle Frere cannot empty his brains into another man's skull. Any man coming fresh to the work would do so at a disadvantage which it might take some time to overcome, and that some time might be critical in the war. And there is another consideration not less important. From whatever cause, Sir Bartle Frere has succeeded, probably beyond any other Governor who has ruled in South Africa, in winning to himself the affections of the inhabitants, both in Cape Colony and Natal; and in that we ought to co-operate with him, because, although we are struggling for their interests, their co-operation is important to us in the matter. He can command it in a way no other man can. If, therefore, Sir Bartle Frere was removed, we might have to count, not only on the apathy, but on the possible discontent of these people. My Lords, all these things sum themselves up in the familiar adage that even if it be desirable to change horses —which I do not admit in the present case—you should not attempt the process while crossing the stream. We are not now discussing Sir Bartle Frere's past administration. The only question before us is whether Her Majesty's Government is to be changed in order that Sir Bartle Frere may be recalled; and on that question, and that question only, I fearlessly challenge the decision of your Lordships' House.

The Duke of SOMERSET said, that noble Lords on his (the Opposition) side of the House did not desire to make this a Party question; but he was at a loss to understand exactly the position of the Government with regard to the course adopted by Sir Bartle Frere. Reading the Papers in the Blue Books, he had all along agreed with the Colonial Secretary and disagreed with Sir Bartle Frere; and he could not but observe the fact that while the Colonial Secretary again and again enumerated offences that were not to be regarded as causes of war against Cetewayo, Sir Bartle Frere again and again treated those offences as causes of war. In fact, Sir Bartle Frere appeared to be a man of very strong will, and the Colonial Minister a man of rather weak will. The Colonial Secretary had said over and over again that he was to use every effort to avoid war; nevertheless, Sir Bartle Frere persisted in driving the country into war. Again, Sir Bartle Frere was especially cautioned that, in the event of war, it was to be a strictly defensive one—and the way in which Sir Bartle Frere gave effect to that caution was to arrange with Lord Chelmsford to invade the Zulu country and to drive the Zulus back to their furthest Frontier—with what result was now known. The public meanwhile asked who was responsible. If they looked at the despatches, the Government were not responsible, for they did all they could to prevent war; but Sir Bartle Frere was determined to go to war, and it seemed they could not prevent it. Look at the course which he adopted in dealing with the Zulus. He gave the land to the Boers, and told the Zulu King to be satisfied with the Sovereignty—the award gave to Cetewayo the Sovereignty of the land, and withheld from him that which to him was the only value of the land, the right to settle his people upon it. Sir Bartle Frere told the King he must at once disband his Army. That meant his ruin, probably his assassination. Sir Henry Bulwer pointed out that the disbandment of the Army was eventually desirable, but could only be effected gradually. Sir Bartle Frere demanded that it should be disbanded in three weeks. Then Sir Bartle Frere took up the question of morality, and told the King he must not go on with these unmarried men, and must not marry the young women to the old men. But the young women did not approve; but the old men, who formed the King's Council, perhaps did. In his despatch, now laid on the Table, Sir Bartle Frere threatened the very independence of the Zulu nation, for he said that there would be no peace and no quiet in South Africa until the Queen's supremacy was acknowledged from Cape Town to Delagoa Bay. What did that point to? Why nothing less than the annexation of the whole intervening territory. And that was what must be the inevitable result of retaining Sir Bartle Frere in his present position. The House ought to know distinctly whether Her Majesty's Government adopted the policy of Sir Bartle Frere. If they did not, was it wise to keep him there? If they changed their policy, they must change their man.

The Earl of BEACONSFIELD: My Lords, there is one advantage at the end of a debate, besides the relief which is afforded by its termination, and that is that both sides of the House seem pretty well agreed as to the particular point at issue. But the rich humour of the noble Duke (the Duke of Somerset) has again diverted us from the consideration of the Motion really before the House. If the noble Duke and his Friends were desirous of knowing what was the policy which Her Majesty's Government were prepared generally to pursue in South Africa—if they wished to challenge the policy of Sir Bartle Frere itself in all its details—I should have thought they would have produced a very different Motion from that which is now lying on your Lordships' Table; for that is a Motion of a most limited character, and, according to the strict Rules of Parliamentary discussion, precludes us from most of the subjects which have lately been introduced to our consideration, and which principally have emanated from noble Lords opposite. We have not been summoned here to-day to consider the policy of the acquisition of the Transvaal. This is a subject on which I am sure the Government would be prepared to address your Lordships, if their conduct were clearly and fairly impugned. With regard to the annexation of that Province—which has certainly very much filled the mouths of men of late—I admit that that would have been a subject for fair discussion in this House; and we should have heard, as we have heard to-night, though in a manner somewhat unexpected from the nature of the Resolution before us, from the noble Earl recently the Secretary of State for the Colonies (the Earl of Carnarvon), the principal reasons which induced the Government to sanction that policy—a policy which I believe can be defended, but which has not been impugned to-night in any formal manner. What has been impugned to-night is the conduct of Her Majesty's Government in sanctioning, not the policy of Sir Bartle Frere, but his taking a most important step without consulting them, which on such a subject is the usual practice with all Governors. But the noble Marquess opposite (the Marquess of Lansdowne), who introduced the subject, does not even impugn the policy of the Lord High Commissioner, and it was left for the noble Duke who has just addressed us, and who ought to have brought forward this question if his views on the matter are so strongly entertained by him, not in supporting a Resolution such as now lies on your Lordships' Table, but one which would have involved a discussion of the whole policy of the Government and that of the high Officer who is particularly interested in it. My noble Friend the noble Marquess who very recently addressed the House (the Marquess of Salisbury) touched the real question which is before us—and it is an important question, although not of the expansive character of the one which would have been justified by the comments of noble Lords opposite. What we have to decide to-night is this—whether Her Majesty's Government shall have the power of recommending to the Sovereign the employment of a high Officer to fulfil duties of the utmost importance, or whether that exercise of the Prerogative on their advice shall be successfully impugned, and that appointment superseded, by noble Lords opposite. Such a course is perfectly Constitutional, if they are prepared to take the consequence. But let it be understood what the issue is. It is this—that a censure upon the Government is called for, because they have in their discretion selected the individual who, on the whole, they think best qualified successfully to fulfil the duties of High Commissioner. The noble Lords opposite make that proposition; and if they succeed, they will succeed in that which has hitherto been considered one of the most difficult tasks of an Opposition—that is to say, they will supersede the individual whom the Sovereign, in the exercise of Her Prerogative, under the advice of Her Ministers, has selected for an important post. My Lords, I cannot agree in the general remark made by the noble Duke, that because an individual has committed an error—and even a considerable error—for that reason, without any reference either to his past services or his present qualifications, immediately a change should be recommended, and he should be recalled from the scene of his duties. I remember myself a case not altogether different from the present one. It happened some 20 years ago, when I sat in the other House of Parliament. A high official—a diplomatist of great eminence—a Member of the Liberal Party at that time—had committed what was deemed a great indiscretion, and which even then was deemed such by several Members of his own Party; and the Government were asked in a formal manner by a Liberal Member, whether that distinguished diplomatist had been in consequence recalled. But the person who was then responsible for the conduct of public affairs in that House—the humble individual who is now addressing your Lordships — made this answer, with the full concurrence of his Colleagues—announcing that that distinguished diplomatist was not recalled, he said that great services are not cancelled by one act or one single error, however it may be regretted at the moment. What I then said with regard to Sir James Hudson, I might say now with regard to Sir Bartle Frere. But I do not wish to rest on that. I confess that, so keen is my sense of responsibility, and that of my Colleagues—and I am sure also that of noble Lords opposite—that we would not allow our decisions in such matters to be unduly influenced by personal considerations of any kind. What we had to determine was this—Was it wise that such an act on the part of Sir Bartle Frere as, in fact, commencing war without consulting the Government at home, and without their sanction, should be passed unnoticed? Ought it not to be noticed in a manner which should convey to that eminent person a clear conviction of the feelings of Her Majesty's Government; and, at the same time, was it not their duty to consider whether, were he superseded, they could place in his position an individual equally qualified to fulfil the duties and responsibilities resting on him? That is what we had to consider. We considered it entirely with reference to the public interest and the public interest alone, and we arrived at a conviction that, on the whole, the retention of Sir Bartle Frere in that position was our duty, notwithstanding the inconvenient observations and criticisms to which we were, of course, conscious it might subject us; and, that being our conviction, we have acted upon it. It is a very easy thing for a Government to make a scapegoat; but that is conduct which I hope no Gentleman on this side, and I believe no Gentleman sitting opposite, would easily adopt. If Sir Bartle Frere had been recalled—if he had been recalled in deference to the panic—the thoughtless panic—of the hour, in deference to those who have no responsibility in the matter, and who have not weighed well and deeply investigated all the circumstances and all the arguments that can be brought forward, and which must be appealed to to influence our opinion on such a question—no doubt a certain degree of odium might have been diverted from the heads of Her Majesty's Ministers, and the world would have been delighted, as it always is, to find a victim. That was not the course we pursued, and it is one which I trust no British Government ever will pursue. We had but one object before us, and that was to take care that, at this most critical period, the affairs of Her Majesty in South Africa should be directed by one not only qualified to direct them, but who was probably superior to any other individual whom we could have selected for that purpose. The sole question that we really have to decide to-night is—Was it the duty of Her Majesty's Government to recall Sir Bartle Frere in consequence of his having declared war without our consent? We did not think it our duty to take that course, and we do not think it our duty to take that course now. Whether we are right in the determination at which we have arrived is the sole question which the House has to determine upon the Motion before it. The noble Duke opposite (the Duke of Somerset) has told us that he should not be contented without being made acquainted with the whole policy which Her Majesty's Government are prepared to pursue in South Africa. If the noble Duke will introduce that subject, we shall be happy to discuss it with him. No one could introduce it in a more interesting, and, indeed, in a more entertaining manner than the noble Duke. We are all aware of the ample knowledge and sarcastic felicity with which he conveys his thoughts and expresses his opinions. I think, however, that we ought to have had rather longer Notice before we were called upon to discuss so large a theme as that which has now been brought suddenly under our notice. If the noble Marquess who introduced this subject (the Marquess of Lansdowne) had given us Notice of a Motion of this character, we should not have hesitated for a moment to meet it; I have, however, no desire to avoid meeting the subject of our future policy in South Africa, even on so general a Notice as we have received in reference to it from the noble Duke. Sir Bartle Frere was selected by the noble Earl who recently occupied the position of Secretary of State for the Colonies (the Earl of Carnarvon) chiefly to secure one great end—namely, to carry into effect the policy of Confederation in South Africa which the noble Earl had successfully carried into effect on a previous occasion with regard to the North American Colonies. Now, if there be any policy which, in my mind, is more than any other opposed to the policy of annexation, it is the policy of Confederation. By pursuing the policy of Confederation we bind States together, we consolidate their resources, and we enable them to establish a strong Frontier; and where we have a strong Frontier, that is the best argument against a policy of annexation. I myself regard a policy of annexation with great distrust; but I believe that the reasons of State in regard to the Province of the Transvaal were, on the whole, in favour of the policy of annexation. For what were the circumstances under which that annexation was effected? The Transvaal was a territory which was no longer defended by its occupiers. The noble Earl opposite (the Earl of Kimberley), who formerly had the Colonies under his management, spoke of the conduct of Sir Theophilus Shepstone as though he had not taken due precautions to effect the annexation of that Province, and said that he was not justified in concealing that he had not successfully consummated his object. The noble Earl said that he did not assemble troops enough in the Province to carry out properly the policy of annexation. But Sir Theophilus Shepstone particularly refers to that very fact to show that so unanimous and so united was the sentiment in the Province in favour of annexation, that it was unnecessary to send any large force there to bring it about. The annexation of that Province was a necessity — a geographical necessity. But the annexation of the Transvaal was one of the reasons why those who were connected with that Province might have calculated upon the permanent existence of Zululand as an independent State. My Lords, I know it is said that when we are at war—as we unfortunately now are—with the Zulus, or any other savage nation, even though we inflict upon them some great disaster, and might then effect an arrangement with them of a peaceable character, before long the same Power would again attack us unless we annexed its territory. I have never considered that a legitimate argument in favour of annexation of a barbarous country. It is very true that if we defeated the Zulus to-morrow—as I trust that we shall shortly in a significant manner—in a few years another war may break out between Zululand and Her Majesty's Dominions in South Africa. But similar results might occur in Europe if we went to war with one of our neighbours—as we unfortunately have done on previous occasions; and even if we defeated our neighbours, yet, after a certain time, when their resources revived, when their population had increased, and when their arms of destruction had been improved or perfected, it would be very likely that they might seize a favourable opportunity to go to war with us again. But is that an argument why we should not hold our hand until we had completely crushed our adversary? Is it to be supposed that, because a barbarous nation in Africa may, after it has been chastised in war by this country, after a period renew hostilities—is that a reason that we are to enter into a war of extermination to prevent a repetition of those hostilities? No, my Lords, that is a policy which I hope will never be sanctioned by this House. It is, of course, possible that we may again be involved in war with the Zulus; but it is an equal chance that, in the development of circumstances in that part of the world, the Zulu people may have to invoke the aid and the alliance of England against some other people, and that the policy dictated by feelings and influences which have regulated our conduct with regard to European States may be successfully pursued with regard to less civilized nations in a different part of the world. I will not enter into any minute discussion of the various questions which, not in consequence of the Resolution on the Table, but by reason of the association of the subjects with the main question, have been imported into the debate. They have really nothing to do with the single issue that is now before your Lordships, and upon which, in a very short time, you will record your opinion. It is not the policy of England with regard to South Africa now for some years past that is called in question. Different Cabinets and different schools of political opinion are equally interested in maintaining that policy. It is not, in fact, the annexation of the Transvaal Province upon which you are now called to decide. It is not, in fact, any of the matters that have been treated in detail to-night, but which really do not branch out of the Resolution which is on the Table, that are at issue. To these, if our policy be impugned, noble Lords opposite will have a legitimate opportunity of calling your Lordships' attention. The question we have before us now is whether Her Majesty's Ministers have acted wisely in retaining the services of Sir Bartle Frere in the circumstances in which they have been retained. That is the only question. On the part of the Government, I give my opinion here, publicly, that, in taking that course, we took one for the public welfare; that we were influenced by no personal considerations; that we were influenced by none of those feelings which it is difficult for even honourable men when they find a distinguished public officer in difficulty and disgrace to be free from; that we divested ourselves from any other sentiment but doing that which in a most difficult state of affairs was for the public advantage. And if you wish the public advantage to be first considered, and not the triumph of a Party, you will to-night give your decided negative to the Motion of the noble Marquess.

Earl GRANVILLE: I will not trouble your Lordships at any length; but I may say, in common with your Lordships, I have heard with great satisfaction the announcement so emphatically made, both by the noble Viscount (Viscount Cranbrook) and the Prime Minister, that the policy of annexation was not the policy of Her Majesty's Government. I own I thought I had some recollection that, from the very beginning, the Prime Minister had made a declaration in favour of a policy which not only maintained, but extended the Empire, and I certainly fancied we had been making annexations at about the rate of one a-year since the present Government came into power. But I willingly accept the assurance they have given us that they are absolutely opposed to that policy for the future. I remember, when I first went into the House of Commons, I read, with a great deal of interest, a speech by a Gentleman known as "Single-speech Hamilton," which was designed to teach young Members of Parliament how to meet every possible Resolution; and I cannot help thinking some of his receipts have been adopted by some of my noble Friends opposite with regard to the present Resolution. The noble Viscount objected to the Resolution of the noble Marquess, as it first stood, that it was ambiguous. The noble Earl objected to it that it was dark. I can conceive nothing less ambiguous or dark than a declaration of a fact which everyone admitted, and a condemnation with which everyone agreed. Objection was also taken to the addition that has been made to the Resolution, that addition having been made in consequence of the publication of the despatches, which certainly took me, and I think the public, very much by surprise, within the last two or three days. The Prime Minister objected to the Resolution that it was too limited. The noble Marquess (the Marquess of Salisbury), on the contrary, objected to our discussing the subject at all, entirely forgetful that one of his Colleagues in "another place" had declared that the time had come for a discussion. In my opinion, these objections, if taken together, answer each other. I am not going to trouble your Lordships by going into all the facts which have been stated to the House to-night; but there is one fact of great importance, and that is that for nearly 40 years our relations with Zululand have been of a perfectly friendly character, although during that time this savage military nation has had a very large standing Army. The onus of explanation certainly lies with those who change that policy, a change which is immediately followed by war and disaster. I remember that the noble Earl who was at that time Secretary of State for the Colonies stated that the annexation of the Transvaal would be done with the full consent of the Boers.

The Earl of CARNARVON: I am sorry to interrupt the noble Earl, but what I said was that it had the consent of, at all events, a very large proportion of the European population.

Earl GRANVILLE: The last information received from the Colonies shows that the great majority of the European population will take every opportunity of shaking off the rule of the English Government. I will now venture to say something with regard to an observation made by the noble Earl the Under Secretary of State for the Colonies (Earl Cadogan). He said he could not take the authority of the noble Marquess against the authority of Sir Bartle Frere, Sir Theophilus Shepstone, and Sir Henry Bulwer. I am not quite sure whether, when my noble Friend has been longer in the Colonial Office, he will be quite so confident about the opinion of Colonial authorities in the case of a war carried on with the full consent of the Colonies at the Imperial expense. Sir Theophilus Shepstone's opinions have changed during the last two years —incidentally, perhaps, to his having somewhat strained the instructions of the noble Earl the Secretary of State for the Colonies in the mode of annexing the Transvaal without the full consent of the inhabitants. Having done this, he was almost bound by his situation to do everything he could to conciliate the Boers. What has always been the policy of the Boers towards the Zulus? I think no one will deny that it has been a policy, without intermission, of violence, cruelty, and fraud; and it seems to me that since this annexation we have put ourselves in the shoes of the Boers, we have adopted their claims, and have taken up the war which was denounced as unjust by the noble Lords when conducted by the Boers, and have brought it to as unsuccessful an end as they did. Then as to the manner in which Sir Bartle Frere dealt with the award. I thought the two Cabinet Ministers who have addressed the House would have said something more in its defence than they did. There are three Commissioners of great standing and competency, who have fully considered all the facts. It is not denied that Sir Bartle Frere has completely changed the character of their award. What was Sir Henry Bulwer's advice to Sir Bartle Frere? He said—"Do not advance your troops to the Frontier of Zululand, because, if you do, great excitement will be created; but make your award as soon as you can, and then the other questions will have a better chance of being settled." Sir Bartle Frere disregarded this advice, delayed the award, and advanced the troops to the Frontier of Zululand, and then delivered the award, in concert with the recommendation of the Commissioners, and coupled with an Ultimatum, which there was no chance of being accepted — with the consequence that all Sir Henry Bulwer's predictions have been realized. With regard to Sir Theophilus Shepstone, my noble Friend (the Earl of Kimberley) made some remarks as to soldiers which were slightly misunderstood by the Prime Minister. He thought my noble Friend complained that no troops were sent out to conquer the Boers; but what my noble Friend said was that, after the annexation was complete, you were bound to have troops in order to fulfil our obligations to the Boers. With respect to the conduct of Sir Bartle Frere, though we condemn it, is it quite clear that we on this side of the House alone are acting unjustly to him? President Lincoln used to say—"It is ill to swap horses crossing a stream;" but will not that be the result of the publication of these despatches? One of these is full of strong censure on him, and another objects to almost every one of the terms of the Ultimatum. When they reach him, will he not think it necessary to resign? And if he does resign, you are not swapping horses in the middle of the stream, but you are dismounting without any other horse being at hand. Sir Bartle Frere's high-handed treatment of the Natives may be popular in the Colony; but you can hardly keep him after publishing these two despatches to the whole world and thus doing him the greatest possible harm. He has resigned, as I understand, all control of military matters; but you have done that most calculated to discredit him in the Colony, even with the barbarians with whom we are at war. I have heard Lord Palmerston spoken of as an example of a man who supported his distant subordinates. I think he was right, and I think the Government right, also, in being as lenient as possible in a case of an error of judgment; but Lord Palmerston always considered whether he should recall a man or not, and then, having settled not to recall him, nothing would induce him to publish such a censure as to deprive him of all authority. I say it is not by our side that injustice is done to Sir Bartle Frere, but by the Government in publishing those despatches. I say he has acted in a most wilful way; that he has disregarded his instructions; and that if you continue him in office you will encourage not only him, but you will encourage other Governors to take a high-handed course, leaving it to the Government at home to approve or disapprove their acts after they have been done. It is for the Government to decide whether they will continue to maintain in high command an Officer who has thus disobeyed their instructions. Parliament, it has been said, was to be debarred from expressing its opinion on a point of this importance; I entirely dissent from that observation, and on this issue appeal most cheerfully to the House.

On Question? Their Lordships *divided:*—Contents 61; Not-Contents 156: Majority 95.

CONTENTS.

Devonshire, D.
Somerset, D.

Ailesbury, M.
Bath, M.
Lansdowne, M.
Northampton, M.
Ripon, M.

Airlie, E.
Camperdown, E.
Cowper, E.
Dartrey, E.
Derby, E.
Ducie, E.
Granville, E.
Ilchester, E.
Kimberley, E.
Morley, E.
Northbrook, E.
Spencer, E.
Suffolk and Berkshire, E.

Canterbury, V.
Cardwell, V.
Falmouth, V.

Aberdare, L.
Belper, L.
Blachford, L.
Boyle, L. (*E. Cork and Orrery.*) [*Teller.*]
Brougham and Vaux, L.
Carew, L.
Carlingford, L.

Carysfort, L. (*E. Carysfort.*)
Chesham, L.
Coleridge, L.
Crewe, L.
Dacre, L.
De Tabley, L.
Dorchester, L.
Emly, L.
Foley, L.
Hammond, L.
Lawrence, L.
Leigh, L.
Lyttelton, L.
Meldrum, L. (*M. Huntly.*)
Monson, L. [*Teller.*]
O'Hagan, L.
Ribblesdale, L.
Romilly, L.
Rosebery, L. (*E. Rosebery.*)
Sandys, L.
Saye and Sele, L.
Sefton, L. (*E. Sefton.*)
Selborne, L.
Sheffield, L. (*E. Sheffield.*)
Somerton, L. (*E. Normanton.*)
Stanley of Alderley, L.
Strafford, L. (*V. Enfield.*)
Sudeley, L.
Thurlow, L.
Wenlock, L.
Wolverton, L.

NOT-CONTENTS.

Cairns, E. (*L. Chancellor.*)

Beaufort, D.
Brandon, D. (*D. Hamilton.*)

Leeds, D.
Manchester, D.
Norfolk, D.
Northumberland, D.
Richmond, D.
Sutherland, D.
Wellington, D.

Abergavenny, M.
Ailsa, M.
Exeter, M.
Hertford, M.
Salisbury, M.
Winchester, M.

Amherst, E.
Annesley, E.
Bathurst, E.
Beaconsfield, E.
Beauchamp, E.
Belmore, E.
Bradford, E.
Cadogan, E.
Caledon, E.
Carnarvon, E.
Cawdor, E.
Clonmell, E.
Coventry, E.
Dartmouth, E.
De La Warr, E.
Denbigh, E.
Devon, E.
Doncaster, E. (*D. Buccleuch and Queensberry.*)
Dundonald, E.
Eldon, E.
Ferrers, E.
Gainsborough, E.
Haddington, E.
Hardwicke, E.
Harewood, E.
Harrington, E.
Lanesborough, E.
Lindsey, E.
Manvers, E.
Mount Edgcumbe, E.
Nelson, E.
Onslow, E.
Pembroke and Montgomery, E.
Portarlington, E.
Poulett, E.
Powis, E.
Radnor, E.
Ravensworth, E.
Redesdale, E.
Romney, E.
Rosslyn, E.
Saint Germans, E.
Stanhope, E.
Strange, E. (*D. Athol.*)
Strathmore and Kinghorn, E.
Vane, E. (*M. Londonderry.*)
Waldegrave, E.
Wharncliffe, E.
Wilton, E.

Bridport, V.
Cranbrook, V.
Hardinge, V.
Hawarden, V. [*Teller.*]
Hill, V.
Hood, V.
Melville, V.
Sidmouth, V.
Strathallan, V.
Templetown, V.
Torrington, V.

London, L. Bp.
St. Albans, L. Bp.

Airey, L.
Alington, L.
Arundell of Wardour, L.
Ashford, L. (*V. Bury.*)
Bagot, L.
Bateman, L.
Blantyre, L.
Bloomfield, L.
Brancepeth, L. (*V. Boyne.*)
Brodrick, L. (*V. Midleton.*)
Byron, L.
Castlemaine, L.
Clanbrassill, L. (*E. Roden.*)
Clements, L. (*E. Leitrim.*)
Clinton, L.
Colchester, L.
Colville of Culross, L.
Cottesloe, L.
Crofton, L.
Delamere, L.
De L'Isle and Dudley, L.
Denman, L.
Digby, L.
Dunmore, L. (*E. Dunmore.*)
Dunsany, L.
Ellenborough, L.
Elphinstone, L.
Forbes, L.
Forester, L.
Gage, L. (*V. Gage.*)
Gerard, L.
Gormanston, L. (*V. Gormanston.*)
Hampton, L.
Harlech, L.
Hartismere, L. (*L. Henniker.*)
Hastings, L. (*E. Loudoun.*)
Hay, L. (*E. Kinnoul.*)
Heytesbury, L.
Howard de Walden, L.
Inchiquin, L.
Kenlis, L. (*M. Headfort.*)
Ker, L. (*M. Lothian.*)
Kesteven, L.
Leconfield, L.
Massy, L.
Monteagle of Brandon, L.
Mowbray, L.
Northwick, L.
Norton, L.
O'Neill, L.
Ormonde, L. (*M. Ormonde.*)
Penrhyn, L.
Plunket, L.
Poltimore, L.
Raglan, L.
Ramsay, L. (*E. Dalhousie.*)

Earl Granville

Ranfurly, L. (*E. Ranfurly.*)
Rayleigh, L.
Rivers, L.
Rodney, L.
Ross, L. (*E. Glasgow.*)
Sackville, L.
Saltoun, L.
Scarsdale, L.
Silchester, L. (*E. Longford.*)
Skelmersdale, L. [*Teller.*]
Sondes, L.
Stewart of Garlies, L. (*E. Galloway.*)
Saint Leonards, L.
Strathnairn, L.
Strathspey, L. (*E. Seafield.*)
Tollemache, L.
Tredegar, L.
Tyrone, L. (*M. Waterford.*)
Ventry, L.
Windsor, L.
Winmarleigh, L.
Zouche of Haryngworth, L.

Resolved in the *Negative.*

House adjourned at Twelve o'clock, till To-morrow, Eleven o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Tuesday, 25th March, 1879.

MINUTES.]—Supply—*considered in Committee*—*Resolution* [March 24] *reported.*

Public Bills — *Ordered* — *First Reading* — Assessed Rates Act Amendment * [113].

First Reading—General Police and Improvement (Scotland) Provisional Order (Inverness) * [112].

Third Reading—Consolidated Fund (No. 2); Poor Law Amendment Act (1876) Amendment * [44]; Petty Customs (Scotland) Abolition Act Amendment * [91], and *passed.*

QUESTIONS.

IRELAND—SPEECH OF MR. WILLIAM JOHNSTON (COMMISSIONER OF IRISH FISHERIES).—QUESTION.

Mr. SULLIVAN asked Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, If his attention has been called to a report in the "Downpatrick Recorder" of the 14th instant, of a public address by Her Majesty's Commissioner of Irish Fisheries, delivered by him in a neighbourhood often and recently the scene of religious strife and party riots, in which that official refers to recent proceedings in the following terms:—

> "One thing that has commended itself to me in this society is that it has never failed to urge a warfare, on the whole triumphant against the great enemy we have to contend with in this country, the errors of the apostate Church of Rome. I have been taken to task for venturing to say that we would not in Ulster as Protestants endure the endowment of a Roman Catholic University, which would falsify history, which would pervert philosophy, and which would give false views of science. I do not desire to give offence; but, if Protestants are to be prevented from speaking the truth because they happen to be civil servants of the Crown, the time has come when Protestants must lift up their voices, and protest against attempts to silence them for any pretext whatever;"

and, what action, if any at all, the Government propose to take under these circumstances in reference to this functionary?

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER: Sir, the Question of the hon. and learned Gentleman raises some important and delicate points with reference to the relations between the Government and gentlemen who are permanent members of the Civil Service. I think, as a general principle, we must hold that the Government ought to interfere as little as possible with that freedom of speech which Englishmen enjoy. On the other hand, I think it is also clear that gentlemen who have accepted permanent offices under the Crown ought to be very cautious how they use language which is of a character to embarrass the Government they serve. If they speak in their official capacity, of course their reserve ought to be very strict. Some different rule, of course, would apply when a gentleman speaks in his private capacity and at a meeting which is of a distinctly non-political or religious character. But sometimes one cannot help feeling that it is difficult to draw the line between religious and political discussion. With regard to the particular case to which attention is drawn, I certainly regret that Mr. Johnston should have used the language which he did on the occasion of the address to the Orange meeting at Belfast; and I regret still more that he should—as is apparent from his remarks at the missionary meeting—have misunderstood the caution which, in a kindly spirit, was given to him on the part of the Government. But as it seems he has misunderstood it, it has been repeated to him more distinctly, and I think that is all the circumstances justify.

POST OFFICE (IRELAND) LETTER-CARRIERS.—QUESTION.

Mr. P. MARTIN asked the Postmaster General, Whether his attention has been called to the evidence given on the trial of a lad named Purcell, a letter-carrier in Her Majesty's service, before Mr. Justice Fitzgerald at the last

Tralee Assizes, from which it appeared that Purcell had been paid by the Post Office the sum of one shilling and sixpence a week; and that another letter-carrier named Prendergast, as mentioned by the Judge, had been remunerated at the rate of six pence a day for carrying a letter bag twenty Irish miles each day; if he would state what amount was allowed to the postmaster in charge of the district for which Purcell acted as letter-carrier, and had the postmaster any payments to make out of his salary; whether there are any instances, and, if so, in what places in England, of remuneration on so low a scale given to officials in the Postal Service; if the Postmaster General has any objection to lay upon the Table of the House a Return showing the rates of payment respectively given to postmasters and letter-carriers in England and Ireland; and, whether he proposes to have an inquiry made with the object of having an increase of remuneration granted in Ireland to the postmasters and letter-carriers who may appear to be insufficiently paid?

LORD JOHN MANNERS: Sir, I had no information on the subject mentioned until I saw the Question of the hon. Gentleman. Having now made inquiry, I find that the postmaster of Kenmare receives, among other allowances, £4 a-year for the delivery of letters in the town, occupying about three-quarters of an hour a-day—which is according to the usual scale for such light deliveries throughout the United Kingdom—and that he hired Purcell, who is a shoemaker's apprentice, to do this small part of his work for 1*s*. 6*d*. a-week. The postmaster, who is paid for all his duties according to scales which apply to every office of the same class in the United Kingdom, receives about £65 a-year, and, having certain expenses to provide for, his net income is a little over £50 a-year. The authorities in Ireland have no knowledge of the case of Prendergast, nor of 6*d*. a-day being paid for carrying a letter-bag 20 miles, nor can they find any trace of such a man ever having been employed. Returns, showing the rates of payment, would be very voluminous and costly. As postmasters and others, who think themselves insufficiently paid, have every opportunity of making their claims known to the Department and of getting them considered, no general inquiry would appear to be needed. It may be well to give power of dealing with these cases by summary jurisdiction. I may add that, under the provisions of the Summary Jurisdiction Bill now before Parliament, such cases as Purcell's would be dealt with summarily.

SOUTH AFRICA—THE ORANGE FREE STATE.—QUESTION.

MR. OTWAY asked the Secretary of State for the Colonies, Whether any application has been made by the Colonial authorities in South Africa to the Government of the Orange Free State for aid in the war against the Zulus; and, if so, whether it is true, as reported, that such aid has been refused?

SIR MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH: Sir, I have not received any information which would enable me to say whether any, or what, application has been made to the Orange Free State. But I think it not unlikely that, if such an application has been made, the President of the Free State has not felt himself able to comply with it. The State is neither rich nor powerful, and it borders on Basutoland, which is reported as disturbed.

SOUTH AFRICA—SIR BARTLE FRERE—LORD CHELMSFORD.—QUESTIONS.

MR. ERNEST NOEL asked Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Whether the Government have received any communications from Sir Bartle Frere of a later date than those which have been already published; and, if so, whether Sir Bartle Frere has given expression to his opinion, as mentioned by Lord Chelmsford, that it would be desirable an officer should be sent out who would be fitted to succeed him as High Commissioner of South Africa?

SIR MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH: Sir, perhaps the hon. Gentleman will allow me to answer the Question. Some time back a private and confidential telegram was sent to me by Sir Bartle Frere, which I presume is the expression of concurrence mentioned by Lord Chelmsford in his opinion that an officer of the rank of Major General should be sent out to Africa without delay. I think I should be justified in reading that telegram to the House, as Sir Bartle Frere's views on the matter have been somewhat misrepresented, and it clearly shows what they were. It is to this effect, dated January 28—

> "Late events have impressed me with the great risks we run should anything happen to Lord Chelmsford. He is very strong, but much exposed to danger, and we should stand still if he were to knock up. There ought to be at hand a second in command, capable of taking up his work in all departments, if necessary, as Provisional Governor and High Commissioner, as well as General."

The House is aware that it is customary in South Africa to name the General commanding the troops as Lieutenant Governor of the Cape Colony, so as to provide for a temporary absence or incapacity of the Governor; and, for the same reason, Lord Chelmsford holds a dormant commission as High Commissioner. I may add that I have received no official communication on this subject from Sir Bartle Frere.

COLONEL MURE: May I ask, Whether any officer has been sent out in that capacity—whether any special officer has been sent out with the view of taking Lord Chelmsford's place, in the event of that being required, and also of taking the place of the High Commissioner, in the event of that being needed?

SIR MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH: Sir, the hon. and gallant Member is surely aware that four Major Generals have been sent out. The senior of these officers would naturally be the officer to be selected.

MR. OTWAY: With regard to the four Major Generals who have been sent out to the Cape, I should like to ask, Is it not the fact, that the appointment of the officers to exercise the offices which may become void through the illness or disability of Lord Chelmsford, would be made by the War Department upon the recommendation of the Horse Guards, and altogether independent of any other Department?

COLONEL STANLEY: Sir, I think I must ask, so far as any arrangement of that sort is concerned, that the hon. Member should give me Notice of his Question. But I think the simple answer is that which has been given by my right hon. Friend (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach). Four officers of the rank of Major General have been sent out to assist Lord Chelmsford. They are at his absolute disposal; and, in the event of any casualty taking place, the command will devolve upon the senior officer, in accordance with the custom of the Service.

PAROCHIAL CHARITIES OF THE CITY OF LONDON—THE ROYAL COMMISSION.—QUESTION.

MR. FAWCETT asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, If he can inform the House when the inquiry, which is now being carried on by a Royal Commission, into the parochial charities of the City of London will be completed?

MR. ASSHETON CROSS: Sir, I believe the inquiry will be completed shortly after Easter.

CRIMINAL LAW—CASE OF WILLIAM HABRON.—QUESTION.

MR. MITCHELL HENRY asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether it is true, as reported in the "Manchester Guardian," that the Government intend to compensate William Habron for the sufferings he has undergone by granting him a sum of £250; and, if there is no foundation for this statement, whether the Government will consider the substantial compensation made to Mr. Barber in consequence of a Vote taken in this House, and will obtain such an amount for Habron as will purchase him a farm, as agriculture is the only occupation he understands?

MR. ASSHETON CROSS: Sir, neither *The Manchester Guardian*, nor any other paper, was authorized to state that the Government intended to compensate William Habron by the grant of £250. The mention of such a sum has never escaped my lips; but it does so happen that I have that sum at my disposal, and I am at the present moment in communication with those who are certainly extremely favourable to William Habron, and who are very much interested in his future welfare, as to how his interests can best be furthered.

EGYPT—THE MINISTERIAL CRISIS.

QUESTIONS.

SIR GEORGE CAMPBELL (for Sir JULIAN GOLDSMID) asked Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Whether the statement is correct which appeared in the "Observer" of Sunday last, to the effect that a joint note was on the 8th instant addressed by telegram to the Khedive by the English and French Governments, with reference to the recent Ministerial crisis at Cairo; and, if so, whether its purport was accurately given; and, whether he will lay a Copy of it upon the Table of the House? He also asked, Whether the English and French Governments have required the Khedive of Egypt to abstain from sitting in his own Council, and to give the Foreign Ministers a veto on the proceedings of that Council, and have at the same time held him personally responsible for any failures in the measures of the present administration; if he can explain how it happened that during the past year the Egyptian bondholders were paid, while the English Government, the assignee of part of the tribute due to Turkey, was not paid; and, if he can now say whether the English Finance Minister of Egypt came under any obligation or made any promises to great financial houses not to reduce the interest on the Egyptian debt for a certain period?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: Sir, I am obliged to say, with regard to the first Question, that as communications are still going on, and as the French Government is a party to them as well as ourselves, it is impossible to give any minute answer as to the nature of the current negotiations. I am, therefore, hardly able to give an answer, which might not be either misleading or imperfect, to the first Question. But there can be no doubt that there is perfect accord between the English and French Governments in the matter. The Papers which are passing through the Press will bring the accounts down to a recent date, though not including the current negotiations. In the second Question, the hon. Gentleman asked how it happened that the Egyptian bondholders were paid while the English Government—the assignee of part of the tribute due to Turkey—was not paid? With regard to the proceedings which terminated in the payment of the Egyptian bondholders—the May coupon, I suppose—which have been made more than once the subject of discussion in this House—[SIR GEORGE CAMPBELL: The November coupon also.] The November coupon was paid very much under similar circumstances, though not under any pressure of the Government. With regard to the last payment of the English Government, we were not, of course, in direct communication with the Egyptian Government on the subject. Our claim was against Turkey, and we have pressed it from time to time. Turkey ordered the Khedive to make payment; but, somehow or other, circumstances have occurred to prevent payment being made. There is no reason to doubt that the Porte gave the order, and that the Porte was justified in giving it. We have not put any exceptional pressure on Egypt in the matter; but in no way have we been an assenting party; on the contrary, we have steadily remonstrated against the delay that has taken place. With regard to the last part of the Question, I am wholly ignorant of any promise made by the English Finance Minister of Egypt. It is not my business to have anything to say to Questions of that sort.

POST OFFICE—THE WEST INDIA MAIL CONTRACT.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

SIR HENRY SELWIN-IBBETSON wished to make a personal explanation with regard to what fell from him in the discussion on the contract for the mail service to the West Indies. His attention had been called to the words that fell from him that certain vessels belonging to the Company, though, no doubt, well adapted for the purposes of the trade, held no passenger certificates. These words were absolutely correct, being founded on a statement of the Board of Trade; but it was only fair to the Company to say that, although they did not hold certificates from the Board of Trade, they had been out of England, and, therefore, could not renew their certificates; and that another vessel, not included in the list, had been certificated on the 11th of January this year.

ORDERS OF THE DAY.

CONSOLIDATED FUND (No. 2) BILL.

(*Mr. Raikes, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson.*)

THIRD READING.

Order for Third Reading read.

SIR GEORGE CAMPBELL asked what arrangement would be made by the Government for enabling hon. Members, who postponed their Motions on Thursday to enable the Government to get the Supplementary Estimates, to bring forward such Motions on another day?

SIR HENRY SELWIN-IBBETSON said, that the hon. Member, having stood fifth on the occasion he referred to, could not have obtained a first position, unless the Motion to go into Supply had been prolonged for five nights. What he said last night pointed to one of the opportunities which would be offered to the hon. Gentleman for bringing forward this Motion. The Government were not prepared to consider what had been done as at all shutting out the question of nights of Supply; and they would take care that the Civil Service Estimates should be put down, so that there could be full discussions on going into Committee. In addition, the natural opportunities of Tuesdays and Fridays were still open to the hon. Member.

SIR JULIAN GOLDSMID wished to take the opinion of the Speaker as to whether it was a regular proceeding for the Chancellor of the Exchequer to put down for a Tuesday a Bill as an Order of the Day, to have precedence over Notices of Motion. It seemed to him to augur ill for the future conduct of proceedings of the House. He thought the House ought to have some clear understanding as to whether it was to be taken as a precedent or not, as he thought it trenched on the rights of private Members.

MR. SPEAKER said, that the course taken by the Chancellor of the Exchequer was a course not unusually taken, especially with reference to Bills of an urgent character, and which had met with no opposition in their several stages.

Bill read the third time, and *passed.*

MOTIONS.

AGRICULTURAL HOLDINGS ACT, 1875.

MOTION FOR A SELECT COMMITTEE.

MR. B. SAMUELSON rose to move—

> "That a Select Committee be appointed to inquire into the operation of the Agricultural Holdings Act, 1875, and into the conditions of Agricultural Tenancies in England and Wales."

Having given a summary of the provisions of the Act, he said it was a curious fact that it had no Preamble; but the reasons why it was passed could be gathered from the speech of the noble Earl at the head of the Government (the Earl of Beaconsfield) when, as Mr. Disraeli, he moved the second reading in that House. He said it was devised to supply the deficiencies in the law relating to agricultural tenancies; he referred, with approbation, to the efforts of Mr. Pusey and others to give compensation to tenants for unexhausted improvements effected by them, and to prevent the deterioration of the soil; and he described the measure as one that would place owners in a strong position and occupiers in a just position—one that would secure to the tenant compensation for unexhausted improvements, and to the owner compensation for waste and injury through breach of covenant. Notwithstanding the declarations of the Prime Minister as to the benefits the Act was calculated to secure to the tenant, it appeared from inquiries instituted by very competent persons that it had proved to be, to all intents and purposes, a dead letter. ["No, no!"] He was perfectly aware that such a statement would not pass unchallenged; but when it was made on respectable authority, a case was surely made out for the inquiry he proposed. The weak point of the Act lay in two formal clauses at the end which enabled landlords and tenants to remain outside its provisions. This was done in ordinary cases by mutual agreement, and in the case of yearly tenancies by the act of either party without the concurrence of the other. The Prime Minister called this "freedom of contract;" but it was certainly a question whether the phrase properly described an arrangement by which one party gave up that to which he had previously been declared to be entitled without receiving from the other party anything in return. Why the Act had been so strangely constructed he (Mr. B. Samuelson) could not imagine, unless the Prime Minister had counted upon educating his Party sufficiently during the passage of the Bill to enable him to conveniently drop the last two clauses altogether. No sooner had the Act passed than a remarkable circumstance occurred. Both the Duchy of Lancaster and the Duchy of Cornwall, which had been specially included in the Bill, contracted themselves out of it, without a word of explanation being offered. Probably there were excellent reasons for this step being taken; but hon. Members would agree with him that the fact was not calculated to inspire confidence throughout the country generally in the working of the Act. Returns collected by *The Mark Lane Express*, and also by the Farmers' Club, soon after the Act came into operation, showed that at the time it was almost universally evaded. He had caused inquiry to be made in every county in England and Wales from persons well informed on the subject as to the operation of the Act, and had received in all over 200 replies from 51 counties. In the great majority of instances the reply amounted to this—that the Act was a dead letter, or had not been adopted at all; in some cases the existing customs rendered the adoption of the Act unnecessary; while in one or two instances the reply was that the existence of the Act had caused 12 months' notice to be given instead of six. One agent on an extensive estate said—"Nearly every land agent in the Kingdom has noticed the tenants out of the Act." One other question he had put was whether the passing of the Act had led to any improvement in the conditions on which farms were let. There, again, the effect of the vast majority of the replies received was that it had not; while, in a few cases, the reply was that it had led to the giving of longer notice and to more liberal dealing with the tenants—that it had opened the eyes of the tenants, and had led to their making better terms; and, in one case, it was said that the Act had led to a revision of agreements and an increase in their stringency. He had now made known to the House the replies which he had received, and it was for the House to judge whether the statement he had made, to the effect that the Act had resulted in very little improvement, was correct or not. In some cases, where agreements existed before the passing of the Act, the agreements had been altered so as to be more in conformity with the principles laid down in the statute; but, on the other hand, no agreements had been granted in consequence of the Act in those cases in which none existed before the introduction of the measure. In answer to inquiries that he had made, he had found that the system of paying for unexhausted improvements was followed in very few quarters. The words of the hon. Member for South Norfolk (Mr. Clare Read), in reference to this point, were well worthy of attention. The words to which he (Mr. B. Samuelson) referred were—

> "Is it or is it not true, that the half or more than the half of the land of England is held at six months' notice to quit, without any compensation to the outgoing tenant, either by agreement or custom?"

The hon. Member for South Norfolk appended a note to those words to the following effect:—

> "The question has become a national one, and it is a disgrace that a great portion of the land of England should be held by tenants on the conditions on which it is held now."

In refutation of the argument that a low rent was an equivalent to compensation for unexhausted improvements, he would refer to an essay on *The Relations of Landlord and Tenant*, by Mr. W. E. Bear, whose name would be recognised as that of the writer of two recent papers in *The Fortnightly Review*. There were numerous estates in the country, he knew, where the tenants had such faith in the continuance of their possession that a sufficient encouragement existed for them to lay out money on improvements; but that faith surely could not be thought to be the equivalent of a law which would grant to tenants such compensation as was just. According to the statistics lately published by Mr. Caird in his little book on the landed interest, the value of home-grown food was about £260,000,000 per annum. It appeared that during the last eight years there had been no increase whatever in the production of grain, and only a very trifling increase in the production of animal food, in this country. But within the last five or six years there had been a sensible diminution in the production both of grain and of animal food. Our imports of foods of various kinds during the year 1878 amounted to £100,000,000. Comparing 1878 with 1868, there was an increase of nearly 100 per cent in grain and of 125 per cent in animal food and various products. He had shown that, in the opinion of the Prime Minister, it was desirable that our home produce should be increased, if possible. The estimates varied greatly—from 10 to 100 per cent—but they all agreed that it was possible, by causing capital to be invested in the soil, to increase our supply of food. Additional capital would not, however, be invested in the soil until tenants were enabled to obtain compensation for their improvements. Therefore, we must consider this as a question affecting not only landlords and tenants, but also the consumers and the country at large. Agriculture was at present suffering from great depression. He had had the curiosity to examine the Return of the number of bills of sales lately granted by farmers. In the eight months from July, 1878, to the beginning of March, 1879, as compared with the corresponding eight months of 1877-8, the number of bills of sale had nearly doubled. This fact was in itself sufficient to show that great distress prevailed among agriculturists. He hoped, if the House were to grant a Select Committee, that the inquiry would have definite limits; if it were to go into the questions suggested by the Amendment of the hon. Member for Mid-Lincolnshire (Mr. Chaplin), it would be a waste of time to all concerned. The course taken with regard to the Amendment was rather suspicious. His Notice had been on the Paper for three months, and the hon. Gentleman took no steps to bring the question to an issue. But when the Amendment was put down, the cry for Reciprocity, which was another name for Protection, was rife in the country; and, if he (Mr. B. Samuelson) was not mistaken, the Amendment pointed in the direction of Reciprocity. But he was quite certain the country would never allow import duties to be placed on the food of the people. Import duties were neither more nor less than protection to the landlord's rents. He held in his hand an account of a sale of 25,000 bushels of wheat imported from Chicago into Liverpool. The freight and charges, including the cost of sale in Liverpool, were 12*s*. per quarter in addition to the expense of conveying the wheat, perhaps from the interior of Illinois to Chicago. In point of fact, the landlord had a protection already of from 14*s*. to 15*s*. per quarter, which was about equal to 35 per cent of the present price in this country. If that were not a sufficient protection, one of two things alone could happen. Either the land must be made more productive—which could only be done by an expenditure of capital, and that could be obtained only by giving the tenant security—or rents must fall. He hoped that, by adopting equitable measures towards the tenant, we might avoid any great reduction of rents. But if rents fell, then would be the time for the inquiry of the hon. Member for Mid-Lincolnshire, and also for inquiry into a state of things which was bound up with the system of primogeniture and entail. Farmers were no longer so ready as they used to be to take leases; and in the present state of things, when they did not know what a just rent was, it was not desirable that they should. If that were so, there was the greater reason for security for agricultural improvements. He would like that the Committee he asked for should, in the first place, ascertain on independent testimony whether the Act of 1875 had failed; secondly, what were the objections of landlords and tenants to it; and, thirdly, that they should determine the best way of meeting those objections—whether by amending the Act, or repealing it and enacting something more simple. He asked, that if a man had to part with what the law declared to be his property, he should receive a valuable consideration in return. If the Act of 1875 were maintained, the scheme of compensation should be made more elastic; the award of an arbitrator should be simpler than it now was, and appeals should be much more restricted than they were under the Act. With regard to the Amendment to be moved by the hon. Member for Dungarvan (Mr. O'Donnell), that hon. Member could have very little knowledge of the circumstances under which farms were held in this country, if he was not aware that if his proposal, which looked like fixity of tenure, were adopted, no labourer could ever become a landowner without a middleman between him and the landlord. The hon. Member for Oxfordshire (Mr. Harcourt) had also given Notice of an Amendment that agricultural agreements prescribed by the Legislature should be permissive in their character. He (Mr. B. Samuelson) entirely agreed with him; but he could not consider that a permissive agreement, where one party was at liberty to contract himself out of it without the consent of the other party. He had only, in conclusion, to state that the London Farmers' Club, which was in every sense a representative body, had at their last meeting passed a resolution in favour of his Motion for granting a Committee. Thanking the House for the attention they had paid to him, he begged to move for a Select Committee.

Mr. PHIPPS said, he rose with pleasure to second the Resolution which had been so ably moved by the hon. Member for Banbury. The subject was one which demanded inquiry. The distress which existed among farmers was so great, that many who had been long engaged in agriculture, and were unfit for any other calling, were leaving it in order to save the remnant of property still left to them; and unless the depression were in some way quickly removed, many others would follow their example. Some of the causes of that depression were practically irremovable. First of all, there was the importation of foreign agricultural produce. Though large, that importation was at present in its infancy, the great efforts of foreign countries being directed to provide food for the English market. The British farmers expressed no desire that these importations should be restricted by law, for they knew that no Government could, or ought to, place any obstacles in the way of the consumers obtaining cheap food. The increase in the price of labour must, of course, depend on supply and demand. The decrease of the home-consuming power would not be alleviated until prosperity was again brought to the commerce and trade of the country. Unpropitious seasons were beyond the control of the British House of Commons. But there were three causes which were preventable by legislation—the importation of disease, the increase of local burdens, and the insecurity of capital invested by the tenant in the cultivation of the soil. It was to remedy the last of these evils that the Agricultural Holdings Bill was introduced. The question was, had it effected its object? If not, why not? The Committee now asked, if granted, would be able to give an authoritative reply to these questions. The right of the outgoing tenant to compensation for unexhausted improvements left on the land for the benefit of the future occupier, although a most beneficent provision, was rendered ineffectual by the power of one of the parties to contract himself out of it. Were the provisions of the Act necessary? If unnecessary, why were they enacted? Were they just; and, if just why should they be ignored? To his mind, they were alike advantageous to the landlord and the tenant. The tenant could not contract himself out of the return of the property tax, which he had a right to deduct by Act of Parliament, notwithstanding any agreement to the contrary. So, by Act of Parliament, should the right of tenants be recognized to payments for unexhausted improvements, notwithstanding any agreement to the contrary. This should be secured, not for the benefit of the tenants alone, but in the interests of the community at large. He knew this view of the question would not be acceptable to those who considered the maintenance of freedom of contract incompatible with the restrictions imposed by law; but might not freedom of contract be carried too far? Was not freedom of contract limited in many ways by Acts of Parliament? Landlord and tenant ought to be able to make any agreement they pleased, provided that agreement did not deprive the tenant of the compensation to which he was justly entitled. But an Act of Parliament was unnecessary, if not unjust, which, while exacting that certain things should be done in the interest of all, still retained a provision that any two parties might by agreement divest themselves of the obligations which the Act imposed. The general consensus of opinion expressed by the farmers' clubs was in favour of changes in the law which would secure compensation to the tenant for unexhausted improvements, as well as to the landlord for dilapidation and deterioration caused by neglect; and he therefore seconded the Resolution.

Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That a Select Committee be appointed to inquire into the operation of the Agricultural Holdings Act, 1875, and into the conditions of Agricultural Tenancies in England and Wales."—(*Mr. Bernhard Samuelson.*)

Mr. O'DONNELL expressed satisfaction that the Liberal Party were coming forward to take their proper place in the movement for the emancipation of agriculture. A generation ago the Liberal Party obtained Free Trade; but, somehow or other, the interests of the farmers were overlooked. A generation ago Parliament took certain advantages from the agricultural classes; but no step was taken to relieve them from their exceptional disadvantages. He was of opinion that it was high time that free agriculture should supplement Free Trade. He did not see that the speech of the hon. Member for Banbury was in favour of his Resolution; but, on the other hand, he considered that speech to be a support of his Amendment. The Amendment he would move was to the effect—

> "That there can be no adequate remedy for the agricultural depression existing throughout the country, and severely affecting also the interests of town labour, which does not, especially at this period of increasing Foreign Competition, protect the application of skill and capital to the soil by the establishment of compensation for unexhausted improvements, equitable appeal against exorbitant rents, and substantial security of tenure for the agricultural classes both in Great Britain and Ireland."

That Amendment he moved for two reasons. In the first place, if the block of the Liberal Party, influenced by many considerations, could not go on the present occasion further than the Resolution of the hon. Gentleman, he thought it expedient that the country at large should know that, at any rate, a section of the Liberal Party was prepared to go thoroughly and to the fullest extent into the demands and requirements of the farmers. In the second place, he made a special reference to the agricultural question in Great Britain and Ireland, because he wished to remind the agricultural classes that they had common interests, and that, as they suffered in common, they should cooperate against common opponents. He had had something to say with regard to exceptional legislation for Ireland on many occasions; but just at present he was inclined to think that the Irish people and the English people were in this matter to some degree influenced by the feelings and desires of common humanity. The Resolution before the House appeared to him to be of the character of a very make-believe sympathy with the agricultural classes, similar to the Agricultural Holdings Act of the Government. It was quite clear that that Act had not introduced any reform into the agricultural relations of this country; and it was a question whether it was ever intended to introduce any important reform. The position which the Conservative Party held, and probably liked to hold, was that, while they were leaders of the country party—the farmers—and enjoyed all the advantages of leadership, they gave in return but a minimum of protection. There was exceptionally severe agricultural depression throughout the country; and this would continue until we got rid of the mischievous features of a mischievous system. What effectual remedy could there be which did not start with the removal of the artificial hindrances to agriculture? One of the chief of these artificial hindrances was the power of capricious eviction. In Ireland they had been more keenly sensible to the evils of the system that weighed on agriculture than the people of England had; but, unfortunately, it was only in England that public opinion was felt, and it was because Irish public opinion was so weak, that nothing had been done to effect a remedy. Irish public opinion had been powerless against the combination of English landed interests, covering and protecting Irish proprietary interests. This matter had a very close relation to the towns. So long as the towns were swamped by ignorant refugees from the country, deprived of the chance of settlement in their old country seats by the wretched system of insecurity, so long would these evils continue to be felt. They knew how the land system in Ireland was causing the expatriation of hundreds of thousands of the Irish working classes. Through no fault of their own, the poor Irish emigrants were driven from their native homes and villages; and, landing on the quays of Liverpool and Bristol, they became active and reckless competitors in town labour with the English artizan. As a consequence, the health, wealth, and comfort of the English artizan suffered, in common with the Irish emigrant, from the desperate struggle that now took place between the Irish beggar for food and the established English labourer in possession of the field. In the same way the mischievous character of the English land system flooded the manufacturing towns with wretched labourers of every kind, members of farmers' families deprived of their only chance of settlement and advancement on the land. This flooding of the towns and manufacturing districts would not be got rid of, and the town industries could not be protected, until they could provide the rural population with guarantees and inducements to put their ability into the land, instead of transplanting it into a wretched competition with town labour. He did not wish to refer further to the question of the agricultural labourers; but he was satisfied that until there was greater security introduced into land tenure, the farmers, even if they desired it, would be quite unable to guarantee a permanent improvement in the condition of the agricultural labourers. The evils of the present Poor Law system, the enormous amount of pauperism existing in and disgracing this country, in comparison with every other progressive nation in the world, could not be got rid of until they remedied the evils of the land system. So long as the agricultural classes had no alternative but anxious labour for bare sustenance, so long an immense portion of the country population would have no refuge to look forward to in old age but the poorhouse, supported at the cost of the ratepayers. To a very large extent the poorhouse system—the poor rate—was a fund which the landholders of this country levied upon the ratepayers at large, in order to provide a degraded and degrading pension for the victims of the landholding system. He would not go further into that matter. The speech of the hon. Member for Banbury had been in favour of his (Mr. O'Donnell's) Amendment more than it had been in favour of his own Resolution. He would repeat the expression of his earnest wish that the Liberal Party would progress in the path on which it had entered that night. The Liberal Party owed a debt which ought to have been paid long since to the agricultural classes of England and of Ireland. Protection was abolished by the voice of the Liberal constituencies, and the farmers were thereby deprived of all their exceptional advantages; but they had been left under all the disadvantages of the *quasi*-feudal system of cultivation which was maintained in this country, though it had been abolished in every other. It was time for the Liberal Party now boldly to place the motto of free agriculture on their banners, by the side of, and as a supplement to, Free Trade. Protection, he hoped and believed, could never be introduced, and for this very reason—they were bound to place the working classes in the counties on an equality and under the same *regimé* of liberty as they had insisted on for the workers in towns. It was said that the Liberal Party was in want of an Election cry. He would respectfully submit to its Leaders that they could have no such excellent Election cry, or one so worthy of the Liberal Party, as "Land Reform and Free Agriculture." In conclusion, he would say that, as an Irishman, he had great pride and pleasure in endeavouring by his Resolution to lay the basis of some common agreement between the distressed interests of England and the distressed interests of Ireland. A feeling of revenge—and no ignoble feeling of revenge—confirmed his desire that the movement for which he prayed might succeed. On many an occasion the worst offenders against the hearths and homes of the Irish peasantry had been protected by the perverted feelings of English landlords. The Irish could exact no nobler vengeance than by enabling the English agricultural classes to wrest from those who governed them—certainly not for their benefit—those blessings of freedom and security for which they had so long sought in vain. It would be a great thing if they could punish English misgovernment in Ireland by doing good to the masses of the English people. He need not fear that to do so would be a bad investment. English farmers could have no permanent interest in the oppression of Irish agriculture. As the free land movement gathered strength, and the certainty of land reform in England became nearer and nearer day by day, the representatives of Irish tenant right, instead of coming as humble supplicants to hon. Members opposite for some poor measure of protection for the wretched tenantry of Tipperary and Donegal, would come as the allies of a great English popular Party to enforce their demands, and then eviction and oppression would fly, and not appear again in the field at any future day.

Major O'Beirne begged to second the Amendment, which so well set forth nearly all that the Irish tenantry had so persistently demanded. A disheartening process of raising rents had been going on, which prevented the people enjoying the land or deriving profits from it. Why that process should go on he did not know, unless it was because Irish proprietors demanded higher interests for their money than the English. Purchasers of Irish property were rarely satisfied with less than 4½ per cent interest, and the result was that the silent process of raising rents had been going on all over the country. He thought it ought to be shown up and put down. He was a landlord himself; and, as such, had had no hesitation in giving his support to the Land Bill of the hon. and learned Member for Limerick (Mr. Butt), which did not entrench on the rights of landowners, but only gave the tenant what he had a fair claim to expect—namely, security of tenure. He should, therefore, support the Bill whenever he had the opportunity. Meanwhile, he thought the hon. Member for Dungarvan (Mr. O'Donnell) deserved the thanks of the Irish tenants for having brought forward his Amendment.

Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "there can be no adequate remedy for the agricultural depression existing throughout the country and severely affecting also the interests of town labour, which does not, especially at this period of increasing Foreign Competition, protect the application of skill and capital to the soil by the establishment of compensation for unexhausted improvements, equitable appeal against exorbitant rents, and substantial security of tenure for the agricultural classes both in Great Britain and Ireland,"—(*Mr. O'Donnell,*)

—instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

COLONEL RUGGLES-BRISE thought the speech of the hon. Member for Dungarvan, though very interesting, had very little to do with the subject before the House. The Amendment, as he read it, advocated a system of fixity of rents.

MR. O'DONNELL observed, that he had said nothing about fixity of rent.

COLONEL RUGGLES-BRISE accepted the disavowal, and hoped the day was far distant when an English Member would be found to support such a proposition. He preferred the Motion of the hon. Member for Banbury (Mr. B. Samuelson) to either of the Amendments. While, with one hand, the Legislature had been alleviating the burdens of the landed interests, on the other hand they had been increasing them by the imposition of education, highway, valuation, and other rates. He did not think the time had come for a Select Committee to inquire into the operation of the Agricultural Holdings Act, for a Committee could not recommend anything at the present moment that would alleviate the existing distress. A temporary remedy would be a considerable reduction in rents; but he believed that there had not been of late years as large an increase in rents as many people supposed. Another remedy might be found in the removal of some of the existing restrictions from agriculture. The abolition of the law of settlement and entail would not influence one way or the other the prosperity of agriculture. No doubt the Game Laws exercised at one time a disastrous effect upon the agriculture of the country; but they did so no longer, as the discussions that had taken place in the House in former years, when the advisability of abolishing those laws was under consideration, had produced much the same effect as would have resulted from their actual abolition. The House had been told that the abolition of the privileges of the landlords would be of assistance to agriculturists; but what, he asked, were those privileges? He did not believe that the remedy which was sought would be found to lie in greater production. Many of those suffering distress at the present time were among the largest producers and best farmers in the country. The Agricultural Holdings Act was, in his opinion, one of the best measures affecting agricultural interests that had been introduced into Parliament for many years. As far as the county which he represented was concerned, the statistics quoted by the hon. Member opposite (Mr. B. Samuelson) were misleading. He knew hundreds of farms that were farmed under the Agricultural Holdings Act, and their number was increasing every day. The number of landlords who were contracting themselves out of the Act was, on the other hand, daily diminishing, and as leases fell in he thought they would hear little more of the use of the powers of contract. The Agricultural Holdings Act had established a local custom where no previous custom existed, and this was an advantage. His opinion was that the Act could be made to do more than it had done; and therefore he was in favour of the appointment of the Committee which was asked for. He did not wish to impair private contracts as far as annual holdings went. Four-fifths of the land in England was let under the system of annual holdings. In all such cases he believed the landlords had contracted themselves out of the Act; and he did not object to this, because an annual holding meant a low rent and a six months' notice to leave. In point of fact, the tenant was compensated by the lowness of the rent. But in the case of land let on lease at a fair rent, a different principle came into action. If, therefore, the object of the Committee would be to inquire how far the Agricultural Holdings Act had benefited the country, and whether any compulsion was necessary, even in the mildest form, he should have no objection whatever to the Committee being constituted; and he was certain that the evidence adduced before it would be of a very different character from the evidence which had been placed in the hands of the hon. Member for Banbury.

Mr. J. W. BARCLAY said, the state of agricultural matters had now become so very grave that he doubted much whether, even if the provisions of the Agricultural Holdings Act were made altogether compulsory, they would suffice to rescue the agriculture of this country from the collapse that was now threatening it. He did not think any hon. Member who had addressed the House was sufficiently aware of the great gravity of the crisis which was impending over the agriculturists. For four or five years past, partly through bad seasons, and partly through the low prices of produce, agricultural capital had been gradually melting away. The statistics quoted by the hon. Member for Banbury (Mr. B. Samuelson), showing a large increase in the number of bills of sale in the last month or two, proved to what straits the agriculturists of this country were driven. He did not, of course, suppose that any Committee of that House could do anything to moderate the seasons which, for the past two years, had been so adverse to the farmers; nor did he think it desirable that any Committee should recommend anything whatever in the way of increasing the prices of agricultural produce; but what he hoped was, that a Committee might be appointed to ascertain whether the position of the cultivator of the soil might be improved, and whether the conditions under which he held the land might be so changed as to enable him better to meet adverse seasons and low prices. It was quite true that wheat had been as cheap on some previous occasions as it was now; but since the increased cost of farming in recent years, the price of beef and mutton had never been so low as during the last 12 months. When the price of grain came down, the farmers were exhorted to turn their attention to live stock, and that had been done to a considerable extent; but now the price of beef and mutton had also come down to such an extent, that the production of those articles could only go on at a great loss to the farmers. Last spring, for instance, farmers were buying store cattle at 75*s.* per cwt., which they had had to sell within the last few months at 65*s.* He did not blame the Government for the recent Order, under the Contagious Diseases (Animals) Act, directing the slaughter of cattle from the United States; but it had frustrated the hope of getting cheap store cattle. By a large importation of cattle from the United States, farmers might be able to buy store cattle at 60*s.* per cwt., and, after feeding them, sell them at 65*s.* to 70*s.* with a profit. He did not think it possible for this country at all to compete with the United States in the actual breeding of cattle; and he regretted that the Privy Council should have declined to make inquiry as to whether disease existed in the great breeding grounds in the Western States, which he was informed it did not, and whether it would not be possible to make arrangements for the safe importation of cattle from those States to England through Canada. The refusal to institute such an inquiry showed a want of appreciation of the vast importance of the subject to the farmers of the country. As to the low prices, considerable hopes were entertained that, when trade revived, the prices of grain and meat would revive also, and he had no doubt that would be so to some extent; but he would point out that, in consequence of the stream of migration which had taken place from the Eastern into the Western States of America, there was likely to be an increase rather than a decrease in the importation from that quarter, not only of corn, but also of beef and dairy produce. The Agricultural Holdings Act was really of more importance to the landlord than to the farmer, in proportion as the landholder's interest was greater than that of the temporary occupant. The fact that wheat was only fetching from 35*s*. to 40*s*. meant something serious to the landlord. Wheat could not be produced in this country at less than 48*s*. a-quarter; and therefore, if the selling price was only 40*s*., there must be a loss of 8*s*. a-quarter, and it was impossible that that could continue to be borne by the farmer. The capital of the farmers was now pretty well exhausted. The profits they had made in bygone years had not been such that they could afford any reduction of them. Newspaper correspondents advised farmers to cut down personal expenses and live more humbly; but, at all events in Scotland, farmers could not live more carefully and economically than they did. If the landlords wanted to reduce the farmers to mere workers on the land in smock frocks, they would have to reduce their holdings very considerably, and to have a system of farming which would not require any capital. He objected to the Resolution of the hon. Member for Banbury, on the ground that it was too limited in its general scope, and because it had reference only to England and Wales. The case of Scotland required investigation quite as much. Farmers who held leases, when the stimulus of Free Trade came, had expended their profits in improving their farms; and those profits had been almost, or altogether, in the majority of cases, appropriated by the landlords in the form of increased rent. It said a great deal for the energy and enterprize of Scotch farmers that they had improved the land so much as they had done; but of late years it had been discovered that a 19 years' lease was not sufficient to enable the tenant to reap a fair advantage from his improvements, in consequence of the much greater cost involved, and the smaller margin of profit. He was in favour of a thorough inquiry; and he denied that those who sought such an inquiry wished to raise the question of Protection. He had no faith in Protection or reciprocity, and he had heard no such idea suggested among his constituents; but he thought an inquiry might serve to educate landlords and land agents as to the proper management of land, so as to make the most of it both for the landlord and the tenant. Nothing was done precipitately in the House of Commons; and he had had very great fears whether any inquiry or change would come in time to prevent a very large number of the present occupiers of land being absolutely ruined: but an investigation by a Committee, and the facts which such a Committee would collect, might result in a new class of cultivators of the soil being enabled to start on a fairer basis, and with much more advantageous prospects than hitherto.

SIR JOHN KENNAWAY admitted that if, as some hon. Members maintained, half the land of England was farmed under the conditions of six months' notice, with no provision at all for the compensation of the outgoing tenant, the state of things would be well worth the attention of that House. But he was very much inclined to doubt whether the Agricultural Holdings Act had proved to be the dead letter which the hon. Member for Banbury (Mr. B. Samuelson) said it was. No doubt a good many landlords had contracted themselves out of it; but it was incumbent upon the hon. Member, if he would establish his case, to show that the provisions of the Act had not been replaced by any good working agreements between landlord and tenant, and also that such agreements had been demanded and refused. He thought that the Act of 1875 went, as far as any Act ought to go, in the way of interfering between landlord and tenant. It was absurd to say that it did nothing. It had this effect—that whereas, before it was passed, the presumption was that at the end of the lease improvements effected during its continuance were the property of the landlord, now the presumption was that the tenant was entitled to compensation in respect of them. It had the effect, also, of bringing the landlord and the tenant face to face; and it embodied a provision giving the landlord a right to compensation in the event of its being found that by his neglect the tenant had impoverished his farm. Exaggerated notions about high farming were not quite so popular now as they were a few years ago. He was opposed to the inquiry sought for, because he believed that nothing practical would come of it; but principally because it would give rise to expectations which could never be fulfilled.

Mr. M'LAGAN supported the Motion, because he believed a case had been made out for inquiry, and because the hon. Member who proposed it was most moderate in his demands. He did not think the time had come for an inquiry so wide as was to be proposed by the hon. Member for Mid-Lincolnshire (Mr. Chaplin). He could not support the proposal to make the Act compulsory. He could not agree with those who held that the farmer had not good times in store for him. The agricultural depression was, he imagined, largely due to the sympathy between farming and other occupations. He was not a pessimist in this matter, as he remembered times quite as bad as these—so bad, indeed, that the cry was raised that it was useless to go on growing corn. He believed the depression was only temporary, and that the time was not far distant when they would have times as bright as before. The fact was, that the British farmer did not depend on corn-growing; but on meat, butter, hay, and other articles that still fetched good prices. His hon. Friend (Mr. J. W. Barclay) had based his argument upon the foreign competition in corn; but the House would remember that the repeal of the Corn Laws had not turned out disastrous to the farmer. They ought not, however, to run away with the idea that the days of Protection, or, as it was called, of "reciprocity," would return. He did not hesitate to say that they would never see a protective duty imposed upon any article consumed by the people. There could be no idea of entertaining reciprocity proposals. Allusion had been made to the necessity of sufficient capital in farming; but, for his own part, he would prefer a tenant with moderate capital, and great experience and skill, to a man who was comparatively ignorant of farming, but had plenty of money. Thinking that the time had come for an inquiry into the operation of the Act—which clearly did not come up to the expectations that had been formed by many of those who were in favour of it—he intended to give his support to the Resolution of his hon. Friend (Mr. B. Samuelson).

Mr. CLARE READ, referring to a statement made on a former occasion, to the effect that a speech which he had delivered in connection with the subject under the consideration of the House was one which should only have been uttered after a "two-shilling ordinary," said that, as a matter of fact, what had just been quoted was uttered after imbibing an eighteen-penny market tea, and, consequently, might easily be of a weak character. The House was much indebted to his hon. Friend the Member for Banbury, who had brought forward the subject of the Agricultural Holdings Act, as it was not likely that another opportunity of considering the agricultural situation would have presented itself this Session. He held that the Act was a very good one, and said so because it was a copy of a Bill which Mr. James Howard and he had introduced into the House. It was a good Act, but it was not free from imperfection. In it there was an excellent homily to landlords; but he was sorry to say that a vast majority of those to whom the homily was addressed had excused themselves from attending to the duties which it enjoined. He regarded its provisions as the minimum of what ought to be given to the tenant, and anyone who sought to restrict these did an injustice. The great fault of the measure, however, was that it came into operation where it was not wanted, and where it was wanted its provisions were not, unfortunately, of much avail. The good landlords, for whom the Act was not required, had accepted it; but the needy or grasping ones had, as a rule, rejected it. In the ranks of those who had contracted themselves out of the Act was the Duchy of Lancaster—a fact which must, in his opinion, naturally give rise to wonder. Therefore, as he said at the time the Act was passed, it ought to be compulsory. He believed the permissive principle was only adopted by the Government as an experiment, with the view of an ultimate resort to compulsion, if necessary. Recently, without doubt, the Act had been more generally adopted, as tenants had become more independent in consequence of bad times, and had therefore been able to get a greater amount of justice done them than formerly. An assertion of his, that half the land of England was held at six months' notice to quit, had been called in question, but it had not been disproved. He wanted to see whether it could be disproved or not, and therefore he should support the Motion for inquiry. He did not know what the Amendment to be proposed by the hon. Member for Mid-Lincolnshire (Mr. Chaplin) aimed at. For his own part, if there was to be a general inquiry into the condition of agriculture and the cause of the existing depression, he should like to see that inquiry intrusted to a Royal Commission, instead of to a Committee of the House of Commons, as the Report of a Royal Commission would be accorded more confidence than would be placed in that of a Committee. The depression in agriculture had been produced by a large number of circumstances, and he wished he could see a chance of recovery. There were burdens which it was impossible for legislative enactments to relieve. He thought he was right in saying that the chief cause of the distress had been our unfruitful seasons—particularly those of the last four years. Another cause was the absence of restriction on imports. We had had 31 years' experience of Free Trade, and the predictions of the Protectionists had been proved to be true. In 1851 and 1852 we were given a dose of Free Trade, and then followed the discovery of gold in different parts of the world, then the Crimean War, the Cotton Famine, and the Franco-German War—all of them circumstances tending to raise the price of the commodities produced by farmers. Only three times in his life had he heard of the price of wheat being as low as it was now. The first occasion was in 1836, when there was a heavy protective duty. In 1833, 1834, 1835, and 1836 the harvests were good; and now, after four exceedingly bad harvests, the price of wheat was just the same as it was then. In 1851 the price of wheat was again as low as it was now. That was in the first days of Free Trade. It had been said that rents had come down. He did not believe, however, that where there was a fair proportion of grass and good tillage land rents had been considerably reduced; nor did he think they would fall very much, although, no doubt, the very light land and the very heavy land would go out of cultivation. Farmers had a right to complain of the tithes, which were 12 per cent above the amount at which they had been commuted. This arose from the unfair way in which the corn averages were struck. Again, the increase of rates was most burdensome; and where a school board had been established in a small agricultural parish the pressure became really grievous. He knew school board rates which were 1*s.* or 1*s.* 6*d.* in the pound, and this meant a property tax on the farmer of 2*s.* or 3*s.* in the pound. What would any tradesman think if such an impost were inflicted upon him? Moreover, the farmers had still to complain of the operation of the Malt Tax. As for the agricultural labourer, he had never been so well off as he was at the present day. Formerly a bushel and a-half of wheat represented the cost of a week's labour; but now a labourer could buy a bushel of wheat for the price of two days' labour. He rejoiced in the improved condition of the agricultural labourer; and the only thing he thought the labourer should now be asked to do was to give a fair day's work for a fair day's pay. It had been urged that the property of the landlords had greatly improved since the introduction of Free Trade. He did not see, however, that there was very much in that, as comparisons between increased values ought to be comparative, and not absolute. Mr. Caird told them, in his recent work, that land had increased 21 per cent in value between 1857 and 1875. How was that arrived at? In the first place, there had been a great increase in the general assessment; next, the enlargement of towns, the increased value of residential estates, and the construction of railways had considerably raised the value of land. Again, the landlords had embarked an immense quantity of capital in the land in the shape of permanent improvements, and large contributions to the value of estates had also been made by the tenantry. The Returns of Property Tax in England, from 1847 to 1877, showed that land had increased in value 26 per cent; but in the same period houses had increased in value 40 per cent; while the profits of trades, professions, and public companies had increased 231 per cent. Taking from 1857 to 1877, land had increased in value exactly the same, or 26 per cent, which showed that in the early days of Free Trade land was stationary in value—houses had increased in value 170 and trades 155 per cent. In another period, from 1865 to 1875, according to figures given by Mr. Giffen—who, he believed, was not generally regarded as particularly favourable to the landed interest—land had increased in value only 8 per cent, houses 38, railways 58, public funds 146, mines 190, and iron works 314 per cent. Therefore, as compared with other property, the increase in the value of land was very small. He thought the inquiry proposed would be of great value, and he intended to support the Motion.

MR. CHAPLIN, who had given Notice of an Amendment, to the effect that the inquiry should be into the

> "present depressed condition of agriculture, and how far it is owing to causes which can be remedied by legislation,"

disclaimed any idea of raising the question of Protection. It was true he had not placed his Amendment on the Paper for three months after the hon. Gentleman's Notice of Motion; but that was because at the close of last Session he had been subjected to such long and severe indisposition that he was not able to attend to any business. He put his Amendment on the Paper immediately after the proposal of the hon. Gentleman had been brought to his notice. It was no wonder, however, that distrust should be felt in the principles of Free Trade, seeing how the predictions of the right hon. Member for Birmingham (Mr. Bright), and the late Mr. Cobden, that if we adopted Free Trade all other nations would follow our example, had been falsified. The hon. Gentleman opposite (Mr. B. Samuelson) had said that if any import duty were placed on corn it would be a protection, not to the tenant, but the landlord. His answer to that was, let them do so before the next harvest, and then ask the farmers whether it would be a benefit to them. He had put his Amendment on the Paper, not from any wish to advocate Protection or oppose inquiry into the working of the Act of 1875. He believed then, and he believed still, that the Act was right and wise in principle, and that the longer it was tried the more beneficial its operation would be found. But the Motion of the hon. Gentleman dealt only with one branch of a very large question; and if the inquiry were limited, as proposed, the conclusions arrived at would be erroneous. He agreed with all that had fallen from hon. Members as to the depression in agricultural circles. It was more than depression. He was not sure that hon. Members would be far wrong if they described it as the decline of agriculture in England; and if that decline were prolonged and permanent it would be a calamity, not only to the agricultural interest, but to all classes of the community. The hon. Member attributed our diminished production to the want of security for his capital on the part of the tenant, and to the Act of 1875 being permissive and, therefore, non-effective. This diminished production, however, was entirely independent of that or any other Act; its causes were many and various. The hon. Member had called the Act a dead letter. On the contrary, the Act of 1875 had made cardinal changes in the relations between the landlords and tenants of England. Before the passing of the Act all improvements, whether exhausted or otherwise, arising out of the capital and labour of the tenant became the property of the landlord. After the passing of the Act, the whole presumption of the law was reversed. The hon. Member said it was impossible for agriculture to flourish until they provided for the tenant greater security than he now enjoyed. He told them that the Crown Lands had all been contracted out of the Act—that the author of the Act had contracted himself out of it. Now, he was in a position to state that all the farms of the noble Duke referred to were under lease; and that of the 37,000 acres of the Duchy of Lancaster 3,500 acres in the county of Norfolk were let under lease. He stated that the Act had been adopted in very few instances. What did all this mean? The contracting parties had preferred—and very properly—to enter into agreements of their own. The tenant was in as good a position as possible to make terms for himself. No one acknowledged more readily than he did the right of the tenant to have the fullest security for the capital he embarked in the land. If he could share the opinion of the hon. Mover of this Resolution—that that security would be attained by some compulsory measure—he would consent to this Act or some other being made compulsory. But he could not share that opinion in the smallest degree. He was convinced there was not the slightest necessity for it. What had been their experience on this point? They had heard a great deal at one time of the Lincolnshire custom; it was very much the same as this Act, especially in this respect—that it was also permissive; but was he to be told the Lincolnshire custom was a sham? Nothing of the kind. Under that custom, the most perfect security was enjoyed by the tenant for everything he could put into his farm. He was perfectly satisfied there was no necessity for the change that was proposed to be made. The first of the causes which had led to the present depression in agriculture was the succession of three or four very bad seasons, resulting in greatly diminished produce, which had suffered not only in quantity but in quality. Another cause was the very bad prices received for that produce. These were the real causes of distress in agriculture—the consequence had been little return or loss on the capital invested. It was no wonder that agriculturists should be more or less disheartened. Agriculture in England was not fairly treated. Land was far more heavily taxed than any other property in the country. Why should real property alone contribute to many important national objects? While they were imposing heavy additional taxes on land, they were also largely increasing the expenses of the farmer in the labour he employed. They compelled him to pay men's wages for a great quantity of work which had hitherto been often better done by boys at one-third of the price paid for men. The labour question itself was by no means one of the least of the farmers' difficulties. But more than all this, there was the great competition he had to meet in the increasing importation of food from abroad. The trade in meat had sprung up in America and developed with a rapidity which was unprecedented. If the American trade was really capable of all that was claimed for it, the conclusion must become almost irresistible that, so far as arable land was concerned, the days of the farmers were nearly numbered. What was the case in dairy farms? He was told that the price hitherto obtained for their cheese had been diminished of late by nearly one-half, owing to the competition they had to meet with from America. Nowhere, he understood, was distress greater than in farms of that description at the present moment. A statement of the expenditure and returns of a farm, the details of which he would show any hon. Member, exhibited a loss of 2*s*. if the holding were rent free; and that brought out the important fact that rent was an insignificant proportion of the outgoings on ordinary average arable farms. On a farm of 500 acres the outgoings amounted to £3,377, and the rent, at 30*s*. an acre, to £750, or one-fourth of the whole. A return of 20 or 25 per cent of the rent was a mere bagatelle to the tenant, and it might be ruin to the landlord. It would not enable the tenant to cultivate the land if he could not do it now. If things remained in their present position, it would be difficult to cultivate a great part of England at all. No doubt the difficulties of the farmers were largely owing to the bad seasons they had gone through, and the general depression in trade had re-acted on agriculture in England; but, before considering remedies, it was necessary to ascertain whether our depression was of a temporary or of a permanent character. If it proved to be permanent, the serious position and prospects of agriculture would render it incumbent on they to look the matter fully in the face with a view to devising an adequate remedy.

Sir THOMAS ACLAND regretted that more of the farmers' Friends had not remained in the House to hear the speeches. No substantial question had been raised except by the speech and Motion of the hon. Member for Banbury (Mr. B. Samuelson). The hon. Member for Mid-Lincolnshire (Mr. Chaplin) attributed depression to bad seasons, low prices, and competition; but he did not give the smallest hint of the good that could be done by inquiring into these questions. It was satisfactory to know that the hon. Member did not speak in the name of his Party. There was nothing to show what the practical purpose of his Amendment was. The Chancellor of the Exchequer had made occupiers a present of about £2,000,000; but how many farthings in the pound were farmers the better for it after the demands made upon them by the additions to Imperial taxation? The next generation would find out that the towns and the country had better bear their own burdens. As to the burden of educating the labourers, it had been made possible to earn from the State a capitation grant of 17*s*.; so that, where any great burden fell upon the tenant-farmers, it was where the landlord had not built a school, and clerical subscriptions alone had been forthcoming to maintain one. He thanked the hon. Member for having shelved the docrine of Reciprocity, which would encourage some of his Friends to do likewise. The question before the House was very much one of fact. Was the Act or not a dead letter? Not knowing the witnesses whose evidence the hon. Member for Banbury had quoted, he frankly confessed that he did not accept their statements with entire confidence; but there was certainly a very strong case for inquiry. The credit of the Government who passed the Bill, and of the great Party who were accused of nullifying it, was at stake, and in their own interests they ought to court inquiry. He believed that there were a great many more good agreements in England than was generally supposed, and that they had not been made under the Act. But if those good agreements had not been made under the Act, had the Act conduced to them? Well, nobody, he thought, was at present in a position to say. A number of them, he knew, were entered into before the Bill passed, and many farmers had elected to remain under their old agreements rather than adopt the Act. But that circumstance furnished all the more occasion for inquiry. If the Act had not proved the boon to agriculture it was expected to be, what was the reason for its failure? Was it the fact that the landlords and the land agents as a body were opposed to the Act, and would not allow the farmers to take advantage of it? These were questions which it was very desirable to get answered. No doubt, the Act had done good by changing the presumption of the law, and by enabling limited owners to do more than they could do before. But there was, he believed, a general distrust of it throughout the country. It was essentially a Conveyancer's Act, and smelt of the Court of Chancery from beginning to end. It was, moreover, very complicated in its details, and it was deserving of consideration whether something less complicated could not be substituted for it which would do an equal amount of good to the farmers. He admitted that the provisions in the Act which enabled either party to go before the Inclosure Commissioners and demand an arbitration was a valuable one; but he thought that power should be given to some public authority to appoint valuers. There was one thing that the Legislature ought to take into their serious consideration, and that was the protection which the farmer undoubtedly required on the question of game. This was provided for by a clause in the Tenants Compensation Bill introduced by him (Sir Thomas Acland) on the basis of the practice of the hon. Member for Scarborough. Another subject provided for in that Bill was security for tenants, that on the sale of an estate they should not be disturbed in them two years at least. He trusted that the Government would not consider the present Motion in the light of one of censure. It was not. On the contrary, it was to carry out to its legitimate conclusion a most useful work which they were the first to initiate.

Mr. NEWDEGATE: I hope that the House will allow me a few minutes of its time on this question, seeing that it was I who, in 1848, first induced the House seriously to entertain the matter included in the Agricultural Holdings Act. The hon. Baronet the Member for North Devon (Sir Thomas Acland) has said that those who were the "farmers' friends" prevented Mr. Pusey from doing anything towards improving the relations between landlord and tenant. Sir, the late Mr. Pusey was an old and valued friend of mine, and for some years we sat together on the Publication Committee of the Protection Society for this country and the Colonies. I laboured with him for three or four years; we acted together most cordially; we wrote at the same table, side by side, like two schoolboys; and I find it rather trying to hear it said that I prevented Mr. Pusey's doing anything, when I induced this House to appoint the Committee on Agricultural Customs for the very purpose of giving substance and form to several of Mr. Pusey's proposals. When that Committee was appointed I gave way to Mr. Pusey, and proposed that he should take the Chair of the Committee. This being the case, it is rather hard to tell me that I, as one of the "farmers' friends," assisted in defeating Mr. Pusey. It is perfectly true that some of Mr. Pusey's views went beyond what I considered consistent with the continuance of that happy understanding between landlord and tenant —that partnership between them—which is the great characteristic of the tenure of land in England; for in Ireland, I am sorry to say, the application of large capital by the landlord to the improvement of the land was in former years—in 1848, for example—the exception, whereas in England it has long been the rule. And when an hon. Member like the hon. Member for Dungarvan (Mr. O'Donnell) speaks as though he would import Irish legislation into England, I beg to tell him that the circumstances of the two countries are totally different. In England—I speak from personal experience and knowledge of the fact—it is the habit of the landlord to make most, as a rule, all the permanent improvements, such as building, road-making, draining, and so forth. These have never been made so exclusively by the landlords either of Scotland or of Ireland. It was to preserve that English principle of action that I opposed some of Mr. Pusey's views. I myself, personally, in my private capacity, acted upon the Report of the Agricultural Customs Committee of 1848, and, I believe, Mr. Pusey did so likewise. I imported the best custom, as proved before the Committee—I mean the Lincolnshire custom—into Warwickshire. I wanted Mr. Pusey to move the amendment of the law of emblements—an amendment of the law which was afterwards carried through this House by another hon. Member of the House, by which the right to fixtures on the part of the agricultural tenant has been placed on the same footing as it stood on under the law relating to the commercial tenants; but Mr. Pusey preferred that that should be done by another Member. In the Committee of the Whole House on the Agricultural Holdings Bill I did all I could to improve and to modify the tenour of that Act; and the hon. Baronet the Member for North Devon, as well as the hon. Member for Banbury (Mr. B. Samuelson), have admitted that the provisions of that Act as to compensation are so stringent as to have deterred both landlords and tenants in many cases from adopting that Act, according to its exact terms. Those provisions I strove to mitigate; but I am happy to say that, by that Act, I saw another of Mr. Pusey's objects carried out, for the presumption of law, as it previously stood, was against the tenant's right in his improvements; this was changed, and the presumption is now in the tenant's favour. I think I have said enough to show that when the hon. Baronet accuses me of lukewarmness upon this subject, his observations may apply to others; but I am one of those who supported Mr. Pusey's main objects; so his observations do not apply to me. With respect to the Motion now before the House, the hon. Member for Banbury, who proposed it in a speech, the tone of which was, I am sure, appreciated by all who heard him, must forgive me for saying that I think it is too soon after the passing of the Agricultural Holdings Act for the House now to interfere with it. I quite admit that the great body of landlords and tenants have contracted themselves out of the Act. My own tenants have contracted themselves out of it, because they had already an agreement with me, which is based upon the Lincolnshire custom. I know that this has been the case on other estates to a large extent; but it is an immense benefit that the Act should come into operation where the landlord has failed to make provision for the tenant's improvements. I know, also, that the present distress among the agricultural classes has rendered many a farm vacant, and that in almost every instance of retake the provisions, at all events, the principle, of the Agricultural Holdings Act is operating powerfully in the sense in which the Act was intended to operate when the Bill passed this House. The intention of the Act is, not that it should be compulsory in its provisions, but that it should be considered a kind of model Act, not violating the principle of freedom of contract between landlord and tenant, but coming into operation whenever there was an absence, a lapse, of private agreement between them. That was the sense in which that Statute was passed. It is difficult, however, to trace the operation of the Act, for this reason —that it does not generally operate in a direct manner by the immediate acceptance of the exact terms of the Act itself; but I know that it does operate indirectly, and very powerfully. It has given the tenant a right to his improvements, and every tenant who takes a farm now can claim to have that right defined in the agreement with his landlord. Thus it has brought freedom to contract into action, and recognizes the right of the tenant in his improvements. The Act has, however, another side to it, and upon that the hon. Member for Banbury did not touch. It would be most unjust, where the landlord had shared largely in making the improvements on a farm, if there were not clauses inflicting a penalty for the deterioration of those improvements and of the farm itself.

Mr. B. SAMUELSON was understood to say that he had in speaking recognized the necessity of such provisions.

Mr. NEWDEGATE: The main object of the hon. Member is in course of being attained; because, under the agreements which are now framed, the rights of both parties are contemplated and provided for. The hon. Member thinks that the Act has little operation, because it is not accepted as a whole, and leaves it to the parties to adopt its principle—in other words, leaves them free to contract. In my opinion, that is the best operation which the Act could have, considering the great variety in the agricultural circumstances of different districts; and as it has been in operation only three years, I am opposed to disturbing it. I am sure that the House must have listened with pleasure to the able speech of the hon. Member for Mid-Lincolnshire (Mr. Chaplin) on this question; and I am equally confident that agriculturists generally, on reading that speech, will recognize in my hon. Friend a Representative who is worthy of his position in this House. I, for one, am very glad that the hon. Member for Mid-Lincolnshire proposes to extend the sphere of inquiry; and now I wish to say at once that, farming having been placed by law upon a commercial footing, I should deprecate any measure not of a commercial nature being adopted with reference to that interest. The hon. Member for Mid-Lincolnshire has alluded to the fact that agriculture is suffering from various causes, depression of trade, and others. In the constituency which I have had the honour of representing for more than 30 years in this House the agriculturists are in a minority; and I should deprecate, as I have always deprecated, any idea of separating the interests of the farmers from the interests of the manufacturers and traders. In my constituency they are united, intermixed, intermarried, and connected in every way; and I would regret sincerely if any words that I may utter should purport the separation of those interests. The hon. Member for Banbury has mentioned that £100,000,000 worth of food annually has been of late years imported into this country; will the House forgive me, therefore, if I quote from documents which are in its possession, which show the state of trade, including this large importation of agricultural produce during the last eight years? On referring to the Commercial Abstract and other documents in the Library, hon. Members will find that, taking the period of four years — namely, from 1871 to 1874, both inclusive, the gross value of the imports amounted to £1,427,000,000, and that, taking the next period of four years, from 1875 to 1878, also inclusive, the gross value of the imports—I am speaking in round numbers—was £1,511,000,000. Conquently the excess of the value of the importations for the last four years over the value of the importations for the previous four years was no less than £84,000,000. This was the value of the gross importations. I will now take the exports of British produce during the same two periods, and I find that in the four years from 1871 to 1874, both inclusive, these amounted to £974,000,000, and for the four years from 1875 to 1878 inclusive, to only £817,000,000. Thus, there was a diminution in the value of exports of British products in the latter four years that amounted to £157,000,000. I have also a summary of the value of the exports of Foreign and Colonial produce, which for the first period of four years was £233,000,000, and for the second period, £220,000,000; and now I come to this general result. The gross value of the imports during the first four years being £1,427,000,000, and in the second period of four years being £1,511,000,000, the gross value of the total exports of British, Colonial, and Foreign produce, were in the first four years £1,207,000,000, or an excess in the gross value of imports over exports amounting to £220,000,000. The gross value of the imports in the second period, 1875 to 1878 inclusive, was £1,511,000,000; the gross value of the exports, £1,037,000,000; so that the excess in the value of the gross imports over the gross exports in the second period of four years was no less than £474,000,000—in other words, the excess in the value of imports over exports for the four years, 1875 to 1878 inclusive, was more than double the excess of imports over exports for the previous four years, 1871 to 1874 inclusive. Now, with such a state of trade as that, how, I ask, can we expect that the country should be prosperous? True, the country was prosperous, whilst the excess of imports over exports was £220,000,000, during the first four years; but when, in the next four years, that amount was much more than doubled, no less than to £474,000,000, that certainly cannot be said. My opinion is that the country has a right to demand of this House that it should inquire into this state of affairs. I am not taking upon myself to suggest a remedy; but there can be no doubt that this is altogether quite an exceptional state of things. If hon. Members will take the trouble to go through the figures to which I have referred, they will see that they bear out the conclusion at which I have arrived. I know it may be said—"Oh! it is idle to attempt to base your conclusions on a calculation of the balance of trade." But the great teacher of Free Trade—Adam Smith—in the fourth book of his *Wealth of Nations*, emphatically records this opinion, that—

> "There is another balance . . . very different from the balance of trade, and which, according as it happens to be either favourable or unfavourable, necessarily occasions the prosperity or decay of every nation. This is the balance of the annual produce and consumption, which, according as it is favourable or unfavourable, occasions the prosperity or decay of every nation."

This is one of the maxims which have been overlooked and neglected for years in this country. I do trust that the rising generation, of whose education we hear so much, will learn that if they do not read the whole of Adam Smith's famous work—if, after reading the three first books, they fail to study the fourth book of *The Wealth of Nations*—they will fail to understand the true principles of political economy. I believe, then, that the proposal of the hon. Member for Banbury falls far short of that which ought to be the scope of inquiry, and I believe that inquiry is really required. I shall certainly vote with the hon. Member for Mid-Lincolnshire for the kind of inquiry which he proposes; because, even according to the hon. Member for Banbury, the inquiry ought to comprehend the £100,000,000 of imports of grain and the like, and their effect in competition with the produce of this country; but the instruction he has moved would not comprehend that sphere. I thank the House for permitting me to make these observations, and I would add that, if witnessing, as we have done during the past eight months, the issue of 1,700 bills of sale, farm after farm thrown upon the hands of the landlords, farmers struggling for existence or absolutely ruined; knowing of these difficulties, and many of us, I trust, coming to the assistance of our tenants, it would, in my humble opinion, be discreditable to the county Members in this House—we should hardly be worthy of our seats in the House—if we did not submit to this, the appointed jury of the nation, a state of things, which is the more grave as indicating the decline, not only of the agricultural, but of the commercial prosperity of this country, than anything I can remember. At present we see but little light through the widespread gloom that prevails. True, the wages of the labouring classes have not as yet been reduced to the point which competition may demand. I look with no pleasure to a possible reduction of wages; but I scarcely know the manufacturer, the mine owner, or the commercial man, who believes that, without a reduction of wages, this country can continue to compete with the low-priced labour of the several parts of the world. I deprecate a reduction of wages, and I have stood out against it to the utmost of my power; I look upon it as the cheapening of the individual Englishman. But a reduction of wages must come, though we have this satisfaction, that food is cheaper now than ever it was. Still, a reduction of wages, if permanent, would be a cheapening of the Englishman—an idea I detest. In former years agriculture has sometimes been prosperous when trade and commerce were depressed, and *vice versâ;* but, at the present moment, you have in this country a depression which extends through the entire agricultural, industrial, trading, and commercial classes; and when you are experiencing this widespread, nay, this universal depression, I do not think that it would be becoming in the House of Commons to treat such a circumstance with neglect. The House should investigate this condition of things, and, without prejudice or undue prepossession, consider whether there is anything that the Legislature can effectually do, with the object of relieving the depression that so widely prevails.

MR. PELL said, he saw no reason to regret the passing of the Agricultural Holdings Act; but as the Act had only been passed four years ago, it was hardly time yet to set about inquiring into its operation. They ought to have more experience of the working of the Act before they proceeded to institute such an inquiry. Unless hon. Members could show that there were glaring defects in it, or that its operation had been actually prejudicial to the interests of the country, to ask for a Committee was exhibiting a sort of childish, inquisitive disposition. There was one thing very remarkable about this debate, and that was that not a single suggestion had been made in any of the speeches that the present depression in agriculture and trade could be remedied by legislative enactment. But, unless hon. Members had some idea of what they would propose by way of remedy, it was hardly fair to ask for a Committee, as to the constitution of which, if assented to, there would be immense difference of opinion. If there was to be any inquiry at all, it would be better made by way of Commission than Committee. He believed that the Act of 1875 had effected a very good purpose, though the proprietors of certain large estates had contracted themselves out of this operation. He knew some who had done so through pure laziness, having never even read the Act; but they had done so unwisely. There was, however, a vast number of small properties, of which hardly any notice was taken, where in hundreds and thousands of cases the landlords had not contracted themselves out of the Act. Besides, there was an immense amount of property which was under the Act—namely, ecclesiastical property, for clergymen, as a rule, had not contracted themselves out of its operation. He believed the best chance for agriculture would be perfect freedom between landlord and tenant. This was what the Act had given. It had established freedom where there was no freedom before—in cases where owners could not charge their estates for improvements made by tenants. He could not see what good an inquiry through a Committee would effect. In his opinion, it was quite unnecessary, and more time ought to be given to see the working of the Act before any further attempts were made to alter the law.

MR. MITCHELL HENRY said, allusion had been made in the course of this debate to the distressed state of the agricultural interest. That distressed state nobody could dispute, and he would like the House to know that the depression existed throughout the Kingdom, and was quite as great in Ireland as in England or in Scotland. He did not, indeed, believe there ever was a time when the agricultural and commercial interests in Ireland were suffering more than at the present moment. The hon. Member for Mid-Lincolnshire (Mr. Chaplin) laid great stress on the very bad prices which were now obtained for agricultural produce as the cause of the distress; but he (Mr. Mitchell Henry) asked the House to consider how that very depressed state of prices had come about. The immense impetus which had been given to trade and commerce of late years, owing to causes he would not enter into now, produced a demand for meat and agricultural produce which had the effect of causing in Ireland a degree of social misery which had led to half the difficulties of late years between that country and England. Small holders had been driven out of their farms; the farms had been converted into grass land, and money had been borrowed at high rates of interest to stock the land and produce meat for England, whilst the price of beef had gone up from 7*d*. to 1*s*. per lb. Now he would ask hon. Gentlemen opposite, who were so greatly distressed at the low prices given for agricultural produce, what would have been the condition of England if it had not happened that a bountiful harvest had providentially been reaped abroad, and brought to this country? Why, they would have had a famine instead of being able to pass through the crisis with the tranquillity which had distinguished the condition of the country. In regard to the Motion of the hon. Member for Banbury (Mr. B. Samuelson), there were many hon. Members who believed that the agricultural question in England would be the great question of the future, and that it was utterly impossible to separate the agricultural interest in England from the agricultural interest in Ireland. The sympathy which hon. Members had met with from various parts of the House, when they detailed the sufferings of Irish tenants, induced him to remark that those sufferings had arisen almost entirely from the same causes that were only now beginning to be felt in England. So long as prices were high everything was satisfactory; but now that a new era had dawned, and we were drawing on all the markets of the world for produce, what was to be the condition of agriculture for the future? In England they were only beginning to feel the force of that question, but in Ireland they had felt it for years. The secret of much misery was the sense of insecurity that existed amongst the farmers; and he apprehended this Motion was designed to ascertain whether the feeble Act of 1875 had been fairly worked or whether it was a dead letter. There were considerable differences, in some respects, between England and Ireland. In England they had farms to let in numbers, and no tenants to take them. In Ireland they had people clamouring for the land, desiring only to be fixed in the soil and not evicted at the caprice of an individual. The hon. Baronet the Member for North Devon (Sir Thomas Acland), had said that in his own experience he had seen great misery produced when an estate which had been sold passed into new hands, and the new possessor thought fit to raise the rents; but that was a complaint which had been made over and over again, as it was what was going on almost universally in Ireland. Estates were sold, rents were raised, and no protection was given to the tenants against the arbitrary raising of rents. The hon. Baronet had pointed out that even in England they required some protection against raising the rent, which produced so much misery and such a sense of insecurity. They in Ireland only asked for the same thing. The hon. Member for Dungarvan (Mr. O'Donnell), as appeared to him, had only elaborated what underlaid the real principles of the Act of 1875, with one exception. The Amendment of the hon. Member for Dungarvan, after alluding to the agricultural depression, went on to say that no good could be done unless they protected the application of skill and capital to the soil by establishing compensation for unexhausted improvements. Well, that was the object of the Act of 1875. Then the hon. Member's Amendment said it was necessary to give an equitable appeal against exorbitant rents. Now, that equitable appeal had not been universally asked for in England. The people there were only just beginning to demand it. It had been said that his hon. Friend the Member for Dungarvan asked for fixity of rent; but he begged to say that the Irish people had never asked for fixity of rent. They were perfectly willing that their rents should fall or rise in justice. What they asked for was simply fixity of tenure—that when they had cultivated their holding they should not be capriciously evicted from it. If they were to have meat brought in large quantities from America, as well as from the Continent, it was impossible that large farms, requiring capital and expenditure in manures, could continue to exist. They must have, as in other countries, moderate-sized farms, in each of which a farmer and his family could find a permanent, and, he trusted, a happy home. This would really make the country strong in the prosperity of a contented people.

MR. BROMLEY DAVENPORT desired, so far as his own experience went, to deny that the Act in question had been made a dead letter by tenants contracting themselves out of it. He sent round to his tenants a circular, asking them whether they preferred to come under the operation of the Act, or to remain as they were—and they preferred to remain as they were—tenants under six months' notice to quit, leaving their farms by will to their sons, subject to the approval of the squire as to one son being more acceptable than another. However feudal the arrangement might be, it showed at least that there was no want of confidence.

VISCOUNT SANDON: Sir, I think we have every cause to congratulate ourselves upon the consideration shown to a very large class of our fellow-countrymen, who at the present time are suffering so severely. The same feeling has been expressed on both sides of the House; and this, in my opinion, can have no other than a very soothing and satisfactory effect upon those who are struggling with the most difficult circumstances in which men can be placed. At the same time, although I confess I do not agree with the Motion of the hon. Member for Banbury (Mr. B. Samuelson), I congratulate him upon the interesting speeches to which we have listened for some time past, and which have added so much to the information possessed by the House upon this important subject. But I think the hon. Member must make up his mind that we should require to have a very clear case indeed presented to us, before we could assent to submit an Act of Parliament, which has only been in operation three years, to the judgment of a Committee of the kind suggested. As far as I can recollect, the promoters of the Act never anticipated that it would produce any rapid or revolutionary consequences; on the contrary, I believe they took a perfectly different line, and said they wished its operation to be gradual. Now, what reason has the hon. Member shown us for taking the very unusual step of submitting an Act which has only been three years in operation to the judgment of a Select Committee? He goes upon one point, and that is that the Act has become entirely a dead letter, and that it has been set at nought. I beg the House to remember that the object of this Act was not, I am perfectly confident, to force all the tenants and landlords of the country to adopt it; but to provide, as far as possible, a security that the tenant should have complete compensation for any improvements made on his farm. This is the key of the position. We must bear in mind that anything which induces the tenant to embark his capital in his farm is of the greatest possible benefit to the landlord, as well as everybody concerned in the soil. I now come to the point which is alleged by the hon. Member for Banbury as a reason for submitting the Agricultural Holdings Act, 1875, to the judgment of a Select Committee—namely, that the Act has become a dead letter, and has been entirely set at nought. I have heard so much to-night to that effect that I wish to go beyond the authorities mentioned by the hon. Member, and refer to the meeting held in January or February, 1877, by the Farmers' Club of London. A most interesting discussion took place upon that occasion, when the secretary to the Club brought before the members a report which had been got together by their orders. The Club had sent out 700 or 800 circulars to farmers in every county, and received 250 answers from persons who might therefore be considered to represent every county in England. Among those replies, I observe there were 13 or 14 from Norfolk. The secretary of the Club says—

> "To sum up the above results I think we may fairly say that, as a general rule, the Act is excluded, and that by landlords, from operating in respect to tenancies from year to year, or at will, which were current when it came into operation. Secondly, as to tenancies which have begun since the Act came into operation, the Act is to a large extent excluded. Thirdly, and this I venture to think most important, the provisions of the Act relating to payment of compensation for unexhausted improvements, especially those of the 2nd and 3rd clauses, are adopted by special agreement, and, in many cases, the time of notice to quit is extended from six to twelve months."

It is to be presumed that the farmers would get as good witnesses as possible; and the testimony of those who were summoned, after one year's experience of the working of the Act by the Farmers' Club, sufficiently showed that tenant-farmers throughout the country were, as to unexhausted improvements, as to notices, and as to agreements, in a much better position than before the Act was passed. In the face of that testimony, I decline to adopt the conclusion of the hon. Member that the Act has become a dead letter and been set at nought. I will just quote one or two words of the hon. Member for South Norfolk (Mr. Clare Read), who said—

> "I do not say the Act has not done some good; I believe it has already done a great deal of good, and I am certain it will do a great deal of good in days to come."

Now, surely the House should be very loth to accept the testimony of the hon. Member for Banbury, however great an authority he may be, against the authorities I have quoted. Of course, he fortifies himself with the answers to the circular to which he referred; but it is asking too much from the House to expect that it should put a very great amount of confidence in the opinions of those anonymous gentlemen quoted by the hon. Member. We ought to be informed a little more as to their position with reference to this question. Are they townspeople? Are they gentlemen who have always backed up compulsion, and who are, therefore, one-sided in their views? All these things we ought to know. At any rate, I will back the circular issued by the Farmers' Club against the statements of the hon. Member for Banbury. It is a very remarkable thing that, while, for months past, it has been known that the hon. Gentleman intended to bring forward this Motion, he has not quoted to us any letters from the tenant farmers, who are said to be in such a state of agitation, although, if his case were a good one, we might have expected that he would have been armed with a sheaf of such letters. The hon. Member has quoted answers to circulars which he sent out; but he speaks of no great amount of correspondence as having passed in consequence of these circulars. In fact, the more you look into the case of the hon. Member the less it will hold water. He, moreover, lays down a rather dangerous doctrine for the consideration of the House, when he puts very great stress upon the importance of agriculture to the nation generally, and makes it a reason for interference with the freedom of contract. Undoubtedly, agriculture is a matter of the greatest national importance; but I ask, are there no other questions of national importance that will have to be handled? Are not strikes of national importance? Is not the question of the price of commodities one of national importance? We have associations asking us to interfere in the question of prices, and are we to be asked to interfere in that question, because it is one of national importance? I think the hon. Gentleman is taking up rather a dangerous argument, when he asks us to interfere with the law of contracts between landlord and tenant, on the ground that agriculture is of national importance. Another curious argument, which I think he used, was that the home produce was diminishing. Quite true; it has diminished, because we have had four bad seasons, as we all know and deplore. He said, also—"Your home produce has diminished, and I argue from that fact that capital is not flowing into the farms;" and from this he inferred that there was something wrong with the system under which farms were held. The argument is a curious one, and it seems strange that, after we have experienced four notoriously bad seasons, he should be surprised that increased capital has not been embarked in the cultivation of the soil. The hon. Member has told us that he did not send his circulars into Lincolnshire, because, as he says, a custom prevails there which renders the application of the Act unnecessary; but surely it is a matter of notoriety in this House and elsewhere that the agricultural depression has been much more severe in Lincolnshire than in any other county.

MR. B. SAMUELSON reminded the noble Lord that he did not for one moment say that the absence or presence of an agreement had anything to do with agricutural depression.

VISCOUNT SANDON: I accept the disclaimer of the hon. Member; but, at the same time, I must be allowed to say that the whole current of his argument certainly seemed to point in a contrary direction. As to the question of capital, hon. Gentlemen opposite seemed to think that the landlords are shrinking from putting capital into their farms; but if there is one thing more than another which a landlord is willing to do, it is to embark his capital when any scheme presents itself which will secure for him a proper return for the investment. I think that, in asking us to see what the landlords and the tenants want, and to investigate carefully what changes they require to be made in the Agricutural Holdings Act, would be to open up a very wide field for inquiry. I will just remind the hon. Gentleman that all he said really points to the old story of direct compulsion. That plan of direct compulsion has, no doubt, been thoroughly discussed in this House; and hon. Members will remember that it was ably put to them in the speech of the hon. Member for Forfar (Mr. J. W. Barclay), and that, on a former occasion, it was rejected by a large majority. The hon. Member would not go farther than this in meddling with the landlords; but, on this point, it is important to notice the speech of the hon. Member for Dungarvan (Mr. O'Donnell), who said that the extreme wing of the Liberal Party, of which he is the Representative, would, if the present demand be granted, endeavour to push their views still farther. In what is all this to end? We are to consider whether or not we are to advise the House to grant the Committee proposed by the hon. Member. I have taken considerable trouble carefully to consider what are the real causes of the present agricultural depression, for it is impossible for us to shut our eyes to the fact of its existence; and it has, moreover, been clearly brought out by the speech of the hon. Member for Dungarvan, and still more so by that of the hon. Member for Mid-Lincolnshire (Mr. Chaplin), in the course of this debate. We have to consider the proposal for a general inquiry. Now, is it clear that there is any doubt as to the cause of this depression? There is no mystery at all about the question, and I hold the reasons for the present state of depression to be perfectly clear. But when we talk of agricultural depression, let us remember that, so far, it has not extended itself to the agricultural labourer, for the condition of suffering to which hon. Members have referred has not reached beyond the landlords and tenants. If you look to the Returns, you will find that, instead of an increase of pauperism having taken place as a consequence of this depression, there has been a continual decrease. The agricultural labourer has not shared in the general depression and pressure, which has, therefore, been confined to the tenant-farmer and the landlord, who are both in a distressing position. The peculiarity of the present period is that, as far as agriculture is concerned, there has been a concurrence of unfavourable circumstances. We have had four seasons, all of them more than usually unfruitful, and during which the farmer has had the greatest difficulty in working the soil. At the same moment we have the terrible recollection of the cattle disease; and even at the present time there are very many herds which have not recovered from the losses they have sustained from that cause, which alone has had a terrible effect upon the agricultural interest. Concurrently with that we have had the labour difficulty, which, after all, is one of the most serious kind to the employers of labour. I am stating facts simply as they have occurred. The men are unsettled, wages are high, and the work, in too many cases, clearly bad; and besides this, there is the difficulty arising out of the recent Education Act, which has deprived the farmers of juvenile labour for ever, because that labour has from time immemorial formed an important factor in the farmer's calculations of his expenses and profits. It is constantly being said that when we have had bad years the farmers have been recouped by high prices; but instead of that being the case, hon. Members are aware that prices have been exceptionally low. The price of meat has been kept up, but it must be remembered that the stock of cattle has only increased 7 per cent in 10 years—a very small rate compared with that of former periods. But the sheep, the great staple of the country, and a most important item with the farming class, have decreased by 8 per cent. That implies a great amount of suffering among the flocks and herds. Butter and cheese have decreased very largely in the quantity manufactured. The price of wheat has fallen from 62*s.* to 54*s.* since the year 1868, during which period barley has declined 2*s.* 1*d.*, and oats 1*s.* 7*d.* to 1*s.* 11*d.* per quarter. This fall in the value of grain crops has been one of the peculiarities of the bad seasons through which we have passed, and it represents a loss of about £13,000,000. I ask, why have these prices been low? It is a very interesting and a very important question; for it will be seen that, during the last decade in which this fall in value has occurred, the population has increased by 3,000,000. I have no doubt that the badness of trade, together with the abundant harvests in America, have to a very considerable extent affected our prices. Again, in what way has the stagnation of trade in England and throughout the world affected the whole conditions of the agricultural interest? The great stagnation of trade has, of course, set free an enormous amount of tonnage; while the steam shipping power of the British Empire has increased, during the last 10 years, by 1,800,000 tons. Thus we have had a most enormous increase in the carrying power of the world just at the moment when trade was slack. These steamers represent the power of three or four sailing ships, and are, therefore, able to carry foreign produce at so low a rate as will explain the enormous increase which has taken place in the importation of food. Of course, we must all rejoice for the sake of those who eat the food so cheaply imported; but we must also sympathize with the farmers for the great increase of competition. To sum up the figures relating to home and foreign produce in two groups, I see that from 1868 to 1878 the value of the annual imports of wheat, barley, oats, Indian corn, peas, and beans has risen from £40,000,000 to £60,000,000, thus showing a rise of £20,000,000 in 10 years; while the value of the imports of live and dead meat, and of butter and cheese, has risen during the same period from £14,000,000 to £35,000,000, which shows, again, a rise of about £20,000,000. I think I have now shown that the cause of the present agricultural distress is quite clear, and that there is no mystery whatever about it. We have not to look to any recondite cause for this condition of things, but to the unfortunate concurrence of four bad seasons, with the other circumstances which I have detailed to the House—a very unusual coincidence of events, which would appear fully to explain the existing state of agricultural distress. We hope for better times; and encouragement has already been given by various hon. Gentlemen who have addressed the House, particularly by the hon. Member for Linlithgow (Mr. M'Lagan), who said that he remembered periods of as great agricultural depression from which we recovered, and that as bright days as those formerly enjoyed were, no doubt, in store for the farmer. There are good reasons now, at any rate, to hope for improvement, although whether we can absolutely rely upon them is quite another matter. The general improvement in trade in America and in this country, for which we are all looking, will, no doubt, affect the agricultural interest in a favourable manner, especially in respect of the excess of steam carrying power, and the other causes of depression to which I have alluded. The position of the labourer, also, let us hope, will become a much more settled one, because it ought to be superior and more comfortable to that of any town artizan. His houses are improving, and his wages are rising, while everything points, in my opinion, to the belief that in a few years' time his position will be one of the most comfortable in the country. Again, the Contagious Diseases (Animals) Act, passed last year, has already restored confidence in the agricultural interest, which will, ere long, become more marked. As to future good seasons, it may be presumptuous to express anticipations with regard to them; but as we have had a cycle of bad seasons, it is not an unreasonable thing to express a hope that we may have a cycle of good ones. But the practical point before us is this—Will it be wise to have a Committee to inquire into the state of agriculture? I cannot too much impress upon the House that the inquiry could not be confined to one point alone. Would the hon. Member for Mid-Lincolnshire (Mr. Chaplin) be satisfied with that? Certainly not. Would the Irish Members be content without pressing us upon points in which they take an interest? They have already touched upon the question in the revised Motion of the hon. Member for Dungarvan, and I do not see what answers we can make them if they want to press their points. It is not wise to raise the flag of distress too hastily; and I believe that the effect of a Committee might be the very reverse of that which we all desire. It would be like calling in the doctor when he is not needed; the doctor comes in, and the patient is almost obliged to put on airs of great sickness, and as soon as he has gone, adopts more of the habits of a sick man than are necessary. In the interests of agriculture itself, I doubt extremely the necessity for any examination of this kind; but if the distress continues to be prevalent, I should be the last man to say that some proposal for inquiry might not be listened to. At the present moment, however, I must say that it would be wiser, in my opinion, to refrain from entering upon any such examination, both as regards the interest of the British farmer and the interest of the British landlord. Let us hope that, as there is nothing recondite in the causes of agricultural distress, we may, by the blessing of Providence and the return of better seasons, pull through these difficulties; and that the British farmer may again set up the agriculture of these Islands as an example to foreign nations without the interference of further laws.

THE MARQUESS OF HARTINGTON: Sir, the noble Lord has given a very interesting account, drawn from the resources of the Board of Trade, of the present condition of the agricultural interest in this country. It is, no doubt, an accurate as well as an interesting statement; but I cannot help thinking that, as far as the Motion before the House is concerned, the greater part of the speech of the noble Lord has been absolutely irrelevant. The noble Lord assumed that the hon. Member for Banbury (Mr. B. Samuelson) rested his case for a Committee of Inquiry upon the question of agricultural distress. Now my hon. Friend carefully guarded himself against being supposed to entertain any such notion. He referred to the depression which existed in agriculture, as well as in every branch of trade; but he carefully explained that he took altogether different ground than that suggested by the noble Lord. I do not deny that the greater part of the speech to which we have just listened may be relevant to the Amendment which the hon. Member for Mid-Lincolnshire (Mr. Chaplin) intends to move if he gets an opportunity; but I must remind the noble Lord that his Amendment is not now before the House. The House has to discuss the Motions of the hon. Member for Banbury and the hon. Member for Dungarvan; and when they have been considered, we may be able to undertake the Amendment of the hon. Member for Mid-Lincolnshire. That Motion is not before the House, and therefore I consider that the greater part of the speech of the noble Lord was extremely irrelevant. But I entirely agree in one remark made by the noble Lord, as to the great importance of the subject which has been brought before the House with so much ability by my hon. Friend the Member for Banbury. The importance of the subject may be judged of when the House remembers what was stated by the hon. Member in his quotation from a work of great authority, recently published by Mr. Caird, to the effect that the amount of agricultural produce of the United Kingdom amounts to something like £250,000,000 annually. In the opinion of a very great and high authority, that amount is capable of very great increase, and some have gone so far as to say that it may possibly be doubled. I do not profess to trust to that opinion; but when we have to deal with figures so enormous as these, it must be very evident to the House that any increase or decrease therein, however great, or however small, must become a matter of very great and serious importance, not only to the agricultural interest, but to the whole body of consumers in the country. As to the condition of this enormous industry, the question is not whether it is at this moment suffering under excptional circumstances, but whether it is, on the whole, in a satisfactory condition; and that is the question which my hon. Friend asked the House to consider, altogether independently of existing agricultural distress. The noble Lord has so assiduously endeavoured to lead the House away from the question raised by my hon. Friend that I must ask the House, for one moment, to allow me to recall them to it. In 1875, in the opinion of the Government, the condition of that great industry was not satisfactory. Their opinion was shown by the fact that they introduced a measure intended to regulate the relations between the landlords and tenants, and, if possible, to increase the cultivation of the soil. I do not think I can show more surely the views of Her Majesty's Government at that time than by reading an extract from the speech of the Duke of Richmond and Gordon, in which he said that—

> "As the law now stands—in many places there being no custom—the tenant may put his capital in the soil, and so increase the value of the soil, the benefit of which is unexhausted at the termination of his tenancy, and yet reap no benefit whatever from the investment of his money, but the whole goes into the pockets of the landlords;"

and the noble Duke adds—

> "I think this is a state of matters which is not at all satisfactory."—[3 *Hansard*, ccxxii. 1684.]

There are some other extracts, but I will not read them at this late hour of the night (12.30 A.M.). Such was the state of things which, in the opinion of the Government, existed at that time. The question which the hon. Member for Banbury has brought forward to-night is whether the Act then passed into law has succeeded, or whether it has failed? I do not wish to prejudge the answer to that question. If I were to give my own answer, I might, perhaps, not be perfectly impartial, for I never viewed that measure with any great degree of favour, and I have stated to the House why I thought it would be nothing but a failure. It was my opinion that the Bill did both too much and too little, and that it entered a great deal too much into detail. I thought it attempted to regulate a great many matters as between landlord and tenant; but, at the same time, it laid down no broad principle which the tenant could grasp and which would make him insist upon receiving the benefit of the Act. I thought also that the Bill was one not likely to commend itself to the landlord, or confer much benefit upon the tenant. As I said before, I do not want to prejudge the question. The Act has now been in operation for three years, and there is, I must say, a very considerable weight of evidence in favour of the opinion that it has been, to some extent, a failure. Nor do I rest altogether upon the evidence brought forward by the hon. Member for Banbury; but I appeal to any Member who has had an opportunity himself of making an inquiry in any of the agricultural districts whether, to his own knowledge, he has ever heard that this Act has been found to have had the important effect of altering the relations as between landlord and tenant? The House must remember that, according to the statements made on introducing the Bill, a very considerable alteration was wanted to be made in the relations which existed four years ago between the landlord and tenant. It is of no use for the noble Lord to come down to the House and tell us that he is aware, from personal knowledge, that in Lincolnshire and Staffordshire many tenants very much prefer agreements with their landlords to the advantages offered by the Act, for I am perfectly well aware that that condition of things existed on a very large number of estates before this Act was ever dreamt of. But the question is not whether there are not a great many estates where the agreements are extremely liberal towards the tenant, but whether the state of things described by the Duke of Richmond and Gordon as being unsatisfactory is in any degree altered for the better. I have not heard one single statement made this evening which has shown that the estates which were badly managed in 1874 have been better managed since. It is objected by the noble Lord, and other hon. Members opposite, that it is too soon to inquire into the operation of this Act. I do not think, however, that anything whatever will be gained by delay. No doubt, when the Act was passed, and when landlords and tenants heard that it would effectually change their relations to each other, it caused a considerable stir in the agricultural world, and everybody looked about to see in what way it would affect them. The result was that the landlords generally would look at the 57th clause and find it conferred upon them, not the power to contract with the tenant to get out of the operation of the Act, but that it conferred upon themselves solely the power to bar the operation of the Act. The result has been that notice has been given in 99 cases out of 100. I challenge hon. Members to dispute the statement that the main and principal operation of the Act up to the present time has not been carried out. There is nothing in the Act which either offers an inducement to the landlord and tenant, or puts a screw upon them to induce them to come under the Act, unless they choose voluntarily to take that course. I also assert that the operation of the Act has been confined to the first year, and that its operation during the second and third year has been very trifling in comparison with that of the first year. Therefore, there is no object to be gained that I can see by deferring an inquiry into the operation of the Act, while if it is the intention of the Government some day to inquire into it the sooner it is done the better. If the result be shown that the Act has had very little operation, we shall be confirmed in the opinion expressed by the Duke of Richmond and Gordon, four years ago, and we must be driven to suppose that the state of things described by him still exists and does require a remedy. It will be reasonable to consider in what way that unsatisfactory state of things is to be remedied. A short time ago an hon. Friend of mine called attention to the operation of certain clauses of the Irish Land Act, the principles of which had been unanimously agreed to by the House; but which there was reason to believe had up to that time had very little effect. My hon. Friend moved for a Committee to inquire into the operation of that Act, and the Government granted that Committee, which made a Report recommending some very considerable changes. Why should not

Her Majesty's Government take that course in the present instance?

VISCOUNT SANDON: The Irish Act had been passed seven years.

THE MARQUESS OF HARTINGTON: No doubt, that was seven years after the passing of the Act in question; but I have given some strong reasons to-night that there is no cause for delay, and that it must not be supposed that any ground whatever exists for thinking that this Act will have more operation in the course of seven years than in the course of three years. Then there are very strong reasons why the Government should take the course followed in the case of the other Bill, and allow a Committee to be appointed to inquire into the operation of the Act. In my own opinion, there are some other reasons besides those stated for making inquiry into this subject. And it seems to me that it is perfectly clear that all who are connected with the management of land should possess full knowledge upon this controverted question. I do not believe that anything would be more effectual for obtaining full knowledge upon such a subject than the appointment of a Parliamentary Committee. It is said that both landlord and tenant are by nature an extremely Conservative class. That may be so; but I entirely deny that they are an unintelligent class. Neither landlords nor tenants are so unintelligent as to persevere deliberately in a course which is injurious to all concerned in the culture of the soil. That is, however, the assertion of many agricultural reformers of the present day. The assertion is that the system now pursued is injurious alike to the landlords and the tenants. If it can be proved by discussion, by inquiry, or by examination, that there does not exist under our present system adequate security for the investment of capital in the soil—if it can be shown that undue restrictions are placed upon that capital by agreements between landlords and tenants—surely that knowledge, that discussion, and that information, would of itself tend to produce an immense effect, even if it were not embodied in legislation. I cannot help thinking that, on a subject so important as this to the whole community, assertions cannot be made by persons of very considerable authority without their being thoroughly examined. My hon. Friend desired, very prudently, that the inquiry of the Committee should be limited in its scope. I think it would be altogether beside the object of my hon. Friend, and would not tend to any good, that the inquiry should take a wider scope than that suggested by the hon. Member for Mid-Lincolnshire (Mr. Chaplin). I think it should embrace the effect upon cultivation of the limited ownership of a large part of the soil of this country. Mr. Hunt, whose absence we all regret when we remember the great part taken by him in the passing of the Act of 1875, laid very great stress upon the provisions of the Bill, which enabled limited owners to charge compensation for improvements effected by tenants; but I have not heard a word said by the other side as to the effect of those provisions. It is impossible to place a limited owner in as good a position as regards the management of an estate as an absolute owner. Mr. Hunt said that the greater part of the soil of the country was in the hands of limited owners; and I do not imagine there is any doubt whatever of that being the fact, which must show how important a matter it is that the larger part of the property in the land of this country should be in the hands of persons who are not, and cannot be made by any legislation that has been devised, in as good a position to manage that property as the absolute owner. What an important matter this is, not only to this class, but also to the whole body of consumers, and the whole of the industrial population. These facts alone show the importance of an inquiry into the subject. My hon. Friend the Member for Mid-Lincolnshire disclaims any intention of bringing forward anything in the shape of Protection, and was most indignant with the hon. Member for Banbury for supposing that his Amendment covered any such thing. I think the hon. Member ought not to be surprised that such an interpretation was placed upon the very vague terms of his Motion. I have read a speech delivered by him, in which he did allude very strongly to that topic, and gave it as his opinion that it was in this direction that the legislative remedy was to be found. He cannot, therefore, be surprised, when we know him to entertain these opinions, that we should anticipate that when he placed upon the Paper an Amendment asking for inquiry perfectly vague in its character, he intended to cover some of those doctrines which he is known to entertain.

MR. CHAPLIN asked to what speech the noble Lord alluded?

THE MARQUESS OF HARTINGTON: I really cannot give the exact information asked for; but the speech to which I refer was made in the presence of the Marquess of Ripon, who spoke very strongly in favour of Free Trade, when my hon. Friend made some observations which gave me the impression that he was strongly in favour of Protection.

MR. CHAPLIN said, the noble Lord was under a complete misapprehension, for he had guarded himself expressly against any opposition to Free Trade.

THE MARQUESS OF HARTINGTON: I have the speech in my recollection, and it was a speech, at all events, in favour of Reciprocity. If, however, I have made a mistake, I am extremely sorry for having misrepresented him. The speech of my hon. Friend was a very valuable one, and afforded a striking commentary upon the policy pursued by the Government during the last five years. He described the then condition of things to be the decline of agriculture, and he expressed the opinion that agriculture had been materially deteriorating. That, no doubt, is as gloomy a picture as has been drawn in any quarter by any hon. Member, and probably it has not been drawn for Party purposes, in the manner in which, according to the opinion of the Secretary of State for the Colonies, some questions are drawn and exaggerated. This seems to me to be a somewhat remarkable commentary upon what has been said by the Government who came in, five years ago, with the policy of protecting certain classes and interests. Now, if there were one special class or interest which deserved the peculiar consideration of Her Majesty's Government, surely it would have been the agricultural interest—for the farmers have ever been the professed object of interest to the Conservative Party, which certainly does owe them a very considerable debt of political gratitude. But what was their position five years ago, and what is it now? What has been done for them by Government? No doubt, the agricultural interest was complaining loudly of the pressure of local taxation; no doubt, Government, out of the surplus of £5,000,000 which they inherited, did bestow upon the agricultural interest certain relief in the shape of a transfer of burdens; but I have not heard that they are now any better off than they were five years ago. I do not think the pressure of the rates has become less; on the contrary, I think it has increased; and, perhaps, after all, it will be found that relief from local burdens has not been gained by the transfer of burdens. Perhaps, also, it will be found that real relief from these local burdens is only to be accomplished by administrative reform, and not by shifting them from one shoulder to another. But if their rates have not been raised, their income tax has been increased. I must say that I sympathize and feel as deeply for those who have suffered by the great agricultural depression under which we labour as any hon. Member opposite; but I must also express my opinion that this trial will not altogether be thrown away, if it leads us to take a somewhat wider view of our political duties. It seems to me that farmers, considering the vast amount of political power placed in their hands, have been in the habit of taking somewhat too narrow a view of political questions, for they seem to consider themselves outside the general sphere of politics. Now, the agricultural interest must have observed by this time that they are as much interested as any class of their fellow-countrymen in politics, and that they have at least as good a cause to take an interest in their own prosperity and that of the country at large. I cannot help thinking that these are considerations which have forced themselves, and will continue to do so more and more, upon the attention of the great agricultural interest of this country, and I sincerely trust that such will be the case. In conclusion, I regret that the Government have not seen their way to grant an inquiry into the operation of this Act; because I believe there exists a well-founded impression that it has failed up to the present time, while I have endeavoured to show that it is not likely that it will have more effect hereafter. I think the present time, quite irrespectively of the peculiar depression under which our industry is suffering at the moment, is one very favourable to a full, impartial, and exhaustive inquiry.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: If it had not been for the closing remarks of the noble Lord opposite, I should have been perfectly content to leave the question where my noble Friend (Viscount Sandon) had left it; but I could not help taking notice of the very remarkable conclusion of the noble Lord's speech. He began by twitting my noble Friend with having made a speech of which a great portion, however interesting, was altogether irrelevant to the subject under discussion. We were told it had no reference to the Motion of the hon. Member for Banbury, although it might be relevant to another proposition not formally before the House. Well, I suppose bad manners are catching, and that, when one Gentleman makes an irrelevant speech, it excites another Gentleman to make one which is still more irrelevant. I will not say that of all the apparently irrelevant conclusions of any speech I ever heard in my life the conclusion to which the noble Lord tried to lead us was the most irrelevant; but that really would almost seem to be the case. The noble Lord, no doubt, has means of information which are denied to us who sit on this side of the House; but I really was not aware what were the ulterior motives in the mind of the hon. Member for Banbury in bringing forward this Motion. That hon. Gentleman, in a very interesting and instructive speech, did give us the result of many communications which he had with different parts of the country; and undoubtedly he did, in reading some of these communications, read to us statements of his correspondents as to the kind of remedy which they would suggest, and one of the favoured remedies was to turn out the present Government. As he put it, I imagined it was purely a playful expression; and the proposition he made to us, that we should appoint a Committee to examine into the working of the Act passed several years ago, did not appear to me to be connected with those hints. But the noble Lord has given a totally different complexion to the question, and those playful remarks now appear as the real sting of the Motion. It is not at all for the purpose of seeing whether this Act has or has not failed to carry out all that was expected of it that a Committee is asked for, but in order that some opportunity may be given to expose to the agricultural community, and especially the voting portion of the agricultural community, the extreme hollowness of all the proceedings of the present Government. Noble Lords and hon. Gentlemen opposite are quite right, if they think the time has come to challenge the acts of the Government, and to propose a Committee on the state of the nation and the condition of agriculture, for the purpose of showing how far those misfortunes at present existing amongst the tenant-farmers are due to the policy of the Administration; but I do say that it is exceedingly irrelevant to hang all these great remarks upon so very small a peg as the proposal of the hon. Member for Banbury. He comes forward and says, very fairly, that this Act, passed three years ago, was an Act intended to improve the relations between landlord and tenant, and especially to give the tenant a greater security in his holding, and a greater encouragement to invest capital in his farm, than he had before. The hon. Gentleman then says—"Now, if you will give me a Committee, I will show you that this Act has not done all that was anticipated from it." My noble Friend near me has very well answered that challenge. Nobody expected that the Act would produce tremendous alterations; but it has produced a very considerable change. And even my hon. Friend and former Colleague (Mr. Clare Read), who was not particularly in love with the Act, himself admits that it did produce two very great and important results, in altering the presumption of law, and in giving facilities to limited owners. I have no doubt it is quite true that a complete change has not been produced in all the relations existing between landlord and tenant in all parts of the country; but the effect of the Act may not be the less for that; and it must be borne in mind that this period during which it has been in force has been a period during which the tenant has not been seeking to invest his capital, and has been stopped from doing so by the difficulties raised by the landlord. But it has been, on the other hand, a period in which landlords have been only too anxious to get tenants to come and invest their capital in farming their land. My noble Friend has pointed out, what other Gentlemen have also alluded to, that the character of the seasons of late has been very unpropitious. But the noble Lord opposite has now given us the key to the whole thing. He says it is not the seasons, it is not the foreign importations; it is the policy of Her Majesty's Government that has caused all this. Then he goes on to declare that we have promised to do a great many things, and have held out expectations which have proved entirely false and deceptive. I say, in reply, that with regard to a particular point in which he refers to Her Majesty's Government, and with regard to the assistance to be rendered as to the rates, that those pledges have been kept. With regard to other matters, these have not been matters that we have had anything to do with. We have been utterly unable to control, and we have had no more to do with the effects of bad seasons, or cattle diseases, or other matters, than the noble Lord himself and the hon. Gentlemen who follow him. It would be quite as fair, indeed it would be much fairer, to say that their policy has prepared the way for all these evil things that have happened, as to say that they have been the result of our policy. But, as far as I can see, neither the one nor the other is the case. Some people will tell you these bad seasons arise from a revolution in climate, from spots in the sun, and from various other physical causes of that sort, which I will not go into. But I do say, however, that the proposition of the hon. Member for Banbury, however well it has been put by him, is not a proposition which would really have the effect of meeting the depression or distress under which we are suffering. As to the last remarks of the noble Lord opposite, I confess I can see very little connection, indeed, between the premiss and the conclusion, except, indeed, that very well known connection, in which we are told that the wish is father to the thought.

MR. B. SAMUELSON begged to be permitted to say a few words in reply to the speeches of hon. Gentlemen opposite. He regretted that he was not aware of the indisposition of the hon. Member for Mid-Lincolnshire (Mr. Chaplin), or he would have spoken in very different terms on the subject. He could also assure the junior Member for North Warwickshire (Mr. Bromley Davenport), that he never for one moment intended to include him among the gentlemen he had mentioned, and he certainly would not have made the statement if he had not been able to say it from his own personal knowledge. As he stated at the time he made it, he believed it was an exceptional state of things; but he did know that it was accurate. With reference to what the noble Lord opposite had said as to his sources of information, he would say that he was himself utterly unacquainted with the names of those gentlemen who had furnished these particulars. He had intrusted the inquiries to a very high agricultural authority, and he had every reason to believe that his instructions had been fairly carried out. It had been suggested that inquiries of this kind would tend to interfere between landlord and tenant; but he could only say, in reply, that the suggestion first came from the Government. They first said it was necessary that security should be given to the tenants, and all that he had done was to state that he did not believe that the Act had done that. He believed that the interests of hon. Gentlemen opposite would have been better served if they had consented to this inquiry. If he did not think it right to treat this matter as a farmer's question, he should have been rejoiced at the decision to which they had come, for he believed it was a mistaken decision, and that before long they would discover that it was so.

SIR GEORGE CAMPBELL said, he did not intend to say anything on this subject, and he now merely wished to make an appeal to the hon. Member for Dungarvan (Mr. O'Donnell) on the subject. He had always been a supporter of the rights of the Irish people; but he did not think the hon. Members could fairly interfere with the Motion before the House — [*Loud cries of* "Divide!"]

Question put.

The House *divided*:—Ayes 115; Noes 166: Majority 51.

AYES.

Acland, Sir T. D.
Adam, rt. hn. W. P.
Amory, Sir J. H.
Anderson, G.
Ashley, hon. E. M.
Balfour, Sir G.
Barclay, J. W.
Barran, J.
Bass, A.
Baxter, rt. hn. W. E.
Biggar, J. G.
Blake, T.
Blennerhassett, R. P.
Bright, Jacob
Bright, rt. hn. John
Brise, Colonel R.
Brogden, A.
Brown, A. H.

Brown, J. C.
Burt, T.
Campbell, Lord C.
Campbell, Sir G.
Cavendish, Lord F. C.
Cole, H. T.
Colman, J. J.
Conyngham, Lord F.
Courtauld, G.
Courtney, L. H.
Cowan, J.
Cowen, J.
Cross, J. K.
Davies, D.
Delahunty, J.
Dilke, Sir C. W.
Dodds, J.
Dodson, rt. hon. J. G.
Duff, R. W.
Earp, T.
Edge, S. R.
Egerton, Admiral hon. F.
Errington, G.
Fawcett, H.
Ferguson, R.
Fitzwilliam, hn. W. J.
Forster, rt. hon. W. E.
Fry, L.
Gladstone, W. H.
Gordon, Sir A.
Gordon, Lord D.
Goschen, rt. hon. G. J.
Gourley, E. T.
Grant, A.
Harrison, C.
Hartington, Marq. of
Havelock, Sir H.
Hayter, Sir A. D.
Henry, M.
Herschell, F.
Hibbert, J. T.
Howard, hon. C.
Howard, E. S.
Ingram, W. J.
James, Sir H.
James, W. H.
Jenkins, D. J.
Kensington, Lord
Law, rt. hon. H.
Lawson, Sir W.
Leatham, E. A.
Lefevre, G. J. S.
Lloyd, M.
M'Arthur, A.
M'Clure, Sir T.
M'Lagan, P.
Martin, P.
Meldon, C. H.
Middleton, Sir A. E.
Milbank, F. A.
Monk, C. J.
Moore, A.
Mundella, A. J.
Muntz, P. H.
Noel, E.
Nolan, Major
O'Brien, Sir P.
O'Clery, K.
O'Conor, D. M.
Palmer, G.
Parker, C. S.
Parnell, C. S.
Pender, J.
Ramsay, J.
Rashleigh, Sir C.
Rathbone, W.
Read, C. S.
Roberts, J.
Rothschild, Sir N. M. de
Samuelson, H.
Shaw, W.
Sheil, E.
Simon, Serjeant J.
Sinclair, Sir J. G. T.
Stevenson, J. C.
Stewart, J.
Swanston, A.
Tavistock, Marquess of
Tracy, hon. F. S. A. Hanbury-
Waddy, S. D.
Walter, J.
Wedderburn, Sir D.
Whitbread, S.
Whitwell, J.
Williams, W.
Wilson, I.
Young, A. W.

TELLERS.

Samuelson, B.
Phipps, P.

NOES.

Agnew, R. V.
Allcroft, J. D.
Arbuthnot, Lt.-Col. G.
Archdale, W. H.
Arkwright, A. P.
Assheton, R.
Bagge, Sir W.
Balfour, A. J.
Baring, T. C.
Barrington, Viscount
Bates, E.
Beach, rt. hon. Sir M. H.
Beach, W. W. B.
Bentinck, rt. hon. G. C.
Beresford, Lord C.
Birkbeck, E.
Birley, H.
Blackburne, Col. J. I.
Boord, T. W.
Bourke, hon. R.
Bousfield, Col. N. G. P.
Bowen, J. B.
Brooke, Lord
Brooks, W. C.
Burghley, Lord
Castlereagh, Viscount
Cecil, Lord E. H. B. G.
Chaplin, H.
Christie, W. L.
Cobbold, T. C.
Cole, Col. hon. H. A.
Cordes, T.
Crichton, Viscount
Cross, rt. hon. R. A.
Cust, H. C.
Dalkeith, Earl of
Dalrymple, C.
Davenport, W. B.
Denison, W. E.
Dickson, Major A. G.
Digby, Col. hon. E.
Douglas, Sir G.
Edmonstone, Admiral Sir W.
Egerton, hon. A. F.
Elphinstone, Sir J. D. H.
Ewart, W.
Fellowes, E.
Floyer, J.
Forester, C. T. W.
Fremantle, hon. T. F.
Garfit, T.
Garnier, J. C.
Gibson, rt. hon. E.
Giffard, Sir H. S.
Gore-Langton, W. S.
Gregory, G. B.
Hall, A. W.
Halsey, T. F.
Hamilton, Lord C. J.
Hamilton, right hon. Lord G.
Hamilton, Marquess of
Hamilton, hon. R. B.
Hamond, C. F.
Harcourt, E. W.
Hardcastle, E.
Harvey, Sir R. B.
Hay, rt. hn. Sir J. C. D.
Helmsley, Viscount
Heygate, W. U.
Hicks, E.
Hill, A. S.
Holker, Sir J.
Holmesdale, Viscount
Home, Captain
Hood, Capt. hn. A. W. A. N.
Hubbard, E.
Isaac, S.
Johnson, J. G.
Johnstone, H.
Jolliffe, hon. S.
Jones, J.
Kennard, Col. E. H.
Kennaway, Sir J. H.
Knowles, T.
Lacon, Sir E. H. K.
Lawrence, Sir T.
Lechmere, Sir E. A. H.
Legard, Sir C.
Legh, W. J.
Leighton, Sir B.
Leighton, S.
Lennox, Lord H. G.
Leslie, Sir J.
Lindsay, Col. R. L.
Lloyd, T. E.
Lopes, Sir M.
Lowther, rt. hon. J.
Macartney, J. W. E.
Mac Iver, D.
M'Garel-Hogg, Sir J.
Makins, Colonel W. T.
Mandeville, Viscount
Manners, rt. hn. Lord J.
Marten, A. G.
Merewether, C. G.
Mills, Sir C. H.
Muncaster, Lord
Naghten, Lt.-Col. A. R.
Newdegate, C. N.
Newport, Viscount
Northcote, rt. hon. Sir S. H.
Onslow, D.
Paget, R. H.
Parker, Lt.-Col. W.
Pell, A.
Pemberton, E. L.
Pennant, hon. G.
Plunkett, hon. R.
Price, Captain
Puleston, J. H.
Raikes, H. C.
Rendlesham, Lord
Ridley, Sir M. W.
Rodwell, B. B. H.
Round, J.
Russell, Sir C.
Ryder, G. R.
Salt, T.
Sanderson, T. K.
Sandon, Viscount
Sclater-Booth, rt. hn. G.
Selwin-Ibbetson, Sir H. J.
Severne, J. E.
Shirley, S. E.
Sidebottom, T. H.
Smith, A.
Smith, rt. hn. W. H.
Smollett, P. B.
Somerset, Lord H. R. C.
Spinks, Serjeant F. L.
Stanhope, hon. E.
Stanhope, W. T. W. S.
Stanley, rt. hn. Col. F.
Starkey, L. R.
Starkie, J. P. C.
Storer, G.
Sykes, C.
Talbot, J. G.
Taylor, rt. hon. Col.
Thornhill, T.
Thynne, Lord H. F.
Torr, J.
Tremayne, A.
Turnor, E.
Wait, W. K.
Wallace, Sir R.
Watney, J.
Watson, rt. hon. W.
Welby-Gregory, Sir W.
Wellesley, Colonel H.
Wheelhouse, W. S. J.
Winn, R.
Woodd, B. T.
Wyndham, hon. P.
Wynn, C. W. W.
Yarmouth, Earl of

TELLERS.

O'Beirne, Major F.
O'Donnell, F. H.

Question proposed,

"That the words 'there can be no adequate remedy for the agricultural depression existing throughout the country and severely affecting also the interests of town labour, which does not, especially at this period of increasing Foreign Competition, protect the application of skill and capital to the soil by the establishment of compensation for unexhausted improvements, equitable appeal against exorbitant rents, and substantial security of tenure for the agricultural classes both in great Britain and Ireland,' be added,"

—instead thereof.

MR. J. W. BARCLAY said the question which the House was now asked to discuss was a very different one to that which they had been discussing during the evening, and it was very important it should be fully gone into. He therefore begged to move the adjournment of the debate.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Debate be now adjourned."—(*Mr. J. W. Barclay.*)

MR. O'DONNELL said, after the very favourable opinion which had been expressed in favour of the proposition, it was a matter of comparatively slight importance to him how much further the debate went on. He thought, considering the circumstances of Ireland, it was right to invite the House to consider the general question of the general condition of land in the three Kingdoms; and he now was of opinion that it would be better to take the vote on the Amendment that he originally proposed. He knew that the opinions expressed in that Amendment were to some extent different from, and somewhat advanced as compared with, the notions largely held by English land reformers; but, on the other hand, he thought he had expressed his views in very moderate terms, and that it would be only fair to allow the more advanced land reformers outside the House to understand to what extent their views were represented. Both sides, by this time, must have pretty well made up their minds; and if he was not supported by as large a number of hon. Members as had already expressed themselves in favour of weaker views, he should be perfectly satisfied to await the gradual advance of public opinion. He should hope to bring on the subject next year, and that then he should find a larger support. He could see no advantage, however, in moving the adjournment.

SIR PATRICK O'BRIEN said, this was not a matter to be decided in that off-hand way. The question what was to be done was a simple matter compared with the points to be considered in reference to the land. His humble opinion was that the hon. Member for Dungarvan had taken upon himself a position which few men would care to occupy, in asking the British public to enter into one of the greatest subjects that could be presented to their attention at an inopportune moment. So far as he could judge from his own experience, and from what he had heard from others, this question was one of the immediate future; and he did not think the hon. Member for Dungarvan, unacquainted with the subject and unconnected for a long time with land, could bring this forward at half-past 1 in the morning, and hurry them into a Division. He declined to vote with the hon. Gentleman. He did not yield to him in anxiety to carry out the views of the Irish people in connection with the tenure of land; but he did deny his right to assume, as he was too happy to assume on many occasions, the right to rush rashly in and deal with very important questions, and so to damage their prospects in Parliament.

THE MARQUESS OF HARTINGTON: I think it would be desirable we should have the views of Her Majesty's Government on this question. As far as I can recollect the two speeches from the front Bench, we had no opinion expressed in them on the Amendment of the hon. Member for Dungarvan. All we can judge from is the vote of the Government, and from that vote I can only collect that the Government is prepared to support the Amendment of the hon. Member. If that is not the case, we ought to have some indication of the line the Government are going to take.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: I have no hesitation in saying that the Government do not intend to support the Amendment of the hon. Gentleman. It sometimes happens, in Motions of this sort, that we are forced to vote in a certain way. I know that the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Chester (Mr. Dodson) thinks, when an Amendment is moved which we cannot accept in itself, that we ought not to support it. On the whole, however, that seems to be the least confusing way of voting; though, at the same time, as happened just now, it sometimes leaves an impression which we do not desire to produce—such an impression as I have just disclaimed. I think, however, under these circumstances, that the views of the Government have been sufficiently explained by my noble Friend (Viscount Sandon). I do not think there is any occasion for debating the Motion of the hon. Member for Dungarvan. Therefore, I do not think we can do much better than to vote for the adjournment.

Motion *agreed to.*

Debate *adjourned* till *Monday* next.

ARMY (MEDICAL DEPARTMENT).

MOTION FOR AN ADDRESS.

MR. MELDON, in rising to move for

> "A Copy of Correspondence which took place in the year 1876, between Surgeon Major P. J. Clarke and Sir W. Muir, M.D., Director General of the Medical Department of the Army, and between Surgeon Major P. J. Clarke and the Military Secretary to His Royal Highness the Field Marshal Commanding in Chief, on the subject of the Supersession of Surgeon Major P. J. Clarke,"

said, he understood this Motion was to be refused on the ground that the correspondence was private. He quite agreed that private correspondence should not be published; but he maintained that this was not the case here. All he asked was that the Correspondence between Surgeon Major Clarke and the Military Secretary should be given to them, and this could not be considered in any way private correspondence. In fact, some of the Papers had been made public already; and, therefore, the objection of the Secretary of State for War was not a valid or a good one. The facts of the case were simply these. Surgeon Major Clarke was an officer in the Medical Department of 28 years' standing. He had been stationed in Dublin in charge of the Recruiting Department, and was entitled to be promoted to a higher grade in the Service. However, he was passed over, and he thereupon called upon the authorities to state the reason for his supersession. As that was not done, he appealed to His Royal Highness the Commander-in-Chief to issue directions to the Director General to state the reasons he was passed over. That was done in a Correspondence in the months of August and September; and in September the reasons why he was superseded were given. In the first place, it was said that he had been censured some 17 years ago, and had been removed from the 90th Regiment in which he was then serving. The other reason was that he had been removed from the Inspectorship of Recruits. Now, the answer he made to these reasons was that in the year 1859, Surgeon Major Clarke, who was a most distinguished officer, had some dispute with his commanding officer as to the treatment of a patient suffering from cholera. Complaint was made to the authorities at home, when it resulted in his being removed from the 94th Regiment. Immediately on his return to this country, he demanded an inquiry into the circumstances of his removal, and His Royal Highness then intimated that such removal would never interfere in any way with his promotion. This was stated in a letter from the Military Secretary of that period, dated the 31st of July, 1863, in the following words:—

> "Dr. Clarke may be informed that he was considered by His Royal Highness to have committed an error in judgment; but there is nothing in the circumstances reported which is liable to prejudice his reputation or to interfere with his future advancement in the Service."

Notwithstanding that letter, in 1876, he was informed by the Director General that he was superseded for what had taken place in 1859. That disposed, then, of one ground of the inquiry. It was a public ground, and if the Correspondence bore out the information he had now made manifest, he thought it must be admitted that this distinguished officer was superseded after promises made to him that what had taken place in 1859 should not in any way prejudice his future promotion. The next ground alleged in the letter of the Director General he would not deal with on the present occasion; but when he had all the facts before him in the Correspondence, he would certainly criticize the conduct of that gentleman in very severe terms indeed. He had been removed, it was said, in consequence of carelessness in the removal of recruits in Dublin; but, in point of fact, he was removed from the position of Inspector of Recruits, and on the 23rd September, more than a month afterwards, he was promoted to the post of Surgeon Major General. Therefore, it all showed that that was not a fair and genuine reason for the way in which he had been treated. It was with a view to bring all these facts before the House, and going into this case, which was of considerable importance—not merely a case of private grievance—but the question bore strongly upon the public administration of this Department, and he thought no reason had been shown why this public Correspondence should not be given to Members of the House, and should not be made public. Even if the Government refused to circulate these letters he could promise them that they would not succeed in stifling the inquiry. But he must say, also, that it was most unusual to refuse information of this sort, especially when strong grounds for its publication had been shown.

MAJOR O'BEIRNE, in rising to second the Motion, said, he had read all the Correspondence in connection with this subject, and he should like to have an explanation on one paragraph. Before the Select Committee in 1876, His Royal Highness the Commander-in-Chief stated that it was absolutely necessary that such Reports as this should be made in the presence of an Officer or Inspector General. All the other evidence given on the subject of confidential Reports concurred in that opinion in the most marked manner. Yet, notwithstanding that opinion, there was not a single clause in the Queen's Regulations which enforced that rule. He supposed the authorities were answerable for the Queen's Regulations, and he should like to know why they had not carried out this opinion of the Commander-in-Chief?

Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, praying that She will be graciously pleased to give directions that there be laid before this House a Copy of Correspondence which took place in the year 1876, between Surgeon Major P. J. Clarke and Sir W. Muir, M.D., Director General of the Medical Department of the Army, and between Surgeon Major P. J. Clarke and the Military Secretary to His Royal Highness the Field Marshal Commanding in Chief, on the subject of the Supersession of Surgeon Major P. J. Clarke."—(*Mr. Meldon.*)

COLONEL STANLEY was sorry that it was his duty to oppose the grant of these Papers; but he thought the House would be of opinion that the hon. and learned Gentleman opposite had pretty well proved that he (Colonel Stanley) was right in doing so. The hon. and learned Gentleman, by quoting the Correspondence, had shown that they were in possession of it already. The Correspondence was of no great moment, and, as had been pointed out on more than one occasion previously in the House, the case had been explained under a most entire misapprehension. It was not at all a case of supersession. When this gentleman had obtained a certain rank, it became a matter between himself and others who should be selected for a particular administrative post. Posts in the higher branch of the Medical Service required a considerable amount of ability; and, without any disparagement to Surgeon Major Clarke, other officers were selected to perform certain duties. As to these Papers, it was not usual to lay them before the House, except in cases of the very gravest moment and of general interest. Therefore, in this case, he must think he was justified in declining to produce these Papers.

SIR PATRICK O'BRIEN said, this matter ought to be considered more seriously than it had been at present. For the last two years there had been considerable difficulty in getting qualified persons to enter the Army. When, therefore, they had one of the Medical Service merely asking for the publication of certain Correspondence in connection with arrangements affecting himself, it seemed to him that it was a thing which the Government ought to allow.

MAJOR NOLAN remarked, that there was one extraordinary thing in the Correspondence which the right hon. and gallant Gentleman had not explained. Surgeon Major Clarke was told that what took place in 1859 should not injure his reputation or interfere with his advancement. Now, on the 26th September, 1876, they had a letter signed "R. B. Haughley," referring to an offence which Surgeon Major Clarke had been distinctly told, 17 years before, should not prejudice him in his Profession. It seemed to him, therefore, that these two letters were totally irreconcilable, and that there had been something very much like a breach of promise. A distinct and definite promise had been given at one time, and it had been broken at another. That was something not at all creditable to any Department, and there ought to be some explanation. The Papers ought to be published, that hon. Members might judge whether these charges were true or not.

Question put.

The House *divided*:—Ayes 26; Noes 76: Majority 50.—(Div. List, No. 53.)

ASSESSED RATES ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

On Motion of Mr. MARTEN, Bill to amend "The Poor Rate Assessment and Collection Act, 1869," *ordered* to be brought in by Mr. MARTEN, Sir HENRY JAMES, and Mr. TORR.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 113.]

House adjourned at a quarter after Two o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Wednesday, 26th March, 1879.

MINUTES.]—PUBLIC BILL—*Second Reading—Committee negatived—Considered—Third Reading*—Consolidated Fund (No. 2) *, and *passed*.

The House met at Eleven of the clock.

THE EARL OF REDESDALE sat SPEAKER.

CONSOLIDATED FUND (NO. 2) BILL.

Read 2ª (according to order); Committee *negatived;* Then Standing Orders Nos. XXXVII. and XXXVIII. *considered* (according to order), and *dispensed with;* Bill read 3ª, and *passed*.

House adjourned at a quarter past Eleven o'clock, till To-morrow, half past Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Wednesday, 26th March, 1879.

MINUTES.]—PUBLIC BILLS—*Second Reading*—Parliamentary Burghs (Scotland) * [97]; Blind and Deaf-Mute Children (Education) * [93].

Third Reading—Racecourses (Metropolis) [48], *debate adjourned*.

Withdrawn—Convention (Ireland) Act Repeal [4].

Major Nolan

ORDERS OF THE DAY.

CONVENTION (IRELAND) ACT REPEAL BILL—[BILL 4.]

(*Sir Joseph M'Kenna, Mr. P. J. Smyth, Mr. Downing.*)

SECOND READING.

Order for Second Reading read.

SIR JOSEPH M'KENNA, in moving that the Bill be now read a second time, said: Sir, the Act, which we seek to repeal by the present Bill, was passed by the Irish Parliament in 1793. It is entitled "An Act to prevent the Election or Appointment of Unlawful Assemblies under Pretence of Presenting Public Petitions or other Addresses to His Majesty and the Parliament." There could scarcely be a more deceptive title. Those who read the Act will see that it was a law to render unlawful and penal, save in the cases of Parliament and the established Corporations, all expression of opinion on any subject, if such opinion were expressed by means of a nominee or delegate. The only excuse for the passing of such an Act, the only palliation of the conduct of the Law Officers of a Government introducing such a Bill is one which suggests itself from the date of the enactment. It is the still surviving offspring of the panic of the great revolutionary year of 1793. Most laws passed in time of panic are unwise, but this was singularly and pre-eminently so. It tended to produce the very evils which its framers designed that it should avert. Within five years from its passing there was matured a rebellious conspiracy amongst the Protestants of the North of Ireland, which subsequently extended to the South, and spread desolation on all sides, amongst Protestants and Catholics alike. It is a reasonable inference that this Act, which fomented discontent, contributed to the outbreak, for it made the ordinary means of collecting opinion, whether with a view to redress of grievances or not, a statutable offence. It shut down the safety-valve, which we all now know is best kept in operation by giving the widest range for the expression on all lawful subjects of the opinions and aspirations of the people. We also know that such expression can be best given vicariously, and by comparatively a few, rather than by monster meetings, which are more liable to tumult under ordinary circumstances. The Preamble of the Bill purported to declare the reasons for passing the measure; it was in these words—

> "Whereas, the election or appointment of assemblies purporting to represent the people, or any number of them, may, under pretence of preparing petitions, be made use of for factious purposes and sedition, to the violating of the public peace, and so on, be it enacted."

What? But, before I explain what it enacted, let me dwell for a moment on the grounds relied on in the Preamble for passing the Bill. I do so, in order to show the inconsistency of the Act with the Preamble. The Preamble says, in effect—whereas the election or appointment of assemblies with unlawful objects in view, but on ostensibly legal pretexts, may be made to serve factious ends, and so on—let something be done. One would expect that the enactment which was to follow would be something to prevent the meeting of unlawful assemblies under pretence of delegation for legal purposes; and if that were so, and if the enactment were suited to the emergency, there could be very little urged against the Preamble, for it merely asserts in the abstract what, in fact, no one questions. We must all admit it is quite true. It would be true at present in England or in Scotland. But no one for that reason suggests that, because some people may make a bad use of a natural right, in this last quarter of the 19th century the exercise of a natural right should be made unlawful for those who have never abused it. But someone suggests that because we find this wretched, groundless, unhappy piece of legislation on the Statute Book, we ought to permit it to remain—no matter how useless it has proved, no matter how degrading and offensive it must be considered by the people of Ireland, and by the Representatives of her people in this House. I pass from the Preamble. Now, let us examine what is enacted by the measure. It enacts—

> "That all assemblies, committees, or other bodies of persons elected, or in any manner appointed, to represent the people of this realm, or any number or description of the people of the same, or the people of any province, county, city, town, or other district within the same, under pretence of petitioning for, or in any other manner procuring, an alteration of matters established by law in Church or State, save and except the knights, citizens, and burgesses elected to serve in the Parliament thereof, and save and except the Houses of Convention duly summoned by the King's writ, are unlawful assemblies, and it shall and may be lawful for any sheriff, justice of the peace, or other peace officer, and they are hereby respectively authorised and required, within his and their respective jurisdictions, to disperse all such unlawful assemblies, and if resisted, to enter into the same, and to apprehend all persons offending in that behalf."

The 2nd section makes it a high misdemeanour to take part in the election of a representative or delegate; the 3rd section simply provides that the law shall not effect bodies corporate; and the 4th, that it shall not impede the right of the subject to petition His Majesty, or both, or either Houses of Parliament for redress of any public or private grievance. The Bill originated in the House of Lords. It was brought down to the House of Commons, where only verbal Amendments were made. It received the Royal Assent on the 16th of August, 1793, and it has disgraced the Statute Book from that day to this. I have explained already how useless the Act was to prevent rebellion and conspiracies against the State—nay, that it tended to provoke them, for it drove men to do in private what was made criminal, if done in public; and we well know, when the limits of legality are once passed, it becomes almost a matter of indifference to the trespassers whether they proceed further in the same direction. The case which I submit to the House for the repeal of the Act of 1793 is three-fold—first, that it was introduced by surprise and carried in panic; second, that it is contrary to the spirit of the Constitution—a fact even more glaringly manifest since the Legislative Union between the Islands, seeing that no such law of pains and penalties applied to the people of Great Britain—and, thirdly, that to keep it in force for Ireland is a grievance and degradation. I do not lightly assert that this Act of 1793 was introduced by surprise and carried in panic. I will prove it. I will show how Governmental and Legislative business was carried on in Ireland during that year, and I will prove that the measures of repression, Executive and Legislative, which were pressed on Parliament by the Government in that year were attributable, and expressly attributed, to extraordinary causes which no longer exist. The Irish Parliament met for the

Session on the 10th of January, 1793. The Lord Lieutenant (the Earl of Westmorland), in the Speech from the Throne, made these statements—

> "His Majesty commands me to meet you. His Majesty feels the utmost concern that various attempts have been made to excite a spirit of discontent. It is an additional ground of uneasiness to his Majesty that views of conquest and dominion should have incited France to interfere with the government of other countries, &c., &c. Under these circumstances, I have, by His Majesty's commands, ordered an augmentation of the Forces upon this Establishment."

And the Viceroy goes on to say—

> "By the advice of the Privy Council, measures have been taken to prevent the exportation of corn, provisions, naval stores, arms, and ammunition."

I now ask the attention of the House to the next passage in the Speech, which bears on all that went before, and which justifies me in claiming that this House is bound to regard the repressive measures of 1793 as exceptional, and should not hesitate for a single Session to sweep this last and most objectionable of them from the Statute Book. The Viceroy continues—

> "The circumstances which render these measures necessary will, I trust, justify any temporary infringement of the laws, and will induce you to give them a Parliamentary sanction."

Now, Sir, I ask the House to consider these words of the Viceroy, in the Speech from the Throne, as conclusive of the extraordinary and exceptional circumstances under which, and of the year in which, the Irish Parliament passed this repressive law, and sanctioned certain Executive Acts of the Government in 1793. I do not read, nor ask the House to read, 1793 by the light of 1879, nor do I ask the House to agree with my views as to the character of the legislation. I make a much stronger case than even that. I ask the House to look upon the repressive legislation of 1793 in the same light as that in which it was presented to the Irish Parliament in the Speech from the Throne, and, even on that view, to reverse it. I do not wish to cast obloquy on the Law Officers of the Irish Government of 1793. I daresay the then Lord Chancellor and the Attorneys General felt themselves justified in the course which they took; nor do I desire to pass over without recognition a passage in the speech of Lord Westmorland, which, perhaps, as much as any other, indicated the serious view which the Government took of the situation. The Lord Lieutenant further said that he had

> "A command from His Majesty to recommend to their consideration such measures as might be most likely to strengthen and cement a general union of sentiment among all classes and descriptions of His Majesty's subjects in support of the established Constitution. With this view, His Majesty trusts that the situation of His Majesty's Catholic subjects will engage your serious attention."

The Commons made a suitable Address—dutiful and loyal—and said, amongst other things—

> "We are sensible of His Majesty's goodness in relying upon our wisdom and liberality, and we shall obey His Majesty's commands in giving full consideration to the situation of our Roman Catholic brethren."

I have cited these passages to indicate the precise temper and views of the Government of the Earl of Westmorland in 1793, and if I extenuate nothing, I will keep equally clear of setting down anything unfairly. But, now, I must examine the character of the legislation of 1793, apart from the Convention Act which we seek to repeal. It is by such an examination that I hope to bring home to the minds of hon. Members that is a reproach to us if we retain this so-called Convention Act any longer on the Statute Book. The first Act passed by the Irish Parliament in 1793 was one to make regulations in respect to aliens dwelling in, or arriving in, the Kingdom. The spirit of apprehension which we find in the first Act of Parliament betrays itself to the end. They lived in perilous times, so the Preamble says—

> "Much danger, under present circumstances, might arise from the resort and residence of aliens."

Of course, there might. After which come 43 enacting clauses to counteract the danger. The next Public Bill which passed was an Act

> "To prevent the importation of Arms, Gunpowder, and Ammunition, and the keeping of Gunpowder without licence."

Next followed an Act

> "To indemnify those Officers of the King who had been engaged in carrying certain proclamations of the Lord Lieutenant into effect."

These measures indicate the sense

of danger under which the Public Business was carried on. It was not, however, until July, and the expiring days of the Session, that the Convention Act was sprung upon both Houses of Parliament. I will now state, for the information of the House, the circumstances which led up to the introduction of the Bill. There was nothing to indicate it in the Speech from the Throne; and I feel convinced that the Earl of Westmorland was free from all complicity with the design of it. There is scarcely any need to remind hon. Members that the year 1793 was, from its opening to its close, the most troubled epoch in the last century. The year opened in France with the beheading of Louis the Sixteenth; it was the year of the Reign of Terror and the worship of the Goddess of Reason in that country; it was in England a year of intense popular excitement, and of the wildest political theories. It could not be expected that, under such circumstances, all would have been tranquil in Ireland. Accordingly, we find that in the Irish House of Lords, on February 11, 1793, there was an important debate on the subject of the state of the country on the Motion of the Earl of Aldborough for a Committee of Inquiry. The Earl of Bellamont spoke strongly in favour of the appointment of the Committee. He made use of these words in the course of his speech—

> "The Roman Catholic clergy have been supposed to have had influence in this insurrection. I rather attribute it to their want of influence. No; it is a description of secondary politicians who have usurped the spiritual functions—such are now the teachers of the mob."

In the result, a Secret Committee of the Lords was appointed with full powers. On the 7th March, 1793, they made their Report. It referred to several isolated acts of crime and disturbance, and thus concludes—

> "The result of their inquiries is that, in their opinion, it is incompatible with the public safety and tranquillity of this Kingdom to permit bodies of men in arms to assemble when they please, without any legal authority; and that the existence of a self-created body of any description of the King's subjects, taking upon itself the government of them, and levying taxes or subscriptions to be applied at the discretion of such representative body, or of persons deputed by them, is also incompatible with the public safety and tranquillity."

Now, here is a general principle laid down, which no one in England or Ireland will dispute. What I say, however, is that the Act now under discussion affirms something wholly different from that which the Irish Lords' Committee of 1793 ventured to state as a matter of opinion. Observe, that Report was presented to Parliament on the 7th of March; but nothing was done or stated in Parliament about this Convention Bill until a period of the Session when most of the Lords had gone to the country. On the 8th July the Bill was introduced in the Lords, and read a first time. It was in the charge of Lord Chancellor Fitzgibbon (afterwards Earl of Clare). It was, as I will show, a genuine surprise to Parliament, and it was hurried through its stages with unusual, and I may say, with indecent haste. The Lord Chancellor, who had already in Parliament confessed himself personally opposed to the measure of Catholic relief introduced by command of the King, determined to carry this Bill. These are the dates. It was introduced by the Lord Chancellor, and read a first time in the Lords on the 8th of July. It must not be supposed that this Bill, which we are here to-day discussing with a view to its repeal, even in the panic year of 1793 passed even the Irish House of Lords unchallenged. It was read a second time in the House of Lords on the 10th of July, 1793, and a debate arose on the Motion, "That the said Bill be committed to a Committee of the Whole House." The Motion was carried; but it led to a remarkable Protest, which we find on the Journals of the House, from the Duke of Leinster and the Earls of Arran and of Charlemont. There were but 23 Lords present on that occasion, out of a House of about 170 Members. I ask the attention of the House to the Protest of the noble Lords whom I have named. They were dissentient—

> "1st—Because we are clearly of opinion that the laws as they now stand are amply sufficient to curb licentiousness of every sort, and to prevent or punish all such crimes as may be injurious to the State or subversive of public tranquillity. 2nd—Because, even though it were true that any evil existed such as might seem to require a new law to counteract its effects, we conceive that laws made on particular emergencies, and enacted on the spur of the occasion, are at all times dangerous to coustitutional liberty, inasmuch as they are usually framed in haste, and perhaps under the influence of passion or ot arbitrary principle, and are apt, therefore, to

entail upon the State a real and permanent evil, instead of the evanescent and temporary inconvenience they assume to obviate. 3rd—Because that as this Bill assumes to itself the style and character of a declaration, as well as of an enacting law, we cannot enough testify our disapprobation of the dangerous practice of grounding a declaration of law upon the foundation of old and obsolete statutes enacted in arbitrary times, falling into disuse, unrepealed, and esteemed by all sound and constitutional lawyers as the lumber and disgrace of the Statute Book. 4th—Because we conceive it to be not only improper, but highly indecent, that a law of such delicate importance should be brought forward at a season when from various causes this House is so ill attended, and deprived of so many of its wisest and best Members. We therefore solemnly protest against the committal of this Bill, at the same time declaring our utter disapprobation of all such meetings or conventions as it purposes to prevent, and firmly trusting that our fellow-citizens, warned and instructed by the sad experience of neighbouring countries, will cautiously abstain from every proceeding which can in any degree tend to public disorder.—(Signed) LEINSTER, ARRAN, CHARLEMONT."

There were only present on this occasion, as I have already remarked, 23 Peers out of 170. The Bill was taken in Committee on the 11th July, and reported to the House on the 12th. On the 13th, it was read a third time in the Lords, and taken down to the House of Commons, where it was read a first time on same day. That was on Saturday, after which the House of Commons adjourned till the 16th (Tuesday). We find the Bill at its second reading in the House of Commons on the 17th. It went to a Division, and was carried by 128 to 27 votes. One of the Tellers of the Ayes on that occasion was a certain Major Wellesley, then 24 years of age, and Member for the borough of Trim. Thirty-six years after that Division, and just 50 years ago, it fell to the lot of that hon. Member, as Duke of Wellington and Premier of England, to carry through the Imperial Parliament the Act of Catholic Emancipation—a victory for right as memorable and more lasting in its effects than that of Waterloo, which deposed the dynasty of Napoleon. The Convention Bill was stoutly opposed by Mr. Grattan. Some of my hon. Friends who are to follow me will probably refer to his speeches; but I fear I have already spoken, or may have to speak, at too great length, and I have rather to deal with those who favoured this measure than with those who, to their eternal honour, opposed it. I must refer to the then Attorney General's speech in reply to Mr. Grattan, and I incorporate his words as a portion of the case I make here to-day for the repeal of this Act. The hon. and learned Attorney General said—

> "I will tell the right hon. Gentleman the object of this Bill; it is not the Catholic Convention, nor any meeting heretofore holden, but it is that Congress or Convention of which he has spoken, and which is intended to meet at Athlone as soon as the Parliament shall be prorogued. This Convention takes its rise from a society in this City which has distinguished itself for great activity in exciting discontent and promoting disturbance. In the last winter this society projected the late Dungannon meeting, and that meeting has ordered and directed the Convention at Athlone."

Now, granting for one moment that what the Attorney General said in the Irish House of Commons was quite true, must it not appear to anyone familiar with the principles of British law a very insufficient reason for passing a permanent Act to suppress or render unlawful for all time all delegations, however innocent or useful in themselves? To me it appears that the admissions of the hon. and learned Attorney General in 1793 are, at this day, as conclusive against the Bill as were the Protests of the Duke of Leinster and those other noble Lords, or as were the eloquent denunciations of Mr. Grattan. I have not, however, done with the Attorney General of 1793. On the 18th of July, on the Order of the Day for going into Committee being read, Mr. Grattan said that he intended to move—

> "That it be an instruction to the Committee to receive a clause to limit the duration of this Act."

I particularly wish the House to consider the nature of the objection then taken by the Attorney General. He said—

> "He could by no means agree to the introduction of such a clause consistently with his arguments of yesterday—namely, that the Bill was only declaratory of what was already the law of the land."

Sir, bearing this in mind, I say there never was an Act passed under graver mis-statements as to the existing law. The Attorney General all through, in the House and in Committee, mis-stated the law. Hon. Members may not take my word on that point; but I will do this—

I will prove that he so mis-stated it, or else that the law was mis-stated to this House in 1869 by Her Majesty's then Attorney General. I beg the House to listen to this—Major Doyle, one of the Members of the Irish House of Commons, on 18th of July, while the Bill was in Committee, suggested the necessity of quieting

> "The fears of the Quakers, by making some exception in favour of them, as they very often delegated members of their body for considering matters in Church and State. He knew their fears were unfounded, but it was right they should be removed."

To this the Attorney General replied—

> "Nothing could be more remote from the intentions of gentlemen than that the Bill should affect any such delegations."

Can anything be plainer? Was this or was it not a misleading of the House of Commons? Let me now call attention to what took place at the time of passing the Act in 1869 to permit the formation of the Irish Church Body. The then Attorney General for Ireland (Mr. Sullivan) is reported in *Hansard*, vol. 195, page 1019, to have spoken these words in reference to the Bill then before Parliament—

> "The Bill merely left the Church to agree to a form of constitution for itself, and it took away disabilities imposed by the statute law in Ireland. By a peculiar law of old standing in that country, and framed for a particular purpose, no person or body could meet by delegation, and that prohibition would extend to the meeting of the Church in Convocation. It was therefore necessary to wipe that Act from the Statute Book in order to enable the Church to meet in Synod; and so it could by the common law."

All this is plain, and quite true; but, if so, let me ask how can what the Attorney General told Parliament in 1793 be also true, that the Bill was not to interfere with the delegations of the Quakers? I say, it is now plainly in evidence that the Attorney General in 1793 gravely mis-stated the fact and misrepresented the law by the answer he gave Major Doyle. The Bill was read a third time in the Commons on the 19th of July—that is to say, that it finally passed both Houses on the 11th day from the day of its introduction by the Lord Chancellor in the House of Lords. It received the Royal Assent on the last day of the Session (the 16th August) with several other Bills. It has disgraced the Statute Book ever since. I have already said that it was introduced by surprise and carried in panic. I add now, that it was carried by misrepresentation in the last few days of an expiring Session. In order to show that they were the last days of the Session, I will give this House the dates of the sitting of the Irish House of Commons. The Bill passed finally, as I have already stated, on the 19th of July—the next day, the 20th, the House met and adjourned till the 26th, and on the 26th it adjourned till the 16th August, when the Session closed—thus it sat three days, and only three, after passing this wretched piece of legislation. And now, Sir, I have brought my melancholy history of this indecent and discreditable contrivance nearly to an end. I have, however, yet to deal with the arguments which have been heretofore offered in the present Parliament for its retention. There never yet was a penal law, I believe, which has not had its advocates and its votaries. This Act is almost an exception, however, of late years, for those who have made formal combat for it, as it appears to me, were half-hearted and doubtful of their cause; nevertheless, I may not pass over what they said without rejoinder on this occasion. The noble Marquess who now leads the Opposition (the Marquess of Hartington), when objecting in 1872 to its repeal, admitted that it was not an Act which should remain permanently on the Statute Book. He, however, said that—

> "In the time of Mr. O'Connell, it was proposed to hold a National Convention, which was announced as furnishing a correct representation of the Irish people; and it was only by means of this Act that that Convention was prevented from being held."

He also said, explaining the uses to which the Act had been put, that—

> "In 1848 the Irish Confederation announced its intention of summoning a National Council, to be elected by the various local national councils in that country, and, of course, such a Council would equally have purported to be the national representative of Ireland."—[3 *Hansard*, ccxi. 144.]

Sir, I answer these objections by saying that such proceedings as are here described are illegal and punishable, irrespective of this Act. There is surely no need of the Irish Convention Act to repress seditious meetings, if it be requisite to do so. But, let me ask, is it not one of the clumsiest, as well as one of the most unjust, of policies to abridge the freedom of the well-disposed—to make a lawful act unlawful for ever—that you may throw some impediment—which, for the most part, they despise—in the way of the seditious and the unruly? But to all arguments for retaining this Act in force there is also this answer—that such arguments were equally cogent and equally availed of in their day for the retention of each one of the penal laws repealed during the present century. I hope, Sir, that the hon. and learned Member for the University of Dublin (Mr. Plunket)—the Colleague of the right hon. and learned Gentleman the Attorney General for Ireland—will not imagine I undervalue the observations which he made in 1875, pleading that the Bill should be allowed still to remain in force. The hon. and learned Gentleman said, in opposing the Motion to repeal the Bill—

> "The Motion had been before the House on several occasions, and had been resisted by the Representatives of the Irish Government of both political Parties. The speech of the hon. Member"—[the Member for Westmeath (Mr. P. J. Smyth]—"tended to create a misapprehension as to the character of the measure. The Convention Act did not in any degree interfere with the right of public meeting in Ireland, nor did it interfere with the right of petitioning. That Act provided that meetings of a representative character, or in the nature of a delegated assembly, drawn together for the purpose of procuring a change in matters established by law in Church or State, should not be allowed. It would not be denied, he apprehended, that were the Act repealed, a Convention would be immediately called together in Ireland. Would not such an institution necessarily act as a rival to the House of Commons, and keep alive and exasperate those unhappy divisions that had already existed there?"—[*Ibid*, ccxxii. 1959-60.]

It is melancholy to think that such an utterance as that could pass for fair commentary on the Act of 1793, or on the Bill to repeal it? But the hon. and learned Gentleman had nothing better to say, for, if he had, so accomplished a debater would not have allowed the occasion to pass without saying it. It is not, Sir, I maintain, a true rendering of the Act of 1793, to describe its provisions as if they only interfered with delegated assemblies drawn together for the purpose of procuring a change in matters established by law in Church and State, and it is the merest playing on the fears of the ignorant and imaginative to say that if the Act were repealed a Convention would be called together in Ireland as a rival to the House of Commons, and that the hon. and learned Gentleman did not anticipate that such an intention would be denied. Sir, the idea is simply ridiculous. I deny that such folly is in the minds of the Irish people who desire the repeal of this Bill, and I think it little short of lamentable that such an assumption should pass for argument. The people of Ireland have no idea of seeking redress of their grievances by any but Constitutional means, and nothing could be more unconstitutional or more illegal than any attempt to set up a sham Parliament in the face of another *de jure* and *de facto* existent. Sir, I will not trespass on the attention of the House much longer; but, before I sit down, let me entreat Her Majesty's Government and the House to cast aside for ever the policy of distrusting the Irish people. No people on the earth are more loyal by nature than the Irish, none have a keener sense of justice, nor any a readier appreciation of Governmental and Legislative acts. Treat Ireland, not in a spirit of jealousy and distrust, but in the spirit of the Constitution as an integral realm of this great Empire, from which I hope she may never desire to be severed or estranged. I beg, Sir, to move the second reading of the Bill.

Mr. O'SHAUGHNESSY, in seconding the Motion, said, he did not intend to ask the House to consider all the details of the debate upon the occasion of the passing of the Convention Act. But he desired briefly to refer to some of the more important matters connected with that debate, and to some of the main arguments used against the Act which the present Bill sought to repeal. When the Act was passed, it was passed as a declaratory Act, declaring that certain things were, at the time of its passing, illegal, and had been so by the common law of the land; but, since the passing of the Bill, other transactions and other modes of meeting which were never intended to be touched by the Bill, had been brought within its range. Thus, though passed as a declaratory Bill, it made illegal acts which before were not illegal, and curtailed the privileges of meeting and of delegation in Ireland. So that, apart from the considerations which had been brought forward as to the policy of preventing delegated meetings of the character against which the Bill was really aimed, the Bill had gone beyond the point at which it was really aimed by its framers, and, therefore, ought to be repealed. The main ground of Mr. Grattan's opposition to the Bill was that the Preamble set forth as law that which he denied to be law. What the learned Gentleman said was this—that, if the Bill contained any of the legislation which was imputed to it, the Attorney General would be the last man to rise for the purpose of supporting it. The main evil of the Bill which was passed in those days was that it declared to be illegal and unlawful that which was now considered to be lawful. A Convention had taken place some short time before, consisting of Catholics elected by Catholics all over Ireland. The meeting was held in Dublin for the purpose of petitioning Parliament upon the Catholic claims, a subject which then attracted great attention; and the Attorney General of the day, in order to back up his previous assertion that the Bill did not make unlawful that which was lawful, proceeded expressly to tell the House of Commons it would not make the Convention now alluded to illegal. He (the Attorney General) went even further, and said—

> "I declare that such an idea never entered into any of our minds as to allude to the Catholic Convention, nor do I think, after the King and both Houses have acceded to their wishes, that any man who is not mad would offer them a deliberate affront by a Bill in Parliament."

The Attorney General then went on to say it was not the Catholic Convention that it was intended to suppress, but the Congress or Convention of which he had previously spoken—referring, of course, to the Convention at Athlone. Turning to the words of the Act, he went on to say that they, too, showed that the Act was never originally directed against assemblies elected or called together for any Constitutional purpose, or for the purpose of petitioning Parliament with a Constitutional object. The assemblies pointed to in the Act were assemblies which were elected nominally under the pretence of petitioning Parliament, but whose real object was representation; and it had never been attempted to indict persons in Ireland who had assembled really and *bonâ fide* for the purpose of drawing up Petitions to Parliament, or for any Constitutional purpose, and not for the purpose of doing what the people intended to meet at Athlone meant to do—namely, to take and usurp the privileges and powers and duties of Parliament. It was not merely the Preamble of the Act which pointed entirely to assemblies aiming at representation, gathered together under the pretence of petitioning; it was not merely by the wording of the Act that one was to arrive at what the intentions of the framers of the Act were. What were the words of the Act? It recited that whereas the election of assemblies purporting to represent the people with a view to petitioning Parliament might be used for factious and seditious ends to the violation of public order, and so on. But it declared, therefore, that all assemblies of persons elected, or in any other manner constituted or appointed to represent, or claiming an authority to represent, the people in any province, town, or city, or other district, were unlawful assemblies, and should and might be dispersed. Evidently the object of that delegation which were elected nominally to petition Parliament really had exercised their powers for other purposes, and that it should never be attempted to apply that rule to any assembly elected really for a *bonâ fide* and Constitutional purpose. In fact, these assemblies had never attempted to do that which the Athlone Convention attempted—that was to say, they had never thought of usurping the power or the privileges of Parliament. It was directly stated in the Preamble of the Act; but it was clear that it pointed to assemblies gathered together for one object, and which had really met for the purpose of carrying out another. With regard to the opinion of the Law Officers of the Crown, he wished to remark that the Attorney General, in answer to Mr. Grattan, used the expression which he (Mr. O'Shaughnessy) had previously pointed out—namely, that it was not intended to make unlawful anything which was now lawful; but that, in fact, the real end of the Act was to prevent the Convention of Athlone. The Attorney General said—

> "Mr. Grattan himself agrees with me that that Convention should be prevented."

And then he went on to say—

> "Many things are unlawful against which there is no positive statute or judicial process,

and yet they are against the first principles of the law"—

thereby showing that what was in his mind was that this was a declaratory Statute, merely declaring the state of the law as it then existed. The Solicitor General, at a later period of the debate, following the line laid down by his superior officer, said—

> "The Bill in question created no new crime —that is to say, the legal Convention held by the Roman Catholics a short time ago did not become illegal. It was only illegal Conventions that it was intended to suppress—Conventions that were called together for the purpose of usurping the rights and duties of Parliament."

He (Mr. O'Shaughnessy) thought he had shown that the Bill was intended simply as a declaratory Act, and he would not deny that there might at the time have been some necessity for making a declaration of the common law upon the subject, for Mr. Grattan himself said the Convention at Athlone should be stopped; but what he complained of was that it had been made to cover Conventions held for a perfectly legal purpose. Well, the Attorney General invited Mr. Grattan to go into Committee with him on the Bill, and said that if it was found that there were any provisions in the Bill which interfered with the right to meeting by delegation at common law, they would strike out such clauses, providing the assent of His Majesty's Government had been previously obtained. He (Mr. O'Shaughnessy) had looked into the Journals of the Irish House of Commons, and he found that the House went into Committee the next day. The Journals said that the Committee spent some short time over the Bill; but they reported it to the House without Amendment. The work of the Committee was done in a very short time, and it appeared that, although Mr. Grattan made an excellent speech on the second reading of the Bill, he did not take the trouble to go into Committee and insist upon the Amendments being inserted, confining the operation of the measure to unlawful assemblies only. He (Mr. O'Shaughnessy) regretted very much that Mr. Grattan did not do that; because, if he had, they would have been spared the trouble of sitting there to-day endeavouring to impress upon the House of Commons the desirability of repealing the Act. The case he had attempted to make out was this—that, whatever were the intentions of the framers of the Bill, it had been assumed in Ireland and in this House to be beyond the limits of a declaratory Act, and to make illegal delegated meetings and Conventions which were purely legal at common law, and which were not only the rights of the inhabitants of the Realm, but some of the best instruments provided by the Constitution to enable the community to assist this and the other House of Parliament in their deliberations for the public good; and the provision had been exercised in such a manner as to prevent the Commonalty from stating to the House many subjects. Notwithstanding all that had been said at the time by the Attorney and Solicitor General, the Act did create a new crime, and it curtailed in some degree the liberties of the people. The general opinion in Ireland now was that it was illegal to elect men to consider even Constitutional questions. If that were only a floating opinion, perhaps it would not be of any great weight; but, as his hon. Friend the Member for Youghal (Sir Joseph M'Kenna) had said, when the Irish Church Bill was before the House, the present Master of the Rolls in Ireland (then Mr. Sullivan) stated, on the second reading of it, and in Committee on the Bill he also laid it down distinctly, that the Act which was then under discussion prevented the Protestants of Ireland, when their Church became disestablished, and when they ceased to hold the right of Convocation, from sending delegates to hold Conventions with the view of considering the future constitution and management of their Church. The consequence was that it became necessary to introduce the 19th clause in the Irish Church Act, which repealed the Act now under consideration, and all other Acts affecting the subject, so far as the newly-disestablished Irish Church was concerned, and gave power to hold assemblies. The very same reason applied to any other assembly that might take place for Constitutional purposes. The intention of the framers of the Act was that the people should not meet under a pretence; but it was clear, from what had been said, that the wording of the Statute applied to places where men had assembled as delegates by election to discuss crucial and Constitutional questions. It certainly was not the intention of the framers of the Bill that if the people were to send delegates to consider the Land Question, or the Franchise Question, or if the people attempted to form a Convention upon the Education Question, or any other practical topic where an expression of public opinion was desirable, that the Law Officers of the Crown should say such meetings were illegal. He thought there was very plain evidence that the Act of 1793 went beyond its intended scope, and inflicted on the liberties of the people of Ireland a curtailment which was not contemplated by the people who passed that Act; and although it might be said the law was ambiguous, he thought it was as clear as Acts of Parliament usually were. There had been very troublesome times in Ireland, and perhaps the power of the Executive and the power of the Crown had been increased from time to time in consequence; and therefore it was not unnatural that an extreme construction, which resulted in a curtailment of the ordinary Constitutional right of the people of Ireland, should have been adopted; but the time had now arrived when all those curtailments should be removed. The real object of the Act was to prevent the growth in Ireland of such assemblies as at the moment when the Act was passed were ruling France, and the growth of such clubs as the Jacobin Club. The aim of the Act was that assemblies should not be allowed to grow up in Ireland, which were at the time being held, and which were attempting to usurp the powers, the rights, and the prestige of Parliament. It was alleged and admitted on all hands that such assemblies would be illegal at common law, and that nobody would object to a statutory declaration that they were illegal, if those rights were still in peril. Mr. Grattan himself did not object to such a Statute being placed on the Statute Book; but what Mr. Grattan and he (Mr. O'Shaughnessy) did object to was that the enactment declaring acts illegal had ever afterwards been directed and construed to apply to perfectly legal assemblies. It appeared to him that the Act as it stood was perfectly unnecessary, even for the purpose of preventing illegal Conventions. The only assembly in Irish history which did effect a change in the Constitution of the country was the Convention of 1782, which was the delegation of armed bodies of men. In the present day he ventured to say that, unless the people of Ireland had arms in their hands for the purpose of sustaining such an assembly against the authority of Parliament, it would be utterly futile to attempt to set it up against the Parliament in which they now sat. It would be an attempt to set up a deliberative assembly without any Executive and without any arms to sustain it, against an Assembly which had an Executive, which had arms, and which had authority. And if such an attempt was made, every man who valued the peace of his country would absent himself and withhold all encouragement from such an assembly. It therefore appeared to him that the Act of 1793 was entirely unnecessary at the present time; and if that was the case, and the Government desired to be consistent, it should be repealed. The Government had, then, three courses open to them. They might repeal the Act, because it was unnecessary; they might confine it within the limits which the framers of it intended; or they might come forward and say that it did not apply to Conventions honestly and constitutionally called together for the purpose of discussing Constitutional subjects. There had never been a judicial decision showing that the Act applied to assemblies called together for purely Constitutional purposes, and he thought there ought to be a full and honest declaration from the Government that it did not apply to such assemblies. He thought it ought to be acknowledged by the Law Officer of the Government that the people of Ireland had a right to meet in delegation and to be represented for the purpose of discussing any questions which might arise, provided they did not assemble, as the Act said, under the pretence of petitioning, but really for other and ulterior purposes.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."—(*Sir Joseph M'Kenna.*)

MR. MARTEN, in moving that the Bill be read a second time time that day six months, said, the question was one not new to the House, for it had been debated and considered on several occasions, and the House had determined, by large majorities, that it was a question which it was advisable should not be re-opened. That was the opinion of the noble Lord opposite (the Marquess of Hartington), when Chief Secretary for Ireland, and of Mr. Gladstone, when Prime Minister, in 1872, when the repeal of the Act was proposed. Upon that occasion it was rejected on the second reading by 145 to 27, the rejection of the Bill being moved by the noble Marquess himself, and supported by Mr. Gladstone. And yet that Government specially took upon itself the redress of Irish grievances, and came into power as being specially charged by the constituencies with the task of bringing in a message of peace to Ireland. In 1875, during the existence of the present Parliament, the Bill was again brought forward and rejected on the second reading by 110 to 38. The numbers voting for the Bill showed that there was not any very great amount of feeling on the subject among the Irish Members, for, while they numbered 103, only 27 in one case and 38 in the other felt it necessary to give their votes in its favour. Neither had the Bill made any progress in succeeding Sessions, for, in 1876, it never reached a second reading, and in 1878 it was a dropped measure. From these facts, it appeared to his mind that the subject was not one of urgency, and that it was one in which the Irish people took very little interest. Beyond that, he would say that he heard with astonishment the statement made by the hon. Member for Youghal (Sir Joseph M'Kenna) that the Act was introduced and carried by surprise, whereas it had received the fullest consideration, although it passed its final stages at the end of a Session when many Peers and Members had ceased to attend the Irish Parliament, as was the case now with the Imperial Parliament. There were extant reports of elaborate speeches and long discussions on the provisions of the Bill, and, after a debate of two days, in which Mr. Grattan took part, the second reading was carried by a large majority. The struggle was renewed in Committee, with similar results. The existing Act did not in any way interfere with ordinary meetings, or with the right of petitioning. What it did prevent was, a number of persons presuming to set themselves up as an elected body and assuming power which really belonged only to Parliament. He could not suppose that hon. Mhmbers would support the Bill without some motive. They all knew that Home Rule was advocated in the sense that there should be an Irish Parliament—that there should be a House established in Ireland to deal mainly with local affairs, and that their Friends should still have the privilege of appearing at Westminster in connection with Imperial questions. He should be sorry to lose the pleasure of the presence of hon. Gentlemen from Ireland; but there could be no doubt that if the Act now under consideration were repealed, something of that kind might be started. Why interfere with a Statute when it operated beneficially, and did not hinder that which ordinarily would be legal? There was an old proverb to the effect that in vain was the net spread in presence of any bird, and a proposal more likely, if adopted, to lead his hon. Friends into diffiulty could not be imagined. Were it to be approved of, the Chief Secretary and the Attorney General for Ireland must undertake beforehand to lay down all the cases to which the Act would not apply, either by amending it, or by making a statement to the House. It had been said that the Act had prevented perfectly legal and harmless assemblies. If it had done so, the facts ought to have been stated to the House. But no single case had been cited—and he challenged hon. Members opposite to produce one—in which it had been used oppressively, or for other purposes other than those it was avowedly designed to meet. The hon. and learned Member for Limerick (Mr. O'Shaughnessy) had said that bodies of persons in Ireland being without arms would not be of political importance; but although they might not have arms they would have influence, and that influence might be exercised by means of terrorism and force, which it would be very difficult indeed to counteract, and in a manner which would be most dangerous to the commonwealth of the United Kingdom. Entertaining these views, he should move the rejeciion of the Bill.

Amendment proposed, to leave out the word "now," and at the end of the Question to add the words "upon this day six months."—(*Mr. Marten.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question."

MAJOR NOLAN thought the hon. and learned Member opposite (Mr. Marten) had made use of an argument very much of a Party character, and in his speech seemed anxious that his own Party should not have the whole responsibility of rejecting the Bill. Feeling, perhaps, that its rejection would be an act of injustice, he seemed to be anxious to attach much of the responsibility for the act to the Liberal Party. He had referred to the noble Lord who led the Opposition (the Marquess of Hartington) and to the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Greenwich (Mr. Gladstone) as persons who, having done so much for Ireland, had not taken up the question. The most illustrious living Irishman had spoken of the right hon. Member for Greenwich as having written his name upon the history of Ireland with a pencil of light; and he (Major Nolan) thought there could be no doubt that the late Ministry had done more for Ireland than any Ministry which had ever sat in that House. A Land Bill had been introduced, and although the measure was insufficient, it was still a step in the right direction. The Church had been disestablished and the Ballot had been given to the electors. In fact, so much had been done that the complaint of want of time to do more might be fairly urged; but such could not be said of the Government to whom the Irish Members now appealed to do something in the same direction. They had undertaken the settlement of very few Irish questions. With the exception of the Coercion Act, and a small measure on Education, they seemed unwilling to entertain them. To the debate of 1872 he (Major Nolan) did not attach much importance; but with reference to the support which this measure for repeal had hitherto received, the hon. and learned Member was quite right in saying that, in 1875, there was not a sufficient number of Members on that side of the House voting for the proposition now made by the hon. Member for Youghal (Sir Joseph M'Kenna); but still, if his memory served him rightly, at least two or three times the number voted for repeal as compared with those that voted against it, and it was only fair to conclude that when there was a large majority of Irish Representatives supporting any particular measure or question, the voice of the country was fairly expressed. It should also be remembered that many hon. Members on the occasion referred to were absent, for there was a grand review at Woolwich at the time. Beyond that, it might be noticed that the Bill did not stand first on the Orders of the Day. But if the hon. and learned Member really attached such importance to figures and numbers as he seemed to do, he (Major Nolan) would ask him to look at the appearance of the House on the present occasion. On the Conservative Benches opposite he had seen three Irish Members, one of them an official who appeared to take an interest in the Bill; whereas the Benches on that side of the House from which he spoke had been throughout well filled. The hon. and learned Member opposite had supported the existing Act, because it was declared to be right in Ireland in 1793. The Act which the Bill proposed to repeal was the outcome of the exaggerated notions and fears of 1793. The French Convention had put 500,000 armed men in the field and bid defiance to all Europe. The Monarchs of Europe were frightened at the success of the Legislative Assembly, and it was believed that something wonderful and fearful would result if a Parliament thoroughly free assembled in Ireland. The example of France led to exaggerated notions of the armed force a free people would employ; but when they all knew that larger forces had been put in the field by absolute Monarchies, they could not attach that extreme importance to the meetings of men for the discussion of national questions. In 1793 there was a very exclusive and aristocratic party in Ireland, and it was difficult for a man not of that party to secure a seat in the Parliament, and it could not be assumed there was any resemblance between 1793 and 1879. He would ask the hon. and learned Gentleman to reflect upon the circumstances of that period, and to say whether it followed for one moment that a measure passed for 1793 was necessarily good and proper in 1879? So far from that being the case, it would be found that one of the most distinguished Irishmen (Mr. Grattan) had eloquently denounced the Statute against which they were now protesting. The hon. and learned Member opposite had also said that the Act had not been put oppressively in force; but what did he mean by the word oppressively? That, practically, meant that the Act had operated so successfully that Irishmen had not dared to meet in opposition to it. He (Major Nolan) attended a short time since a meeting held in London of the delegates from the agricultural labourers in favour of household suffrage, and he would have gladly called a similar meeting to support the same object in Ireland could he have done so; but the state of the law prevented Ireland joining in that Constitutional movement. Had he done so, he would have been amenable to punishment. Why should the people of Ireland not have an opportunity of expressing their opinions in the same manner as the people of England, and of endeavouring to give effect, by perfectly legitimate means, to their views on the Land Question, the Education Question, the Franchise Question, and other important subjects? It had often been said that meetings of delegates were required in Ireland, and that it was sufficient for hon. Members to come to the House and express their grievances. They had done so over and over again. They had repeatedly brought forward their grievances. They had taken Divisions. No one could complain that they had not brought forward their complaints often enough. But they had been met with various arguments in opposition to their proposals, and amongst these arguments was the statement that they did not represent the Irish people. They were told that there was no agitation and no clamour in Ireland, and that there were no Petitions from that country. How could there be, when the Government prevented the inhabitants of Ireland from meeting in a perfectly natural and legitimate manner in Dublin or elsewhere, in order to confer together on some particular and important question? The meeting might be permitted on sufferance; but that was putting public opinion under the thumb of the Government, who would take credit for not instituting a prosecution. Take a particular instance—not more than two years since, Irish Members were anxious to gather the opinions of people from different parts of the country on their Parliamentary policy, and they were anxious also to have at the conference representatives of Irishmen living in England. The senior Member for Limerick (Mr. Butt) was asked could such a meeting be legally held?—and it was only by the greatest precaution that a meeting could be held in Dublin. The meeting was held, and, under the skilful pilotage of that able lawyer, illegality was avoided; but still it had not been free from anxiety, and had been somewhat cramped. The people simply came forward, but not as elected representatives. It was a representative meeting, but not such a meeting as it would have been had the Act not been in force. Delegates met in England, and often with the best results; and if such meetings could be held in Ireland, attended by elected representatives of the interests of the big farmers and of the little farmers, they would go far to find a settlement of the Land Question, and the Irish views would find expression in the House even more definitely than they now did. He thought the Government, in not supporting the Bill, or at least mitigating grievances, would be guilty of an act of the greatest unfairness. It would increase the authority of hon. Members in that House; and he could not help thinking that if there were such an increase of authority, the Government would find Irish Representatives more ready to come forward and support them when they asked Votes for the many wars in which they were engaged.

Mr. BLENNERHASSETT said, he should endeavour to supply the omission of the hon. and learned Member for Cambridge (Mr. Marten), and deal with this question on broad Constitutional principles. For that purpose, he should ask the House to go back to a certain Wednesday afternoon, 86 years ago, when the debate took place which had been alluded to more than once in the course of the present discussion. On the 17th of July, 1793, when the second reading of the Convention Bill was proposed, the rejection of the measure was moved by Mr. Grattan, who pointed out—and the declaration was eminently worth recalling—that

> "If this Bill had been the law of the land, four great events could never have taken place—the independence of the Irish Parliament, the Emancipation of the Irish Catholics, the Revolution in Great Britain, and the great event that followed from it—the succession of the Hanoverian Dynasty. The glorious and immortal Assembly purporting to represent the people of England, that placed the Crown on the head of William and Mary, comes under every clause of this Bill descriptive of illegal assembly. Had

such a Bill been the law of England, and been executed, Lord Somers and the Leaders of the Revolution must have been apprehended."

Mr. Grattan also said—

> "I have objected to this Bill as an innovation on the Constitution. I object to it also as an innovation on the system of criminal jurisprudence. It puts the peace officer in the place of the Court of Justice in cases where there is neither tumult nor danger of tumult. It is true the common law makes him the judge of the imminent danger to which society is exposed from a numerous body armed and proceeding to execute an illegal purpose, or a legal purpose in an illegal and tumultuous manner; but it is the force, or imminent danger of force, that brings the subject under the cognizance of the subordinate magistrate. The illegality clause would only bring him under the cognizance of the Courts of Justice. This Bill gives the peace officer, in the instance of a peaceful meeting assembled to do a legal act—such as to frame a Petition for those who have deputed them to do so—to judge of the fact of the deputation, of the manner of exercising that trust, and of the public nature of the object of it, with right of entry, and power to call in the military. Here is the principle of the Riot Act applied to the peaceful communication of sentiment."

Mr. Grattan spoke on that occasion as a liberal and enlightened statesman, as well as an Irish patriot; and he concluded by saying—

> "The friends of the Bill have seized the opportunity of public panic which certain excesses have excited. I condemn both the excesses and the remedy. Instead of either, I am for the Constitution of England."

Mr. Grattan was replied to by the then Attorney General, who, however, took up an attitude which had been entirely unsupported by subsequent facts. The next speaker on the occasion to which he referred was Mr. Hardy, who

> "entered into a short review of the different Conventions that have met in Ireland within a few years, and observed that where they attempted to dictate to Parliament, Parliament was enabled to disperse them with ease, as was the case in 1783; but that, when their propositions were founded in reason, and Parliament made reasonable concessions, then they dispersed themselves, as the late Roman Catholic Convention did."

Then there was the speech of Dr. Brown, who declared—

> "For God's sake, if you must sacrifice on the altar of peace, do not immolate liberty as the victim."

Following Dr. Brown came no less a person than Mr. Curran, with some observations which ought to be a warning to the present Attorney General for Ireland. Mr. Curran confessed himself

> "Struck with horror at hearing the first Legal Officer of the Crown appealing to the uninformed judgments of the country gentlemen for justification in subverting one of the principal pillars of the British Constitution."

Mr. Curran showed that the constituent, when he elected a Representative, did not part with all his powers; but retained a right, above all, to watch the conduct of Parliament. He also showed that the right of the people to petition by delegation was confirmed by the British Law, which prevented more than 20 people from presenting a Petition, and, of course, those 20 must be delegates of the rest; and that that very principle had been discussed in the British Parliament in 1780, and confirmed to the people. The second reading of the Bill was carried by a large majority; but on the very next day—Thursday, June 18, 1793—on the Motion for going into Committee, Mr. Grattan pointed out that the principle of the measure was that any representation, not of the people only, but of any description whatever thereof, for a public purpose, save only the House, was an unlawful assembly. Mr. Grattan then said—

> "Gentlemen say that a national Confederation at Athlone was intended. If that is the object of the Bill, direct the Bill to that object. Do not extend the Bill to every delegation from any county, city, town, or district, from any description of any number of His Majesty's subjects appointed to procure redress in any abuse relating to Church or State. My objection to your Bill is that it is a trick, making a supposed National Convention at Athlone in 1793 a pretext for the prevention of delegation for ever. Does it follow, because the supposed National Convention at Athlone should be prevented, that all committees of correspondence on the subject of redress should be put down for ever? No county, no city, no description of men can delegate a few individuals to concert the most legal and effectual method of procuring for an acknowledged abuse a temperate remedy. The Bill avails itself of the present panic to abridge popular rights; and it finds support in sanguine, but weak minds, who know there is a disease, but have not sense to discover the remedy, and think that a Convention Bill is to restore us all to peace—who think that in time of local disturbance the remedy is a Bill, not against the particular disturbance, but against the liberty of the people."

Those were the words of Mr. Grattan, and it was a significant comment upon his language that, five years after they were used, the Irish Rebellion of 1798 took place. Another speaker in the debate to which he was still referring was Major Doyle, a man who might be unknown to fame, but who was still a very sensible man, and a man who could express his thoughts in a clear and common-sense fashion. Major Doyle said—

> "Whilst popular misconception has a tongue it gives you warning; but if you constrain discontent to be in secret, discussion will become conspiracy, and attempts at redress will degenerate into hostile projects, sanguinary in proportion to the danger hazarded in their formation."

The hon. and learned Member opposite (Mr. Marten) had alluded to the violence, tumult, and terrorism which, he said, might take place if the Act were repealed. But the arguments of the hon. and learned Gentleman had been anticipated by Mr. Curran, who said—

> "If the people had a right to petition, as was allowed on all hands, they must also have a right to do so in the most convenient manner, which was evidently delegation. Why was the House of Commons elected? Why did not the people themselves assemble and exercise their rights as a Third Estate? Because such proceedings must be attended with a violation of good order, and must be productive of tumult. If, on a matter of general concern, the people, exercising their undoubted right, should meet at large in their respective towns and counties to petition, would not the same inconvenience follow? Could it be convenient, then, for the people to govern themselves in this instance by the same principle as in exercising their legislative functions. Certainly not."

Another speaker, Sir Boyle Roche, who might be called the "Jingo" of the Irish Parliament of that day, described the country as being over head and ears in sedition. Some echoes to a similar effect still lingered on the Benches opposite. Sir Boyle added—

> "That there were a great many 'Jacks the painter' in the land. The House, however, had one good stake in the hedge—the exertions of a patriotic Army. The effusion of anarchy and confusion had done much mischief, and if any Convention should presume to assume authority, he hoped Parliament would not be so chicken-hearted as to suffer it."

On the next day, Friday, July 19, 1793, the Report on the Bill was brought up, and one of the most distinguished Members of the Irish Parliament (Mr. George Ponsonby) then declared that he conceived the measure to be a direct attack upon the vital principles of the Constitution. Well, the Bill was successfully passed into law; but the illustrious names which had made the Irish Parliament live in history were found voting against it. The only name of any note on the other side was that of Sir John Parnell. Grattan, Curran, and Ponsonby were powerless in a corrupt Assembly not representing Irish people, and free from the healthy influence of popular control. The eloquent voices of those great men were raised for a time in vain; but, being dead, they yet spoke to them. He did not apologize for having asked the House to listen, after the lapse of many years, to the words of famous men whose "distant footsteps echo through the corridors of time." Their arguments were founded on great Constitutional principles, and were as fresh, as vigorous, and unanswerable now, as they were on that far-off Wednesday in the old Irish House of Commons. How weak, how frivolous, how feeble, were the official pleadings with which they had been met, and how completely had the position taken up by the supporters of that Statute been falsified by events! The arguments against the existing Act had never been answered. Would they be answered on this occasion? Hon. Members opposite could not complain that in this matter they had not found foemen worthy of their steel; but he did not think the arguments to which he referred would or could be answered. He hoped that truth and justice would at least be allowed to prevail; they must prevail in the end. Let not the House think that the maintenance of this Act was a mere slight and sentimental grievance. No Act which violated the principles of the Constitution and imposed penalties upon the free expression of public opinion could be slight or trifling. If that Act existed in England, the great measures of the century to which Englishmen owed so much of their freedom and prosperity might never have been carried. The Corn Law League would have been illegal, and the great movement for Parliamentary Reform might have been crushed by prosecutions. An unconstitutional and coercive measure was not needed in order to prevent and to vindicate the violation of the law. The common law of the land was amply sufficient for that. Against any real peril and conspiracy the Act now sought to be repealed was impotent and useless; it could not be enforced without tyranny; and a law which could not be enforced without tyranny should not be allowed to disgrace the pages of the Statute Book for a single day.

MR. SERJEANT SIMON said, as an English Member, he could not allow the opportunity to pass without rising upon the Liberal side of the House to repudiate the position which had been taken up by the hon. and learned Gentleman opposite (Mr. Marten). He had listened with astonishment—he might almost say with distress—to the speech of the hon. and learned Member. The hon. and learned Gentleman had avoided the Constitutional question as to the right of public meeting, and his contention that because the measure was good for the period when it was passed it was proper for the present time, would militate against the repeal of any law to which exception might be taken. The hon. and learned Gentleman had also said that this Act had not been passed in a hurry or in a panic; but he (Mr. Serjeant Simon) declared advisedly that there never was a Statute which received the sanction of the Irish Legislature, or of any other Legislature, that was passed under circumstances of greater panic than the enactment which was now the subject of discussion. What were the circumstances of the period in question? The Catholics had been struggling for emancipation. They had obtained, to some extent, a release from their disabilities; they had procured the franchise such as it was—that was to say, the right of sending their Protestant masters to rule over them in an Irish Parliament. At that time Europe was in the midst of a great warlike movement; and the Irish, chafing under English rule, had been led to expect help from France, and, in order to suppress disaffection, it was attempted to call out the Militia. But the peasantry rose in every part of Ireland to prevent the Militia being called out, and there were sanguinary contests all over the country. In short, Ireland was then in a state of complete insurrection. A Parliament was sitting in Dublin; it had given the Catholics the franchise, and the Civil Lists were being discussed, when, in the month of July, 1793, the Convention Bill was brought in. How could his hon. and learned Friend say, under these circumstances, that the measure was not passed when there was a panic? No doubt, a Convention had been summoned to meet at Athlone; but it had not been called in order to supersede the Government, but for the purpose of obtaining a reform of the Irish Parliament. Would his hon. and learned Friend opposite resist the repeal of such a measure as this if it were in operation in England? Why, then, resist its repeal because it was in operation in Ireland? Meetings of delegates in England had been held for various purposes. They had congresses of trades unions every year to regulate their interests, with a view to legislation; gatherings of representatives from the Associated Chambers of Commerce to consider commercial affairs; and that very Session a Bill emanating from that body had been brought forward to alter the law of bankruptcy. The Nonconformists sent their delegates to the great towns to assist in the work of disestablishing the English Church. Would his hon. and learned Friend opposite say that the law ought to step in and prevent such gatherings as those? If there was any part of their history which Englishmen ought to deplore, it was the history of their relations to Ireland. He never read the history of those relations without feeling that if he were an Irishman he should not be content until he had removed every legislative trace in connection with them. It appeared to him that it would be sound wisdom for hon. Gentlemen to meet their Irish fellow-subjects, not in a spirit of resistance, but in a spirit of conciliation; and no part of his Parliamentary life had given him greater satisfaction than that in which he had been enabled to assist in promoting some of the Irish measures which had been passed by the late Administration. The Act which was being now debated was simply a remnant of that system of penal legislation which ought ever to be a subject to be lamented; and if there were no other cause for its repeal than that of its manifest injustice and inequality, he thought that of itself was sufficient ground. He should much more gladly support measures introduced by Her Majesty's Government to benefit Ireland, than see the Government going in the teeth of Irish opinion and Irish feeling. Why should the Irish people not have the Parliamentary franchise as it existed in England? Why should they not have the same municipal representation? Why should they not have the same right of public meeting? The right of public meeting was a precious liberty; and while there was any restrictive legislation which prevented the exercise of that right, hon. Members could not proclaim that perfect equality existed between England and their Irish fellow-countrymen.

MR. J. COWEN trusted the Government would be able to see their way to consent to the repeal of this obsolete, but exasperating Statute. It was a remnant of the odious penal laws once levelled against their Catholic fellow-countrymen, which no liberal-minded Englishman could now think of without regret, or speak of without humiliation. It offered neither indemnity for the past, nor security for the future. It only fostered a spirit of resentment by maintaining a recollection of an evil and unhappy era in our national history. It was powerless to prevent any outburst of popular wrath, and yet it was sufficient to keep running an angry and irritating social sore. The Act did not interfere with the common right of holding public meetings. That was enjoyed by Ireland and England equally and alike. The Irish people could muster in menacing numbers on the classic hill of Tara, or at Trim, or at Mullaghmast. Indignant and animated Celtic orators could declaim through all the scales on the gamut of political invective against the sad fate that linked the fortunes of their race with that of the Saxon. They could evoke Party feeling, or rouse religious animosities against the Union as an Act that had been conceived in corruption, carried by craft, and enforced by violence. They might attempt, if they were so minded, to overawe the Government of the day by threats. The Act of 1793 would not prevent them. But if, instead of holding threatening assemblies 500,000 strong, such as gathered round O'Connell 30 years ago, a deliberative council of representative men, sent from different counties in Ireland, met quietly in a room in Dublin, and strove, not by force, but by persuasion—not by noise, but by argument—not amidst clamour, but calmly to put their case for the repeal of a specified law, or the reform of a social usage, the law would step in and prevent them. To summarize the scope in a sentence, it might be said to have offered a premium to passion and violence, and to have put a penalty upon representation and reason. The Act did not concern itself so much about the aim of a meeting, as about the mode in which it was summoned. It might be held for a political or philosophical, for a social, scientific, or theological object. That was matterless. The purpose of the promoters of the Act was palpable enough. They levelled it at the Catholics and the Nationalists; but it was drawn so loosely as to bring within its meshes all manner of representative bodies, however wide their operations, or however harmless their designs. A meeting, in itself not only legal but commendable, was made by this antiquated and obnoxious Act illegal. It prevented representative gatherings of mechanics, merchants, medical men, or farmers, equally with political conventions. Its unlimited and unqualified application was its strongest condemnation. He asked for the repeal of the Act, because it was out of harmony with the spirit as well as with the letter of all modern legislation. The time was, and that, unfortunately, not long since, when a Catholic was an outcast in Ireland. He was in the country, but not of it. Every avenue to political influence, social distinction, or civil authority, was barred against him. He was denied admission to the Bank, the Bench, and the Bar—to the University, the Exchange, and the medical schools. By an iniquitous enactment he was prevented accumulating property, and then was upbraided with being poverty-stricken. The raw material of knowledge was not only heavily taxed, but the most rudimentary machinery of education was impeded by legal fetters, and then it was made an offence that he was ignorant. This harsh and outrageous code of pains and penalties had now been abandoned, never more, he trusted, to be restored. A juster spirit pervaded their legislation, a more generous and genial sentiment was entertained for those who differed from the common faith of Englishmen. Catholics now could become not only electors, but Representatives — not only jurors, but Judges, which they were not permitted to be when this Act was passed. The country had been bettered, the institutions had been strengthened, and the breath of our national life had been sweetened by this more enlightened course of rule. But in the midst of a chorus of conciliation one inharmonious chord was heard. Among these self-gratulatory cries a disturbing element obtruded itself. The Act sought to be repealed unpleasantly forced itself upon them as a legacy of darker days. Since Parliament was last in Session the handful of unfortunate men who had been charged with complicity in the political rising of 1866-7 had been set at liberty. It was now the proud and happy boast of Englishmen that there was not within the compass of the British Isles one man who languished behind bolts and bars for his political opinions. He gave all honour to the Government for having—tardily, perhaps—but still for having freed the last of the Fenians. He invited them to secure added encomiums, by destroying the last vestige of the penal code that a relentless persecution once fastened upon the followers of the Catholic faith. The circumstances under which that Act was passed threw a lurid light over its history. Ireland at that period, as it had been too frequently since, was England's difficulty. The Government strove to maintain their authority by playing off the prejudices and the jealousies of one section of the people against the other. But, in 1793, their hold on Ireland was exceptionally precarious, as they had opponents in the North and South alike. What were popularly termed French principles had at that time taken firm root in Ulster. Wolfe Tone, and his United Irishmen, under the cover of seeking Parliamentary Reform, were engaged in an active and successful Republican propaganda. The English Government was about to commit itself to the European crusade against regenerated France. It became, therefore, specially necessary for the authorities to establish better relations with the Irish Catholics. With this view, the shabby Act of Sir Hercules Langrish—which permitted Catholics to marry Protestants, to practise at the Bar, and made other trifling concessions—was allowed to pass the Irish Legislature. It did not, and could not, satisfy the Catholic population. They held a Convention in Dublin, drew up a Petition to the King, praying for a redress of grievances, and sent delegates with it to London. The Petition was received courteously, and the delegation was sent home with no end of fine phrases. There was no evidence, however, that these phrases would resolve themselves into substantial deeds, and the Catholics drifted more closely into union with the Radical Protestants of the North. With a view of putting their claims more pointedly before the Legislature, another Catholic Convention was arranged to be held at Athlone, and the Act they were now asked to repeal was passed to prevent the gathering. It was introduced to the Irish Parliament by Lord Clare, the then Chancellor. This Irish statesman was a sort of small Bismarck. He believed it was possible to stamp out political conviction by force. He dreamt that he could cut the Catholic creed to pieces as easily as his soldiers could slaughter the Catholic advocates. This was the common mistake of all despots. They imagined that by destroying the clay receptacle from which thought springs they could annihilate thought itself. It was a miserable mistake. Thought would never die. It would float like thistledown on the stormy stream of time—

> Bearing a germ beneath its tiny car—
> A germ predestined to become a tree,
> To fall on fruitful soil, and on its boughs
> Bear seed enough to stock the universe."

Lord Clare painfully realized the correctness of this poetic truth. The Irish Nationalists and Catholics, being deprived of the right to meet and deliberate openly in the presence of the world, betook themselves to plot and rebellion. The passing of the Convention Act was followed by a widespread conspiracy, which culminated in the melancholy but memorable Rising of 1798-9. The lives of 150,000 Irishmen and 20,000 Englishmen were sacrificed. Triangles, tortures, flogging, pitchcaps, and hanging reigned for a time supreme. That was the blackest chapter in the modern history of Britain. He did not say—he did not think—that the passing of the Convention Act alone caused the insurrection of 1798; but he did contend that it was a potent factor in promoting that outburst of national indignation. A like result sprung from like causes in England. Lord Castlereagh strove to strangle thought as he strangled political opponents, by force, in this country. The passage of his famous, or rather infamous, six Acts, which for the time annihilated liberty of speech, and established a reign of terror, was succeeded by extensive plots which culminated in the Cato Street Conspiracy. As the Convention Act had helped to precipitate the Rebellion of 1798, so the six Acts of Castlereagh provoked Thistlewood's plot. Let them contrast the policy of those days with the more liberal mode of dealing with political opponents in later times. In 1838-9-40, the working classes of this country were stirred more strongly than they ever were before, or ever had been since. All their hopes for political and social betterance centred round the People's Charter, and faith in that document was with them a religion. The Chartists held a Convention in London. It sat conterminous with the Parliament of the day. The delegates made speeches, passed resolutions, and adopted petitions. If the law of this country had been strictly enforced, such a gathering at that time could not have been legally composed of more than 39 persons; but nearly double that number took part in its proceedings. Yet no attempt was made to interfere with them. The Government of Lord Melbourne refused to yield to the pressure that was put upon them in that House to disperse the Convention. And what was the result? When a medical man wished to deal with an internal irritation, he strove to bring the inflammatory matter to the surface. If he saw it upon the skin, he could prescribe with more success than he could if it was buried beneath bones and flesh. The same rule applied to the body politic as to the material frame. If political discontent had always had an opportunity of showing itself openly before the world, its complaints could have been redressed, and the fallacy of its doctrines could have been exposed. If the Chartist Convention had been dealt with as the Irish Conventions were, they would in all likelihood have had a rising in England. As it was, the people were satisfied with the opportunity they had had of ventilating their grievances. By peaceful, agitation, the main principles of that historic document had become, or were becoming, incorporated in the Constitution of the country. He asked the House to contrast the results that had flowed from the arbitrary and despotic course pursued in Ireland —and in England under Castlereagh— with the more conciliatory course taken in the time of the Chartists, and mark the consequences that had followed the opposite lines of action. With a view of consigning to oblivion a Statute of bad eminence, as well as for removing a source of irritation, he trusted the Government would consent to the repeal of the objectionable measure that the Irish Parliament, at the instance of Lord Clare, had made law.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. GIBSON) said, he had listened with much attention to the eloquent speech of the hon. Gentleman the Member for Newcastle (Mr. Cowen), and he could not help thinking that the hon. Gentleman had somewhat misconceived the history and character of this measure; because, if he had not done so, he (the Attorney General for Ireland) did not believe he would have described it as an exasperating measure which owed its origin to corruption. It must be borne in mind that this Act was levelled at no particular class, and at no particular religion; because the Conventions which had existed in Ireland, and against whom it was intended, had been largely supported and upheld both by Protestants and Roman Catholics. It was, therefore, not a Party measure, nor did he think it could be traced to corruption. It was passed by the Irish Parliament, he must remind the House, as an immediate object, to prevent the holding of a Convention which was to take place at Athlone. He gathered from the speeches of some hon. Gentlemen opposite that they thought the Executive of that day would have done well to allow that Convention to take place; but that was not the opinion given at the time the Bill was passed by Mr. Grattan, a most distinguished Irishman, of whom all on both sides of the House were proud, and who was one of the principal opponents of the Act now under discussion. When speaking of the Convention of Athlone, Mr. Grattan said that such a meeting should be "withstood"—that was, if necessary, by force—as strong a word as could be suggested—for, he said, such an assembly would not be a meeting to petition Parliament, but an assembly which would attempt to "put itself in the place of Parliament." That was a very short and clear statement, and one which he (the Attorney General for Ireland) thought showed the necessity at that time of putting upon the Statute Book the Convention Act. It was the object of those who passed the Statute to obtain under its provisions what Mr. Grattan thought might be attained in a different manner. As had been admitted by the Mover and Seconder of this Bill, this Act did not interfere with the right of public meeting. It did not in any way interfere with the fullest and freest discussion of public questions, or with the right of petitioning the Sovereign or Parliament. But what it did do—to take the words of Mr. Grattan, who was a good authority upon this subject—was to forbid or put difficulties in the way of the meeting of an illegal assembly which sought to put itself in the place of Parliament. He asked whether such an object was not common sense, and reasonable and fair? Was it not fair and reasonable for the Legislature to say that it was not right that there should be a Convention of delegates who purported to be the representatives of the people? Parliament was the National Council. Now, what was this Act? What was its title? Its title was—

> "An Act to prevent the election or appointment of Unlawful Assemblies, under the pretence of preparing or presenting Petitions or other Addresses to His Majesty or Parliament."

He asked whether that was not a most reasonable title? Then came the Preamble—and what was that? It recited that—

> "The election or appointment of Assemblies purporting to represent the people under the pretence of preparing Petitions might be made to serve the ends of factious or seditious persons."

If that were so, would it not be right to have an Act of Parliament to prevent it? Would it not be reasonable and fair, to use the words of the Act of Parliament, that such unlawful assemblies directed to factious ends should be suppressed, provided that no extravagant penalties were imposed, and no such penalties were imposed in the present case? Then, as to the enacting part of the Statute. It enacted that—

> "All Assemblies shall be unlawful which shall assume to be, or be construed to represent, the people of this Realm."

That was very carefully and cautiously expressed. The meaning of the Act was very much that of the passage he had already quoted from Mr. Grattan, and its object he thought it desirable and even necessary to attain. Then the Act went on to certain provisions which made the object of the Act clear, and it then made exceptions in favour of the knights, citizens, and burgesses of Parliament, showing that it was not intended to prevent the assembling of Members of Parliament out of Session, or otherwise than in Parliament. Assuming that this Act of Parliament was moderately administered in the future—and everybody admitted that it had been moderately administered in the past—he thought it not an unreasonable Act, and one which no special grievance could be urged against. He gathered, both from the hon. Member for Youghal (Sir Joseph M'Kenna), and the hon. and learned Member for Limerick (Mr. O'Shaughnessy), that no complaint could be made of the way in which the Act had been carried out in the past; and the only case which had been raised to-day in the argument against the Act by Irish Members was that the words of the Act of Parliament —the object of which was admitted to be reasonable on all hands—were so wide, that it might be used to prevent proper and legal meetings not assuming to represent the people. That was to say, it was possible that an extravagant interpretation might be placed upon its provisions; but he thought they must look at the matter in a spirit of common sense; and he must point out that, from 1793, when the Act was passed, to 1879, which was not far from a century, there had not been a single particle of evidence adduced to show a single evil consequence had resulted from this Act. Since the Act was passed a great number of men had been responsible for the Executive of Ireland; but not a single inconvenience or a single unjust use of this Act had been made. He saw some hon. Gentlemen apparently preparing to speak, and, of course, he would not attempt to prophesy what they might say; but he would say that this debate commenced at 12 o'clock, and it was then half-past 4, and during that time not a single statement had been made that the Act had ever been enforced to interfere with a legitimate expression of public opinion. In previous debates upon this subject it had been said that the Act had been put in force, and that was quite true. The first occasion was when Mr. O'Connell, whose political life they were all acquainted with, summoned what was intended to be a rival in influence and authority to the House of Parliament. Mr. O'Connell summoned what he avowedly called a National Convention. He (the Attorney General for Ireland) asked whether it was not reasonable for the Executive of the day to say—"There is an Imperial Parliament that is the Convention of the Nation, and that must be regarded as the grand inquest of the nation, and we will avail ourselves of the powers of the Act of Parliament which has been passed, and forbid this meeting to be summoned." The next case was nearer our own times, only 30 years ago, when Mr. Smith O'Brien summoned not what he called a Convention, but what was practically the same thing, a National Council. There was simply the substitution of the word Council for Convention. He asked whether it was reasonable to say that that assembly, which professed to be a rival to Parliament, should have been allowed to be held? Was it not right that the Executive should, as they did, warn the people that this would be an illegal meeting? They did so warn the people, and that meeting was not held. But for 31 years, from that time to this, the Act had never, he believed, been again applied. It had been said that there was no such Act in force in England; but he must point out that there was some difference in the condition and circumstances of the two countries which made it necessary to deal differently with them. It must be borne in mind that England had not been disturbed by any difference of opinion as to the Constitution of the Government of the country for a great number of years, as had been the case in Ireland, and, therefore, it was somewhat difficult to apply exactly the same ideas to the two countries. But neither in England nor Ireland was national delegation assuming to represent Parliament, permitted by the common law. Therefore, the prohibition was a part of the common law of the country. Whenever the circumstances of the country rendered it possible that such attempts at national delegation might be made, it would be better that the matter should not be left to the common law, which might culminate in a great trial, but that there should be a short and clear remedy with a definition about which there could be no mistake. The Act only made the offence under it punishable as a misdemeanour which did not involve any extreme punishment. It was a mistake to say that the English people had no law analagous to this. In the reign of Charles II. an Act was passed directed against unlawful and tumultuous petitioning, calculated to overawe that House, the language of which was very similar to that of the one under discussion, and there were possibly other Acts of a similar kind showing that each country dealt in the manner most appropriate to its circumstances with any attempts to supersede or overawe Parliament. In England the danger was from the tumultuous presentation of Petitions; whereas in Ireland the danger was from the meeting of delegates arrogating to themselves the position, character, and authority of Parliament, and in both cases Acts had been passed to prevent such occurrences. This subject was very fully debated in 1872, when a similar Bill to the one now before the House was rejected by a majority of 118; and on that occasion the noble Lord opposite (the Marquess of Hartington), who was then Chief Secretary for Ireland, went very fully into the question, and Mr. Baron Dowse, who was then Attorney General for Ireland, in a most witty and amusing speech, opposed the repeal of this Act, and was supported by Mr. Gladstone, who was then Prime Minister, on the ground that it strongly tended to prevent the assembly of bodies professing to rival or assume the place of Parliament. The history of the Act showed that the Act had never been put into operation, except in pursuance of the policy on which it was based. It had never been applied to the prevention of legal meetings. Under these circumstances, he could not very well understand the argument of hon. Gentlemen opposite. He could understand their course, if they had proposed to pass an Act preventing the application of the Convention Act to meetings other than those to which it was intended to apply; but that was not the operation of the Bill before them, which simply repealed the Act of 1793—that was to say, hon. Gentlemen were proposing to repeal an Act which was directed to a purpose with which they sympathized and towards an object which they approved, and which there was no reason to suppose ever had been or ever was likely to be applied to any other purpose. The Bill now before the House did not propose any qualifications, but sought to repeal the Act absolutely in the most unqualified way. He was not prepared to say that no such qualifications should be suggested, and he was quite sure that the Chief Secretary for Ireland and himself would be happy to consider closely and with attention any suggestions made; but it was another thing when they were not asked to give attention to such qualifications, but to repeal an Act of Parliament. It was when they were asked to do that, they must say that they did not think a case had been made out for it; and that, under the circumstances of the case, they thought it desirable the Act should remain on the Statute Book, trusting that it would be administered in the future as cautiously and as prudently, and with as much moderation, as in the past.

MR. SHAW LEFEVRE said, he should give his cordial support to the Bill. He had heard with great regret the right hon. and learned Gentleman the Attorney General for Ireland say that he intended to oppose it, for he thought that the Government would have done more wisely to allow the second reading of the Bill, and to make any Amendments they might think advisable in Committee. The Act of 1793 was passed when only Protestants were represented in Parliament, and the opinions of the Catholics, therefore, could not be represented. The consequence of this Act went far beyond what had been represented by the right hon. and learned Gentleman as its object, for under it meetings of delegates of trades unions and other bodies which were perfectly legal in England were illegal in Ireland. He could come to no other conclusion than that the Act of 1793 extended largely beyond what the framers of the Act intended it to go. Under those circumstances, he felt that it would be wise to consider the Act and to amend it, even if the Government were not prepared to repeal it. It was extremely unlikely, if it were repealed, that any meetings should now be held in Ireland in rivalry to Parliament; for in these modern days most persons would be convinced that to attend such assemblies, if convened, would simply be waste of time. Besides, such meetings were illegal under the common law. If, however, the Government desired to retain so much of the Act as related to such meetings, its provisions should be made applicable to England and Scotland as well as to Ireland, as he did not consider it wise to maintain this distinction between the legislation for Ireland and the legislation for this country. He believed that those who objected to Home Rule, and those who, like himself, wished to maintain the integrity of the Empire, would do well to remove all those differences which now existed between their legislation towards the two countries. Under those circumstances, he should support the second reading of the Bill, and it would be a wise step if the Government would allow it to go into Committee, when it could be amended.

MR. PARNELL said, he rose to say a few words in reply to the speech of the right hon. and learned Gentleman the Attorney General for Ireland. He (Mr. Parnell) had always been one of those who thought that the best way to deal with the Act was not to bring in Bills to repeal it, but to consider it, as he had always considered it, to be an obsolete Act. The speech of the right hon. and learned Gentleman, however, showed him that it was not necessary to treat the Act as obsolete. The right hon. and learned Gentleman had explained to the House at considerable length what his opinions were with respect to the Act. He had adopted the definition of Grattan with regard to the Athlone Convention, and he had explained that, in his opinion, as the responsible Law Officer of the Crown for Ireland, the real construction of the Act was the purview of the Preamble and Title. Now, the purview of the Preamble and Title simply amounted to this—a declaration against Conventions and assemblies arrogating to themselves the functions of Parliament. The common law of the land already provided for dealing with such illegal assemblies. Nobody on the Opposition side of the House would attempt to deny that an assembly arrogating to itself the functions of Parliament would be illegal. But it had not been generally known in Ireland that that was the construction the Law Officers of the Crown placed upon this Act. The fact that an Act of the last Government specially exempted the delegates under the Irish Church Act from the operation of the Act under discussion showed that the opinion of the last Government did not coincide with the opinion of the right hon. and learned Gentleman the Attorney General for Ireland. The decision of the right hon. and learned Gentleman would, however, clear up matters very considerably in Ireland. They had always been desirous of holding a Convention, not for the purpose of arrogating to themselves the functions of Parliament, but for the purpose of eliciting public opinion; but because of their view of the Act they had felt themselves debarred from any such course. Now, however, they had it from the highest authority that such assemblies could not be illegal. Under these circumstances, he thought the Government might very fairly adopt a modification of the Bill, and he believed that the hon. Member who proposed the second reading (Sir Joseph M'Kenna) would agree to such a modification—namely, that the Preamble, or the spirit of the Preamble, of the Act of 1793 should be embodied in a Bill, and that the Bill should be an amending Act of the 1793 measure. In that way, every possible difficulty or doubt would be removed as to the legality of holding a Convention next year in Dublin for the purpose of collecting certain political information. He thought the right hon. and learned Attorney General for Ireland would do well to consider whether he would allow the present Bill to go into Committee, in order that modifications might be made in its provisions to give effect to the interpretation of the Act of 1793.

Mr. SYNAN said, he was anxious for a Division on the Bill, and did not desire to detain the House at length. He rose principally for the purpose of replying to a few of the points put forward by the right hon. and learned Gentleman the Attorney General for Ireland in the very able argument, very moderately worded, that he had made, and he thought he would convince the House that there was no foundation for his argument. The right hon. and learned Gentleman had said that the Act of 1793 was intended to hit at the Convention of Athlone. It was intended to strike at that meeting, and all similar meetings. What was the state of Ireland at the time that Bill was brought in? There were two associations in Ireland—a Reform Association and a Catholic Association. All Ireland was in commotion; and the Act was intended both for the Reform Association and for the Catholic Association, and the Government succeeded so well by the threat of the Bill that they prevented the Reform Association from proceeding in a Constitutional way, and drove that Reform Association into the United Irishmen Society and the country into the Rebellion of 1798. They prevented the Catholic Association from stating or making any further demands and the Act was used, not for the purpose of preventing illegal meetings, but for the purpose of preventing Constitutional agitation as well. The right hon. and learned Gentleman had challenged them to produce instances in which the Act was put into force against a Constitutional Convention. He would give him one instance. It was put in force in 1812 against the Catholic Convention in Dublin, when that Convention was suppressed. Lord Fingall prosecuted, and Mr. Kirnian convicted. The Act also drove O'Connell into abandoning meetings by delegates, and holding large popular gatherings. They did not want a Convention for the purpose of setting up a rival Parliament, but for the purposes of free debate, and for such purposes a Convention of delegates was better than a tumultuous assemblage. It was, therefore, the interest of the Government to allow this to be done legally. The Bill did not propose to do anything illegal. The common law of the land provided against illegal meetings; but when the right hon. and learned Gentleman told him that there were similar Acts in England he was drawing upon his imagination. There was no analogy between the Acts of Charles II. and the Convention Act. The former were passed to prevent the presentation of Petitions to the Crown or to Parliament, in such a manner as might overawe them. In fact, they were the converse of each other; the Convention Act led to tumultuous meetings; the Acts of Charles prevented them. If they could depend on the good intention of the right hon. and learned Gentleman the Attorney General for Ireland being always carried out, even beyond his own lifetime, perhaps there would be no need for passing the Bill; but such a matter could not be left in that position. If the Government objected to the enacting clauses of the Bill, let them allow it to go into Committee, and then propose any alteration which they thought desirable. The right hon. and learned Gentleman said the Act was a short way of defining the common law. Then, if the definition was wanted only for a Constitutional purpose, why did they not extend it to England? He maintained that it was not safe to leave the liberties of the people at the mercy of any Attorney or Solicitor General, however well meaning. He could not consent to the continuance of that state of things, and, therefore, he appealed to the House to allow the Bill to pass a second reading.

MR. MORGAN LLOYD said, that the question was not whether it was right and proper to pass the Act under the exceptional circumstances which existed in 1793, and he would assume, for the purposes of his argument, that such legislation was then necessary; but the real question was, whether there were sufficient reasons for maintaining the Act at the present time? That such an Act might have been at one time necessary was no argument in favour of continuing its restrictions. The Irish Statute Book contained many Statutes, the maintenance of which, at the present day, would be admitted by everyone to be simply ridiculous. Any exceptional interference with the liberties of the Irish people was *primâ facie* wrong, and the burden of proof rested upon those who advocated such exceptional interference. That no inconvenience had ever been felt from the absence of such a law in England was a strong reason to show that it was not required in Ireland. The laws of both countries should be the same, so far as circumstances would permit. Now, what reason had been given for the continuance of this law? No valid reason had been given. The right hon. and learned Gentleman the Attorney General for Ireland had in effect admitted that it was no longer necessary, seeing that he grounded his objection to its repeal upon the fact that it had not, in recent times, been enforced. That was, however, no reason for maintaining it. On the contrary, it was a strong reason for its repeal. No Government had a right to say that the Irish people should only do on sufferance what was lawful in England. The Attorney General for Ireland had also contended that the Act was limited in its operation to "assemblies assuming or exercising a right or authority to represent the people," and he referred to the Title and the Preamble of the Act in proof of that statement. They must, however, look to the enacting part, which was most general in its terms, and extended to all meetings of delegates with the object of obtaining any alteration in the existing law, however innocent. The only restriction was contained in the Proviso in the 3rd section—

> "That nothing herein contained shall extend or be construed to extend to or affect elections to be made by bodies corporate, according to the charters and usages of such bodies corporate respectively."

He trusted the Government would see their way to support this Bill, so far, at least, as to limit its provisions to meetings professing to execute legislative functions. The Statute was an obsolete piece of legislation which ought to be at once repealed.

MR. J. LOWTHER: Sir, I had hoped that, after the clear and comprehensive statement of my right hon. and learned Friend the Attorney General for Ireland, it would have been unnecessary for me to address the House; but one or two observations have been made since upon which I would like to say a few words. I would first call the attention of the House to the somewhat remarkable speech of the hon. Member for Reading (Mr. Shaw Lefevre), from which anyone who listened to him would have inferred that he had always been a firm and consistent supporter of this Bill; but I think I am correct in stating that a few years ago he recorded his vote in favour of an Amendment to the second reading, which was moved by the noble Lord who now leads the Opposition (the Marquess of Hartington), and who made some strong observations in favour of the rejection of the Bill. After those speeches and votes, I think it is a little exceeding the usual limits of Party licence, when we find the present Advisers of Her Majesty charged with desiring to maintain oppressive legislation for Ireland. I fancy the administration of the law in Ireland by the present Government cannot have been exceptionally oppressive, or we should not have had the testimony given us just now—that if my right hon. and learned Friend the Attorney General could be made eternal, there would be no necessity for this Bill. But my special object in rising was to say this—that if the idea which has lately been thrown out were realized, and if some Bill were produced which, while dealing with the obsolete portions of this Act, would at the same time insure a prohibition of those illegal and objectionable assemblies against which the original Act was framed, I should be quite prepared to support such a Bill. I refer to those provisions in the original Act which were intended to prevent the convention of assemblies which arrogated to themselves the attributes or functions of Parliament. That was the object of the Act. And, entertaining these opinions, my first impression would be to assent to this stage of the Bill now before the House; but on looking through the Bill, I find—and I think any hon. Gentleman, looking at it from a candid point of view, will be disposed to agree with me—that it does not afford us the means of carrying out the compromise which I have proposed my willingness to adhere to. If the Bill were so amended in Committee as to bring it within these dimensions, it would rival the celebrated knife belonging to the hon. Gentleman's fellow-countrymen, for nothing would be left of it. There would have to be a new short Title, a new Preamble, and nothing of the original would remain. I think the present Bill, therefore, is not calculated to arrive at that general understanding which I believe is desired by both sides of the House; and I therefore suggest that the hon. Gentleman opposite (Sir Joseph M'Kenna) should withdraw his Bill and introduce another measure which should contain a strict prohibition of those illegal assemblies against which the Act was originally framed, and which would then not be open to any misconception. If the hon. Gentleman wishes to take advantage of the present opportunity for obtaining the decision of the House, and complains that he may have to wait a long time before he is again placed in an equally favourable position, I would point out to him, in the first place, that the Session is still young, and secondly, that in event of the new Bill being of an unobjectionable character, and one to which the House generally could assent, no time would really be lost; because, even supposing the present Bill, were read a second time to-day, an interval would have to take place before it could go into Committee, and the further progress of the Bill would be opposed, and probably brought to a conclusion, unless the Amendments which were proposed to be inserted met with the general approval of the House. Therefore, if he takes the course I advise, he will be in no worse a position with regard to time. I venture to throw out this suggestion. I am sure that if the hon. Gentleman and his supporters adopt it, we shall be glad to accept any reasonable measure, by way of showing that nothing is farther from our desire than to stand in the way of anything that is for the benefit of Ireland. Amongst the details of the Preamble of this Bill there is one which we could not assent to, which demands an assimilation of the law of Ireland to that of England. I therefore hope the hon. Gentleman may be disposed to accept my suggestion, and withdraw this Bill and introduce another.

SIR JOSEPH M'KENNA, in reply, said, he thought he should be doing wrong and accepting an undue responsibility, if he rejected the advances which had been made by the right hon. Gentleman. The way in which the subject had been discussed gave him great hope for the future. He was quite willing that a Bill should be brought in which would remove difficulty on the points to which objection had been taken; but what occurred to him was this—that a clause might be inserted in the present Bill to this effect—

> "Provided, nevertheless, That nothing herein contained shall be considered to legalize any meeting in Ireland which has taken upon itself or has been put forward as having a Parliamentary or legislative function, and the same shall be, and is hereby declared, a misdemeanour in as full a manner as if this present Act had not passed."

Well, now, the right hon. Gentleman thought it would be better to have a new Bill. He accepted that suggestion in the spirit in which he was sure it was made—namely, with a desire for conciliation, and a desire to remove unnecessary asperities in the legislation for Ireland. But he thought it would be better if the right hon. and learned Gentleman the Attorney General for Ireland would take upon himself to introduce such a Bill, The right hon. and learned Gentleman would have more command over the attention of Parliament, and he would be able to do it in a shorter time and in a more efficient manner. He (Sir Joseph M'Kenna) should be happy to give the right hon. and learned Gentleman all the attention he desired at his hands, and if he would accept the duty, he (Sir Joseph M'Kenna) would ask leave of the House to withdraw this Bill.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. GIBSON) was understood to intimate his disinclination to bring in the Bill.

SIR JOSEPH M'KENNA understood that the right hon. and learned Gentleman did not accept the duty, but left him to the chances of the Session. He was afraid he must accept those chances, and, therefore, he would now ask leave to withdraw the Bill.

Amendment and Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Bill *withdrawn.*

RACECOURSES (METROPOLIS) BILL.

(*Mr. Anderson, Sir Thomas Chambers, Sir James Lawrence*)

[BILL 48.] THIRD READING.

Order for Third Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read the third time."—(*Mr. Anderson.*)

MR. A. GATHORNE-HARDY thought it would be very unsatisfactory to pass the third reading of the Bill when so many hon. Members who had observations to make upon it, and who did not anticipate it would come on at that hour, had left the House. He trusted the hon. Gentleman would not then proceed with the third reading. He begged to move that the debate be adjourned.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Debate be now adjourned." —(*Mr. Alfred Gathorne-Hardy.*)

MR. J. LOWTHER also urged the postponement of the second reading, on the ground that the objects of the Bill were not thoroughly understood. He saw no reason why the functions proposed by the Bill should not be exercised by the Jockey Club. At present, no meetings were allowed to be held unless the promoters gave an assurance that they would take measures for the maintenance of order, and would see those measures carried into effect. The Bill, he contended, would be dangerous as a precedent. The right hon. Gentleman was still speaking against the Bill when——

It being a quarter of an hour before Six of the clock, the Debate stood adjourned till *To-morrow.*

House adjourned at a quarter before Six o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Thursday, 27th March, 1879.

MINUTES.]—PUBLIC BILLS—*First Reading*—Petty Customs (Scotland) Abolition Act Amendment * (33); Poor Law Amendment Act (1876) Amendment * (34); Tenant Right (Ireland) * (35); Divinity School (Church of Ireland) (36).

Second Reading—Oyster and Mussel Fisheries Order (Blackwater, Essex) * (29).

DUBLIN UNIVERSITY—DIVINITY SCHOOL (CHURCH OF IRELAND) BILL.

BILL PRESENTED. FIRST READING.

THE EARL OF BELMORE * rose to call attention to the Report of the Dublin University Commissioners of 1878, and to present a Bill, and said: My Lords, the Report of the Dublin University Commission, to which I am about to call your Lordships' attention, dealt with several matters; but to only two of these, relating to the Divinity School, and the power of the University to confer Degrees in Theology, need I refer at any length. The other matters, which I may have to mention incidentally, related to the amount of compensation received by the College for the loss of its advowsons; the remedies to be provided for the injury caused, as regards promotion amongst the Fellows, by the loss of patronage of the livings; and the proper mode of disposing of the Advowson Compensation Fund.

I will read that part of the reference to the Royal Commissioners which related to the Divinity School—

> "And whereas by the Dublin University Tests Act, 1873, the position of our said College and of the University of Dublin, as regards the teaching, and granting of Degrees in the Faculty of Theology, has been in some respects modified. . . . We authorize you to be our Commissioners for inquiring into the offices of Professors and Lecturers in Divinity in our said College and University, the endowments and emoluments, either of private or public foundation connected with the same respectively, and into the mode of conferring degrees in the Faculty of Theology in our said University; and into the expenditure of our said College and University in connection with the Divinity School; and whether it would be proper that the same respectively should be continued, or other provision made in lieu thereof."

I must now shortly give your Lordships some account of the history of the Divinity School.

The exact date of the foundation of the Regius Professorship is unknown, but it must have been nearly co-existent with the University, for it is known that Luke Challoner, one of the three original Fellows named in the patent of 1591, was the first Professor.

The celebrated James Ussher, afterwards Archbishop of Armagh, whose reputation was not merely Irish, but European, succeeded him as Professor in 1607.

No addition to the staff of the Divinity School was made till 1718, when Archbishop King's (of Dublin) Lecturer was founded?

The first Assistant to the Regius Professor was appointed in 1783.

The first Assistant to Archbishop King's Lecturer was appointed in 1833, and there are now nine Assistant Lecturers, or, at least, there were a year or two ago.

The Professorship of Biblical Greek was founded in 1838, and that of Ecclesiastical History in 1850.

Of these officers, part of the salary of Archbishop King's Lecturer is paid by the interest of the Private Endowments by the Archbishop, the proportion varying from £35 to £52 9*s*. 11*d*. in different years.

In 1833 the salary was made up by the College to £700 a-year, paid out of the Decrements—that is, the fees payable by all students.

The Professor of Ecclesiastical History has been paid for the last 15 years £100 a-year, out of the interest of two endowments of £1,000 each by the late Lord John Beresford, Lord Primate, and also Chancellor of the University, the balance probably being funded.

The other salaries are paid out of the College Funds. The salary of the Regius Professor was fixed by King's letter of *Car. II.* at £80 a-year Irish, subsequently raised to £500 and £700, and in or about 1814 to £1,200 British; but since 1858 he has received £1,212, £12 compensation for some Degree fees having been then added.

Archbishop King's Lecturer receives the balance of his salary from those funds; in 1877 this amounted to £655 5*s*. 7*d*.

The Assistant Lecturers received in that year £472 10*s*.; in the two previous years, £460.

The Professor of Biblical Greek receives £100 a-year out of the same funds.

There are no endowments by the Crown in the Divinity School; but there are some private endowments—scholarships, exhibitions, and prizes—amounting to £188 a-year. There are also some prizes given by the College, varying in amount, but coming to some £300 to £400 a-year. The total annual expenditure by the College on the School was, on an average of three years ending November, 1877, £2,867 16*s*. This, with the private endowments, gave the School an income of over £3,000 a-year.

The Divinity School has always been governed by the Board of Trinity College—that is, Provost and seven Senior Fellows.

It has been contended in some quarters that the connection of the Divinity School with the Irish Church is of comparatively recent date. It has been pointed out that the Statute of 1 *Geo.* III., which regulates Professorships of Divinity, refers to the "*juventus academica*" as a whole, and goes on to speak of those especially who are destined [for Holy Orders. Also that Archbishop King's endowments, made some years earlier, were to found a Divinity Lecture for the instruction of the Bachelors of Arts; and it is inferred that at the time there was no special school for the instruction of the Clergy. I shall have something more to say about this presently.

In 1790 the Irish Bishops drew up a list of books, in which they decided to examine candidates for Holy Orders, and sent it to the Board, who, in their turn, recommended the Divinity Lecturers to prepare students in these books. At the same time, 11 out of 22 of the Irish Bishops signed an agreement that they would not ordain any candidate for Holy Orders who had not attended one course of lectures by the Assistant Divinity Lecturer, the Divinity Lecturer, and Regius Professor respectively. This is said by some to be the first apparent connection between the Irish Church and the Divinity School Lectures. The Divinity School was placed on its present footing in 1833. All the Irish, and the majority of the English, Bishops required the Divinity *Testimonium* of the College from graduates as necessary condition of ordination.

Not unfrequently Presbyterian ministers have received part of their theological education in the School. In several instances the Presbyterian Church has taken a year's attendance in lieu of a year's attendance in their own school at Belfast; and there have been a few cases of ministers of other Protestant denominations attending the School.

Formerly, all the Fellows of Trinity College, with two or three exceptions, were obliged to take Holy Orders within a short time after obtaining their Fellowships. Since the death of Lord John Beresford, Lord Primate, in 1862, this obligation, which was enforced by the Visitor—that is, the Chancellor of the University, has not been so much insisted on. In fact, no Fellow has taken Orders since 1864, the Chancellors who succeeded Lord John having, for reasons which they considered sufficient, not pressed the matter. The obligation was entirely removed by the Dublin University Tests Act of 1873. That Act provided that no person should be required, in order to hold any office, &c., in the College, to belong to any particular Church, sect, or denomination, or to take Holy Orders; but the word "office" was not to apply to Professors and Lecturers in Divinity as long as the University should continue to give instruction in Theology.

In 1874, the year after the passing of the Act, the General Synod of the Irish Church appointed a committee to consider the position of the Church with regard to the Divinity School, and the result was that they entered into communication with Her Majesty's Government on the subject. A deputation waited on the noble Earl at the head of the Government in 1876, and in 1877 a Royal Commission was appointed to inquire into certain matters connected with the University of Dublin, including that of the Divinity School, and the power of the University with regard to conferring Theological Degrees. Six persons were appointed on the Commission — one Member of either House of Parliament, two persons intimately connected with the College—namely, an ex-Fellow and Professor, who had also been a Judge of the Irish Encumbered Estates Court (Dr. Longfield), and an actual Fellow of the College (Mr. Galbraith). Also, a Judge of the Landed Estates' Court, who represented Roman Catholic interests, and an eminent Queen's Counsel, who belonged to one of the Protestant Denominations which had dissented from the Presbyterian Church.

The Commissioners found that a strong opinion existed in favour of retaining the connection between the School and the College; and, at the same time, it was generally felt that the School could not remain on its present footing.

Suggestions were made from various quarters as to the best course to pursue.

I. By the Divinity School Committee of the General Synod of the Church of Ireland. They asked—

That the annual sums hitherto expended on the School of the College should be capitalized, and the amount placed in trust in the hands of the Representative Body. They did not, however, wish entirely to sever the present connection between the School and College. They pointed to the Advowson Compensation Fund as a convenient source from which their scheme of capitalization might be met, the present income being thus left free for the general purposes of Trinity College.

II. The Board of Trinity College gave the Royal Commissioners the text of certain resolutions which they had passed with regard to the future of the Divinity School—namely—

"(*a*) That the Students in the Divinity School shall be allowed to continue, as at present, to have the use of lecture-rooms in Trinity College for Theological instruction, provided that the lecturers are subject to ordinary collegiate discipline, and that they accommodate their time of lecturing to the requirements of secular instruction in Trinity College.

"(*b*) That the Board of Trinity College are willing to confer a similar privilege on any other religious body, desirous that its candidates for Orders shall be instructed in Trinity College.

"(*c*) That in fixing the qualifications for Theological Degrees the Board are willing to accept the certificate of any of the Theological Schools so placed in connection with Trinity College, as a sufficient testimonial of the candidates' Theological acquirements.

"(*d*) That the control and management of the Divinity School of the Church of Ireland be transferred to a Council appointed by the Church of Ireland, reserving the statutable rights of the existing Professors and Lecturers."

"(*e*) That on the vacancy of any Professorship or Lectureship, a sum equal to the salary and payment made to such Professor or Lecturer be paid annually to the Representative Body of the Church of Ireland towards the maintenance of the Divinity School on the following condition—namely, 'That the Students of Trinity College shall continue to receive instruction in the School, as hitherto, without charge.'"

The two last resolutions were carried at the Board by 5 to 3, and were passed on a different occasion from the three first resolutions.

The Board communicated the foregoing five resolutions to the Divinity School Committee, who, in their turn, passed the following resolutions:—

"1st. That the Divinity School Committee do very gratefully accept the resolutions of the Provost and Senior Fellows on the subject of the Divinity School, and request them to put the matter in the hands of their Law Advisers, for such ratification as may be requisite to insure the legal permanence of the arrangements.

"2nd. That the Divinity School Committee respectfully suggest to the Board the advisability of effecting the security of the pecuniary part of the arrangement, by capitalizing the income requisite for maintaining the Divinity School, and handing over this capital in trust for that purpose."

The Board of Trinity College considered these resolutions on 31st May, 1876. They agreed to the first; as regards the second, they, on that occasion, were evenly divided on it, and on a later occasion negatived it by 5 to 3.

III. Suggestions were made to the Royal Commissioners by several of the Fellows, including, apparently, the original minority on the Board, which being in the nature of objections to the plan of the Board, I will deal with presently.

IV. Dr. Salmon, the Regius Professor, made some suggestions for a mixed Governing Body, which he afterwards withdrew. He, however, thought it important that the obligation to select the Regius Professor from amongst the Fellows and ex-Fellows should be removed, and that the office should be open to the best qualified persons wherever they could be found.

The recommendations of the Royal Commissioners will be found to be, up to a certain point, substantially the same as the proposals of the Board. They recommended that the government of the School should be handed over to a Council appointed by the Church; that the income should be deal with as suggested by the Board; that the offer of the Board to allow the practical connection between the College and the Church by the use of the lecture-rooms to continue, should be accepted, and that the Undergraduates should have an absolute right to attend the lectures without charge. The Commissioners, however, went beyond that, and added a recommendation that the annual income of £2,867 16*s*. should be made a charge, not upon the rents of the College as it was at present, but that it should be made a charge on the annual interest arising from the compensation money received by the College for the loss of its advowsons. That compensation money amounted, with interest, to about £140,000, and produces an income of rather more than £5,000 a-year.

I now come to describe the Bill which I am about to present to your Lordships. It is a Bill to provide for the government and future management of the Divinity School, hitherto in connection with Trinity College and the University of Dublin. There is, of course, the usual Preamble, describing what has been done heretofore. Clause 3 provides for the transfer of the Divinity School, and its government, control, and management, from Trinity College to the Representative Body, who shall receive the funds to be paid in trust. Clause 4 saves the rights of the existing Professors and Lecturers. We know that none of them will consent to come under the control of any new body. We leave it also optional with them whether they will change their paymaster or not. Clause 5 provides for the transfer of the private endowments, and Clause 6 for the transfer of the payments heretofore made by Trinity College, giving power to commute them at the rate of 4 per cent per annum. Clause 7 secures that students in Trinity College shall continue to receive instruction in the

School as heretofore, without the payment of fees. Clause 8 enables the Representative Body, with the approval of the General Synod, to appoint a committee to govern the School. Clause 9 provides that the School may have the continued use of buildings within the College for lecture-rooms. Clause 10 provides for a similar use of the rooms by the Divinity Schools which may be founded in connection with the College by other religious denominations; whilst Clause 11 provides for the maintenance of the Faculty of Theology in the University.

The Schedule contains a list of the private endowments.

I now wish to point out some of the objections that will unquestionably be made to my proposal. I do so, in the first place, because I wish to be perfectly fair; and, in the next place, because I know that my case is not stronger than its weakest part; and although some of the objections that are made to it are possessed of more or less plausibility, I hope to convince your Lordships that they are really not of such force as to put a stop to this measure. The first class of objections come from persons who object to any dealing with the Divinity School, unless they could have the whole University question settled in the manner desired by themselves. I do not suppose I shall have to contend very much against such objections in this House—if I do, I had better reserve my defence to a later stage of the Bill; but in regard to this particular class of objections, I would appeal to their generosity, and ask them to consider whether, having had the Maynooth Question settled on very liberal terms, they would wish to prevent the Church of Ireland receiving equally fair treatment, and whether they think that irritating an important section of their fellow-countrymen is the best way of obtaining, not, perhaps, all they want, but an equitable settlement of what, I grant, they have a right to ask for. The second class of objections are those which are shadowed forth in Judge Flanagan's and Mr. Porter's dissent to the Report of the Commission. They took the same view which was taken in Mr. Gladstone's University Bill in 1873, for in that Bill it was proposed entirely, and in the fullest possible manner, to sever the Divinity School from the College, and also to abolish the Faculty of Theology, handing over to the Representative Body 15 years' purchase of the annual income of the School, which I suppose was calculated in some way on the value of the life-interests of the Professors and Lecturers; and also, together with the private endowments, the right of the Church to which nobody disputed, £1,500 to provide buildings elsewhere. Although I have heard plenty of hostile criticism upon the Report of the Commissioners, I have never seen a single newspaper or magazine, or heard of more than one individual on the other side of the Channel, who supported this proposal of the dissentient Commissioners. They objected, moreover, to the amount proposed to be given as compensation. They thought that, owing to the diminished number of Divinity Students since before the passing of the Irish Church Act, it was too much. They particularly objected to that part of the salary of Archbishop King's Lecturer, about £655 per annum, being compensated for, which was paid out of the Decrements. Now, as regarded the last point, it was simply a matter of internal convenience and arrangement. In 1833, the Board was anxious that the late Dr. O'Brien, afterwards Bishop of Ossory, should take the appointment. They thought that his great reputation would attract students to the University, and so swell the fees, and they therefore determined to increase the small private endowment up to £700 a-year. As this could not legally be charged on the rents of the College estates, as a mere matter of convenience they charged it on the Decrements, or fees payable by all the students.

I now come to the last class of objections—those of some of the Fellows of the College. Those objections will be found in Appendix VII. to the Report, and they will also be found restated in a paper which, I have no doubt, some of your Lordships have seen. I have lately had an interview with two of these gentlemen, who came to me to know exactly what I wanted to do, and who put me in full possession of their views.

It is said that the Report of the Commissioners was contrary to the weight of evidence. I cannot agree with that assertion. I admit that it is perfectly true that the Commissioners set on one side suggestions which were made to them by some of the Fellows, both as regards the Divinity School and other matters; but I contend that it is not correct to say that the Commissioners, in adopting the proposals which were originally made by the Board of Trinity College, who are persons of great weight, and persons whose opinion ought to be respected, and are, moreover, the Body which had a right to make them to the Divinity School Committee, which were supported by the Provost and Vice-Provost, and which the Board laid before the Commissioners, together with the reply of the Divinity School Committee accepting their proposal, and a report of the Board's action thereupon, as part of their evidence—it is not correct, I affirm, to say that the Commissioners, in adopting this proposal, reported against the weight of evidence.

It is again said that there is no necessity to deal with the question at present, and that the proposal now made is opposed to the wishes of the general body of the Graduates of the University, and of the majority of the members of the Church. Now, as regards the time, five years have elapsed since Mr. Gladstone's unsuccessful attempt to settle the matter, and the Church is naturally getting uneasy. No doubt, there are some Fellows of the College who oppose the measure. I cannot exactly say how the matter stands with regard to the general body of the Graduates; but this I do know—that the Governing Body of the Church—and the Synod represents the Church in this matter—for it is a most strictly representative assembly—has passed resolutions in favour of this proposal, and they have, through their Divinity School Committee, intrusted the duty of introducing the question in your Lordships' House to myself and my noble and reverend Friend (Lord Plunket), who presides over the See of Meath. At any rate, I think that the majority of the members of the University, who are members of the Church, are in favour of the present proposal. It is also said that what is now proposed means the separation of the School from the College. Now, as I have already remarked, there will only be a partial separation in the sense of government, and in the sense of payment of salaries; but the Undergraduates will remain in the position they at present occupy, and all other things will remain unaltered. Under the circumstances, it is thought that the present proposals are for all practical purposes the best that could be drawn up. It was said, further, that the effect of what is proposed in the Bill will be to remove a Faculty from the University. That I entirely dissent from. I can speak with authority in the matter, and I know that the Royal Commissioners took particular pains to prevent this result, and proposed a plan for appointing Examiners in Divinity as an alternative for the plan proposed by the Board. There is a clause in the Bill to provide that, as regards the Faculty of Theology, matters shall remain unaltered. Again, it is argued in opposition to the Bill that the Board of Trinity College in this matter are in conflict with the University Council and the General Body of the Senate. Of course, I can say nothing about that. All I know is that the Commissioners had certain evidence placed before them. The Board of Trinity College made certain proposals, and in the most formal manner laid them before the Commissioners as their evidence.

Moreover, it is argued that if the connection between the Divinity School and the College ceases to exist, the services in the College chapel cannot be carried on. I believe it is true that the services are now conducted by the Lecturers and Assistant Lecturers in the Divinity School; but in Cambridge, where the Divinity School has nothing to with the Colleges, services are carried on in the College chapels. In my own College (Trinity) the services were usually not even performed by the Clerical Fellows; but two persons called "conducts" were appointed for the purpose, who were not Fellows, but who received salaries, rooms, and commons. I can see no necessary connection between the Divinity School and the chapel services. It appears to me to be mainly a question of expense, and I do not see much force in this objection.

There is, however, another objection of very considerable importance; but it has not been very prominently put forward. The reason, however, is obvious. It is because it is a matter in which some Fellows are personally interested. It is, however, alluded to in Mr. Gray's evidence before the Commission. The objection to which I refer is that the

College would lose the patronage of the Regius Professorship, and of Archbishop King's Lectureship, if the present Bill were carried into law. It has been said to me—"You might as well abolish two Fellowships." Now, I admit that probably the Regius Professorship, which is worth £1,212 a-year, may probably "take out" a Fellow—a Senior Fellowship being only worth about £1,100 a-year. But I am not so sure about Archbishop King's Lectureship—which is only worth £700 a-year—doing so; because, previous to the passing of the Irish Church Act, the College livings had, to a great extent, ceased to induce Fellows to retire, and as recently as 1867 a valuable living, worth over £1,000 a-year—with which I used, before the alterations in Ecclesiastical arrangements consequent on the passing of the Church Act, to have some connection—I mean the living of Drumroagh, which includes the town of Omagh—was refused by all the Clerical Fellows—even those whose incomes from the College were only worth £200 or £300 a-year. It seems to me, however, to be hardly a worthy way of dealing with this great office of Regius Professor to treat it merely as a retiring pension for a Fellow, and as a means of promoting circulation in the lower part of the body of Fellows.

If the recommendations of the Commissioners are carried out, and the annual income payable to the Divinity School is commuted, some additional income will accrue to the College over and above the payments now made to the School, and which will be set free for general College purposes. The College invested parts of the Advowson Compensation Fund in buying up rent-charges. The rest—about £96,000—which represented the compensation for the livings granted by King James I., they invested in the Government Funds, where it only produces 3¼ per cent interest. The annual payment of £2,867 16*s*. a-year, if capitalized at the rate of 4 per cent, could be bought up for about £72,000; and the College could thus, for a sum of money now producing them only some £2,200 a-year, get rid of a charge of nearly £2,900 a-year.

There is another matter to which I desire to refer, and that is a resolution of the University Council, which was passed on the 5th of March. The resolution was proposed by one of the gentlemen who called upon me, and it put in the fairest possible manner how some of the Fellows of the College regarded this proposal. The resolution was as follows:—

> "In view of the large requirements of the University for educational purposes, it is, in the opinion of the Council, most undesirable that Trinity College should be deprived of any funds for the endowment or maintenance of any Professorial School of which they may cease to have control."

There was, however, this rider to the Motion—

> "Providing suitable endowment or maintenance can be provided for such School from any other source primarily liable."

This rider seems to me to concede a good deal that I contend for, and it evidently points at "the surplus" of the Irish Church Funds. Now, the Royal Commissioners were expressly excluded, by the way in which the Commission was drawn up, from going into the matter of the surplus revenues of the Irish Church; and, although some of the Fellows of the College suggested that compensation should be supplied from this source, they—the Commissioners—had no right to go into the question.

I know that some people differ from me; but I do not think that, as far as these payments are concerned, the "surplus" is "primarily liable," although I do not say but that there might be some matters over and above them, as regards which the Church might fairly look for compensation from this source. Maynooth, and the *Regium Donum*, and the Presbyterian Widows' Fund, no doubt, received compensation from the funds of the Irish Church; but that was because Parliament chose to apply those funds to the purpose, and so to relieve the Imperial taxpayers, instead of charging the compensation to the Consolidated Fund of the United Kingdom.

My Lords, the Bishops of the Church of Ireland will in future be elected by the Diocesan Synods—by the majority in those Synods—five of them have already been so; and it is reasonable to suppose that they will not ordain candidates, should those candidates have been instructed in a Theological School in whose teachers the great majority in the Church may not have confidence.

I will call a witness of greater authority than myself, and that is the Provost.

The Provost of Trinity College is strongly in favour of the present proposal. He is a man of great weight, of high character, and he is well known in the University world. He has in a recent pamphlet adduced very strong reasons why wisdom prompted the adoption of the proposal now presented to the House, and he strongly combated the objections to which I have called your Lordships' attention.

The Provost—speaking of "separation," of course, in the limited sense proposed by my Bill—says that—

> "The inevitable result of the University Tests Act is to separate the Divinity School of the Church of Ireland from Trinity College. The existence of the present connection is absolutely dependent on the Bishops; and it is evident they would not recognize as a requisite for ordination the teaching of a School the members of whose Governing Body were not of necessity members of the Church of Ireland, and in which the clerical element must ere long be effaced."

He shows that the Act of 1869 disestablished at once the Divinity Schools of the Roman Catholic and Presbyterian Churches, making liberal provision for their future maintenance; whilst, owing to the connection between the Divinity School of the Church of Ireland and the College, legislation respecting that School was naturally deferred till the College itself came to be dealt with. Accordingly, Mr. Gladstone, in his Bill of 1873, proposed to make provision for the future of the School, though on a far less liberal scale than he had done for Maynooth.

The Provost shows that the College, by having become voluntarily secularized —for the names of the Lord Chancellor of Ireland and my hon. and learned Friend (Mr. Plunket) were on Mr. Fawcett's Bill—has placed itself in a position in which it can no longer perform its duty as respects the Divinity School, and it ought, therefore, to place it in the hands of those who can do so. He combats the argument about the "surplus," and he points out that B has no right to look to C to pay the debt he owes to A.

He points out that it appears to be forgotten that the College would really lose nothing by the proposed arrangement. It might at first sight appear that the College might be a gainer if the debt were paid by some other party; but it would only be an apparent gain, because students who were candidates for Orders would no longer come to the University, if there were to be a Theological College outside it—they would be too poor to attend both—and he thinks that the injury would be likely to re-act on the other professional Schools.

My Lords, I have no desire—and I think I can speak also for those with whom I am acting—to injure Trinity College in any way. For my own part, I have the utmost admiration and respect for that great institution; and I think that the Commissioners had no wish to deal with the College in any arbitary or unfair manner. One of them (Dr. Longfield) was an ex-Fellow of the College, and is a man of great weight and judicial experience. Another Commissioner was a Fellow of the College; he is at present very near the Board, and he might soon expect to take part in the government of the Divinity School. The promoters of the Bill do not wish to bring about an entire separation between the College and Divinity School, or to set up a Theological College; what they want is to prevent it. They only strive for such a separation as should secure the income of the Divinity School from being meddled with by Parliament, or anyone else, and should secure that the appointment of teachers and the government of the School should be in the hands of those who possessed the confidence of the Church of Ireland. I contend that the Divinity School is as much the School of the Church as of the University. Formerly all the Fellows of the College, with two or three exceptions, were clergymen; and the Statute of *Geo.* III., which speaks of the teaching of sacred literature in connection with the academic youth, goes on to speak of those especially who are destined for Holy Orders, for which end, principally, the College was founded; the Orders being, of course, the Orders of the Established Church, for there was then no other Church in connection with the College. The members of the Church of Ireland would have been very glad if Her Majesty's Government could have seen their way to take up this question; but, for reasons given elsewhere, they were not able to do so. I feel the responsibility I have incurred in taking charge of this question—a question which has assumed so much importance.

The Church of Ireland—though it has entered upon a period of great financial difficulty, owing to recent legislation—has lost none of its importance and usefulness. All I now ask for is that simple justice should be done to the Church, and that she may be secured the means of keeping up a constant supply, not only of pious and godly, but also of learned ministers. I have now to present the Bill. I do not propose to ask your Lordships to read it a second time at a very early period, because, in the first place, the Easter Recess is fast approaching, and, in the next place, the Synod of the Church is soon to meet, and I have no doubt the members of it would give their utmost attention to any suggestions that may be made by any of your Lordships. I also hear that the Provost, upon further consideration, thinks that a Professorship of Divinity should be preserved in the College, and probably a proposal may be made to the University Council to that effect. I now move the first reading of the Bill.

Bill to make provision for the future control and management of the Divinity School heretofore connected with Trinity College and the University of Dublin—*Presented* (The Earl of BELMORE).

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 1ª."

LORD PLUNKET *: My Lords, as this is the first time that I have had the honour of addressing your Lordships, and as I am now the only Bishop of the Irish Church who occupies a seat in your Lordships' House, I would ask for your kind indulgence as I make a few remarks on the Bill which has just been introduced by my noble Friend (the Earl of Belmore).

The object of the Bill now before the House, as I understand it, may be briefly stated thus—It proposes to transfer to the Irish Church the endowments and the control of the Divinity School of Trinity College. But it proposes, at the same time, to do so in such a way, and under such conditions, as not to sever thereby the intimate relationship which has for so long and so happily existed between those two Bodies.

I hope presently to show that this Bill, if carried into law, will have a tendency to promote union rather than separation between the Church and the University, and that the proposed transfer will confer a benefit, even financially, on the University by which the transfer will be made. But, in the first place, I desire to call attention to the claim which, quite apart from such considerations, the Church of Ireland has upon the State, and upon the University too, for some such intervention and action on her behalf as that contemplated by the present Bill. In advancing this claim, I do not wish to be regarded as making an *ad misericordiam* appeal for any special bounty on behalf of my Church. My object is rather to speak of an outstanding debt of compensation to which that Church has, as it seems to me, an indefeasible right. Nor do I desire to be understood as basing this appeal on any ground of Party or religion. The subject is fortunately one which does not involve any Party issues; and, as regards religion, I shall not, I trust, make any demand which I would not be willing, under similar circumstances, to concede to others, however widely they might differ from me in their religious views.

And now I may, I think, assume, as an axiom of political justice, that if the State sees fit to adopt legislation for the benefit of the community at large, and if that legislation places at a serious disadvantage any particular Body in the community, it then becomes the manifest duty of the State, at the earliest possible opportunity, to provide some sort of compensation for the loss so sustained. If this principle be true, I would now apply it to the case of the Irish Church, and her Divinity School.

Until quite recently, the Irish Church was a State Church, and her Divinity School was under the control of another State Institution—a University, whose constitution was based upon principles strictly identical with her own. Such a relationship was, under the circumstances, a perfectly natural one, and, as a matter of fact, it worked most harmoniously. But recent legislation has altered considerably the position both of the Church and of the University. The Church has been separated from the State, and, as is absolutely necessary in the case of a Voluntary Church, the regulation of her affairs now rests with a Governing Body of her own choice. Under such circumstances, it appears to me that, even if no change had meanwhile taken place in the constitution of the University, the Church of Ireland, in her altered position as a self-governing and self-organized Church, cannot long be expected to allow so important a department of her organization as her Divinity School to remain under the control of a Body over which she has no authority. This, at least, I will say—that if she should consent to such an anomalous state of things as a permanent arrangement, she would follow a course not adopted, so far as I know, by any other Voluntary Church in Christendom.

But the real gravity and urgency of the case will not appear until we notice the changes which have meantime taken place in the University.

Let me first point to the Body in the University from which hitherto the Divinity Teachers of the Church have been chosen. That Body consists of the Fellows and ex-Fellows of Trinity College. In times past, these were all clergymen; but, owing to recent changes, and more especially to those involved in the University Tests Act, no Fellow is now required to take Orders. And, as a result, not one Fellow has entered the Ministry of the Church during the last 14 years. Even already the small circle within which a choice of teachers was confined has been thus materially narrowed. What may it not be by-and-by?

But this is not all. Let me call your attention to the Body with whom the choice of teachers rests. That Body is the Board or Governing Body of Trinity College, and consists of the Provost and seven Senior Fellows. From the same causes to which I have just referred, it has come about that no member of that Board need now be a clergyman; no member need belong to the Irish Church; no member is even required to profess a belief in God. Now, I do not stand here to condemn the policy whereby the constitution of the University has been thus altered. I long ago came to the conclusion that the interests of religion would not, in the end, suffer, but the contrary, by opening up the privileges and the government of the University to all, whatever their faith might be. But I do stand here to ask your Lordships—and I ask it of you as men of good sense and good feeling—whether the Church of Ireland can be expected for very long to allow the choice of her Divinity Teachers to rest with a Body whose constitution may so soon utterly unfit it for the discharge of so sacred a trust.

And now, if no remedy such as that which is proposed in the Bill now before the House be found for this state of things, what must be the result? I answer, with deep sorrow, that I see nothing for it but that, at all risks, the Church should decline to accept, as the permanent training school of her future Ministry, a Divinity School constituted after the anomalous manner just described. In other words, in the absence of some such alternative as that proposed in this Bill, I see nothing for it but that our Church should proceed to organize a separate Divinity School of her own, and under her own control.

The separation from the old University, which such a course would involve, I, for my part, would regard with unspeakable regret. For, quite apart from the attachment which I naturally feel for the University where I myself received my early training, and where I spent so many happy years, I see plainly the disastrous effects which such a separation would produce on the best interests of the Church to which I belong. For my own part, I consider it essential to the complete education, in the highest sense of the term, of those who are preparing for the Ministry of our Church, that they should carry on their studies in the healthy atmosphere of a place of learning, where truth in every shape is eagerly and fearlessly pursued, and general culture dearly prized. It is, I hold, all-important to the usefulness of those who will have to minister among their fellow-men that they should, during their course of training, mix with those who are studying for other Professions, and that they should thus learn, not only to read books, but also to read men. It is, I am convinced, most desirable for the benefit of the Clergy, and the laity too, that by a mutual interchange of thought and of social kindliness during their University career, some safeguard should be provided against that estrangement which so often unfortunately separates us, as it were, into different camps, and which it is, I fear, too often the tendency of a purely Theological College to promote. And yet, unless some way be found, as in the Bill now before your Lordships, for extricating the Church of Ireland from the difficulty in which she now finds herself, I see no course open to her but to face even so disastrous a necessity as that of founding a separate Theological Seminary for the training of her own Clergy.

And now I have, I think, shown the grave nature of the difficulty in which our Church has been placed by the legislation which has been recently adopted by the State, and in which the University has concurred. I need scarcely dwell at any length on the responsibility which, as a necessary consequence, now rests upon the State and the University to come to the help of the Church in this the hour of her distress and danger.

As regards the State, I will only say that her duty in this matter does not rest merely on abstract principles. It is clearly pointed out by recent precedent. When legislation made it necessary that the Divinity School of Maynooth should be reduced to somewhat similar straits, the justice of meeting its claims, by a policy of liberal compensation, was admitted with scarcely a moment's hesitation. Nor is this all. Mr. Gladstone, when advocating this policy, then and there gave a distinct pledge that, whenever the Divinity School of the Irish Church should be placed at a similar disadvantage—and he evidently contemplated such a contingency—it should be dealt with on similarly liberal terms.

Those who supported Mr. Gladstone at that time are, I would hope, now prepared to abide by this pledge; and those who then differed from his general policy will be the last, I take for granted, to oppose the fulfilment of this portion at least of his scheme.

It only remains for me to ask how can the State and the University most justly, most wisely, and most promptly give the Church their help at the present crisis? Before showing how it can be thus given through this Bill, let me first notice briefly one or two proposed ways of so doing which do not seem to me sufficiently just, or wise, or prompt, to command your Lordships' approval.

I have heard it said by some that the true policy of the Irish Church is to wait until some proposition is made to Parliament for the endowment of a Catholic University. We may, it is said, then reasonably expect some help for our Divinity School, as an equivalent for the concession made to others. I desire to avoid any controversy on a "burning question," and will, therefore, express no opinion as to the expediency of any such possible concession to another Church. But in the interest of some settlement of our own claims, more tangible and immediate than that just proposed, I would only say that the demand which we now make on behalf of our Divinity School finds its equivalent, not in the possible endowment of a Catholic University in the future, but in the actual compensation given to a Catholic Divinity School in the past. And I think it is an honest principle that old debts should be paid before new accounts are run up.

But, apart from any question as to the endowment of a Catholic University, it has been urged by others that the compensation for which we seek should be looked for from the Church surplus, rather than from the Advowson money of the University. I am free to admit —and here I venture to differ from the noble Earl—that, if no more feasible or prompt method of receiving this compensation could be suggested, I, for one, should consider the Irish Church not only entitled, but bound to claim some grant for her Divinity School from the Church surplus. But an immediate opportunity presents itself now in the friendly offer which has been made to our Church by the authorities of Trinity College, and which this Bill proposes to carry into law; and I would appeal to your Lordships whether our Church would not be sadly lacking in common sense, and in duty too, if she were to let go this present opportunity, and to wander off in search of some possible gain in the future, which, after a weary pursuit, she might find in the end to be altogether beyond her reach? But, again, it has been suggested that things might remain very much as they are—that the funds and government of the Divinity School might still rest with the Board of Trinity College—but that for the better management of the School the Board should associate with itself some of the Bishops of the Irish Church, and otherwise, it may be, modify the method of electing teachers for that School. This seems plausible, and I desire to express my respect for the motives which have prompted such a suggestion. But I see two fatal objections.

In the first place, would such an arrangement fulfil the intention with which the provisional clause—reserving the solution of the Divinity School problem for a future time—was inserted in the University Tests Act? It was surely never intended that the ultimate solution of that question should be inconsistent with all the principles of the Act which it is intended to supplement. And could a Divinity School for the purpose of denominational teaching, and under the control and payment of the University, be maintained in accordance with these principles? I think not. I feel, therefore, that no such arrangement could hope to be permanent. And, if so, I do not think that our Church could wisely lean her hopes against what might soon prove to be a tottering wall.

But there is a second, and an equally insuperable, difficulty. Such an arrangement is one to which the Governing Body of the Church of Ireland would not, in my opinion, ever consent. I go further, and make bold to say frankly that to such a scheme as a permanent arrangement that Body ought not to agree. Is it reasonable to expect that any Voluntary Church could thus permanently hand over the appointment and supervision of her teachers to any body over which she has not entire control? When the Irish Church was a State Church she had advantages—which I would be the last to undervalue—in return for which she could well submit to certain restrictions upon her liberty. But she has lost these advantages, and has received in exchange her present independence. And for my part, I do not think that she can now afford to relinquish that independence, or, what is more important, to abandon the responsibilities which that independence involves.

It has, I know, been assumed that if the Governing Body of the Church should have the control of the Divinity School it would become marked by a one-sided and narrow character. For my own part, the experience of the past tells me that it would not. At every step in the past proceedings of our Church the party of moderation has gained the day. The Right and Left Centres have combined, and the extremes on either side have had to give way. It would, I believe, be the same with our Divinity School. Possibly, it would remain in its character very much what it is now; but the teachers in it would have the additional advantage of having been chosen by the Church within which they taught, and all the additional influence which would result from such a choice.

And this leads to the question—How does the Bill before the House propose to solve the present difficulty? The answer is a simple one. It proposes that the University should transfer the endowments and the control of its Divinity School—subject, of course, to the rights of its present teachers—to the Church of Ireland. It also proposes that University lecture-rooms should continue to be used freely by that School; but, in return, it stipulates that the Students of the University should receive instruction free in the Church Theological Schools.

You will observe that, while this Bill does not hereby run counter to the principles of the University Tests Act—for it offers the same local accommodation to the schools of other denominations—it provides for the localization, as hitherto, of the Divinity School, within the precincts of the College, and thus insures the maintenance of that union between the two Bodies which it is so important to preserve.

But as regards the University this Bill does more. It confers upon it a positive financial benefit. For many a Divinity Student, whose means might not permit him to pay fees both to the Church and to the University, will be enabled by the offer of a free theological education to pursue, at the same time, his course of arts in the University, to the consequent gain of that Body. When I remind you that, as my noble Friend has said, this view of the benefit derivable to the University from the Bill is the view of one who, of all others, may be expected to have the interests of the University at heart, and the soundness and clearness of whose judgment is admitted by all—I refer to Dr. Lloyd, the Provost of Trinity College—your Lordships will attach to my remarks a weight which they might not otherwise possess.

Let me add, that the provisions of this Bill will not interfere with the Faculty, or rather the power, which the University possesses of granting Degrees in Theology. There has been, I think, some misapprehension on this point. A Faculty such as that which we find in

Continental Universities, involving a Corporate Body, does not exist in the case of Dublin University. The Divinity School is certainly not a Faculty of this nature. It does not grant Degrees, nor is it in any way connected with the granting of Degrees. Attendance at the Lectures of the Divinity School is not any condition of obtaining a Degree in Divinity. The applicant for a Theological Degree in Dublin University has to pass an examination by the Regius Professor, for the purpose of testing his acquirements in theological knowledge, quite apart from his religious views or the doctrines of the Church to which he belongs. This power of granting degrees to candidates, of any denomination, whose qualifications will pass the test of an examination, would remain as it was before, even though the Divinity School should be transferred to the control of the Irish Church. And a special clause is contained in the present Bill to insure the preservation of such a Faculty.

I have only to remind your Lordships that the principles of this Bill have met with the approval of the Governing Body of the Church of Ireland, of the Governing Body of Trinity College, and of the two Representatives whom the University sends to Parliament for the special purpose of guarding its interests. It lastly embodies the recommendations of a Commission appointed by Her Majesty, with the special object of considering the question which is now at stake. Under all these circumstances, I think I am justified in confidently recommending this Bill to the favourable consideration of your Lordships' House.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR * : My Lords, this subject has been brought before the House by my noble Friend (the Earl of Belmore) in a speech of very great comprehensiveness, and my noble Friend has been followed by my noble and right reverend Friend in a speech worthy alike of his name and the distinguished position which he holds in the Irish Church. In addressing a few words to the House on this subject, I desire to speak not merely as a Member of Her Majesty's Government, but also because I have the honour to fill the place of Chancellor of the University which has been referred to. The proposal which the Bill contains has been made in pursuance of the recommendations of a Royal Commission which was appointed to inquire into the subject, and I cannot refer to that Report without offering my tribute of admiration for the manner in which that Commission discharged its functions. The subject was one of considerable difficulty, and the Report is remarkable for the clear and succinct way in which the subject has been dealt with. With respect to the particular proposal embodied in the Bill before the House—a proposal which was only one of those contained in the Report—I can readily understand the desire which the Irish Church must entertain that it should receive the sanction of Parliament. The reasons which actuate the Irish Church, as I understand them, are three in number. In the first place, the Irish Church has now become a voluntary and self-governing body, and it is natural that, in pursuance of the practice in other voluntary self-governing Churches, it should desire to have largely, if not altogether, under its own control, the management of the institution which is to be the training school for those who are about to take Holy Orders. The second reason which has been adverted to is a very remarkable one. The Divinity School of the University of Dublin is at present under the control of the Governing Body of the University, which is composed of the Provost and Senior Fellows. According to the constitution of that Body at present, the Church, would, no doubt, say that the government of the School is satisfactory. But under the effect of recent legislation it might, in the course of time, come to pass that the members of the Governing Body might cease to be members of the Church; and if this should happen—as I hope it may not—it certainly cannot be expected that the Church would continue to repose confidence in the control and management of the Divinity School. The third reason is of the same kind. The area of choice from which the Professors and Lecturers of the Dublin School are at present selected comprises the Fellows and ex-Fellows of the University. That area has hitherto, no doubt, been sufficiently large for the purpose of securing an efficient choice. But here, again, the result of recent legislation has been remarkable. During the last 14 or 15 years no Fellow of the College has, I am told, taken Holy Orders; and if this state of things continues, the area of choice will become so much narrower that the persons chosen as Lecturers and Professors in the Divinity School may be such as the Church would not desire to see in that position. I am, therefore, not at all surprised that the Church of Ireland, influenced by these reasons, should be extremely anxious that an arrangement such as that to be found in the Bill—supported as it is by the Report of the Commissioners—should be carried into law.

Your Lordships must, however, bear in mind, on the other hand, how this question may be looked at from a University point of view.

As I understand it, this proposal involves, in the first place, a transfer from the University to the Church of an annual sum of nearly £3,000. No doubt, that sum is at present expended by the University in keeping up the Divinity School; and it may be said that, if that School be kept up for the future by the Church, the University will be no loser by handing over the money. But, at the same time, it is an important question whether the University is ready to consent to the transfer of so much of its property? Again, the proposal involves the suppression in the University of great Theological Professorships—of the Regius Professorship, and other important Professorships and Lectureships. It is not impossible that such might be the best solution of the difficulty, and one to which the University will be ready to agree; but it is an important point, and one which would have to be gravely considered. Again, as Theology is at present one of the Faculties of Dublin University, it has the duty imposed on it, both of teaching and conferring degrees in that Faculty. There is no other Faculty in the University, except perhaps Music, in which the University does not both teach and confer degrees. The effect of this proposal would be to put an end to the possibility of the teaching of Theology by the University, and it is open to considerable doubt how far any satisfactory arrangement could be made for conferring degrees in a Faculty in which the University should have ceased to teach.

Such are the views, with respect to this proposal, which seem to me of importance, both as regards the Church and the University.

I was very glad to hear from my noble Friend who introduced the subject that an interval—and I hope a substantial interval—will be allowed to elapse before the Bill comes on for a second reading. The measure is one which can hardly be expected to secure the support of Parliament, unless it shall appear to be promoted by the unanimous action of the two Bodies concerned. From what has been said, I expect that the proposal will have the approval of the Irish Church; but it is a proposal which ought to be submitted to the Synod that will meet soon after Easter. In the same way, the opinion of the University ought to be obtained; and by the University I mean not merely the Governing Body, consisting of the Provost and the Senior Fellows—though in their wisdom, moderation, and experience, I have thorough confidence—but in the larger Bodies of the Council and the Senate. There is no person whose opinion ought to carry more weight on an occasion such as the present than that of the Provost—and I would say the same of all the members of the distinguished Board over which he presides; but, after all, they are only the Governing Body, and it is not for them to decide with regard to important structural alterations in the University itself. What Parliament will desire to see is a free expression of opinion from the Corporate Body of the University, and to know what the Council and the Senate, and the Body at large think upon so important a subject. I hope my noble Friend will take care that there shall be ample opportunity for obtaining such an expression of opinion; and if it shall appear that the measure has the full assent of the Church and the University, it will then be for Parliament to consider whether it cannot also accord its sanction to the scheme.

Motion *agreed to;* Bill read 1ª; and to be *printed.* (No. 36.)

TENANT RIGHT (IRELAND) BILL [H.L.]

A Bill to make further provision in respect of Tenant Right in Ireland at the expiration of leases—Was *presented* by The Earl of BELMORE; read 1ª. (No. 35.)

House adjourned at a quarter past Seven o'clock, till To-morrow, half past Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Thursday, 27th March, 1879.

MINUTES.] — PUBLIC BILLS — *Resolution in Committee* — East India Loan (£10,000,000) —R.P.

Committee — Blind and Deaf-Mute Children (Education) [93], [House counted out].

QUESTIONS.

IRELAND—GLENGARIFF DISPENSARY DISTRICT.—QUESTION.

MR. SULLIVAN asked the Chief Secretary for Ireland, If it is the fact that there is no dispensary doctor resident in the Glengariff Dispensary District which comprises an area of 200 square miles; whether the medical officer's residence is not three miles from the nearest point and more than twelve miles from other points of the district; if he would state what is the population of the district and the number of dispensaries in it; and, how often in the week is any medical officer required to attend at the Glengariff Dispensary?

MR. J. LOWTHER: Sir, the Glengariff Dispensary District comprises an area of 91 square miles. The population is 5,187. There are three dispensaries, at each of which the doctor is required to attend once a week. He was unable, I understand, to find a suitable residence in his district, and was therefore allowed to live at Bantry, which is situate, as regards the Glengariff district, at the distance indicated by the hon. and learned Gentleman. The understanding, however, was that he should obtain a house within his district as soon as an opportunity arose. I see the hon. and learned Gentleman has another Question on the Paper to me, if I have received any further information as to the extent of delay in holding an inquest recently held on the body of James Swanton, at Glengariff, and as to the cause of that delay. I may say that I have telegraphed for information, but I have not received any answer as yet.

MR. SULLIVAN: Sir, I beg to give Notice that I shall call attention to the circumstances of that dispensary on the Estimates for the Irish Poor Law Board.

IRELAND—THE GAME LAWS—CASE OF THE HAGNEYS.—QUESTION.

MR. ALEXANDER M'ARTHUR (for Mr. P. A. TAYLOR) asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether it is true that at the last Dunfanaghy Petty Sessions, two men, father and son, named Hagney, were charged by Mr. Stewart, J.P. of Hornhead, with being unlawfully on his preserves in pursuit of game, and having in their possession two rabbits, and were sentenced to be imprisoned in Lifford Gaol for three months without the option of a fine; and, if so, whether he will order a mitigation of the sentence?

MR. J. LOWTHER: The facts are, I believe, correctly stated by the hon. Gentleman, though it should have been added that the men are notorious bad characters, who had been previously convicted of acts of plunder, such as robbery of potatoes. They had also been distinctly warned against trespassing upon the land in question, and had recently been let off upon a promise not to offend again. In these circumstances, neither the conviction nor the sentence appears to call for any action on the part of the Government.

CUSTOMS RE-ORGANIZATION. QUESTION.

MR. RITCHIE asked the Secretary to the Treasury, If he is now in a position to state whether the scheme for the re-organization of the Customs has been finally settled, and when it will come into operation?

SIR HENRY SELWIN-IBBETSON: In answer to my hon. Friend the Member for the Tower Hamlets, I am happy to be able to say that the principle of the scheme has been already decided upon; but there are certain details which will require a short time before they can be finally settled.

MR. RITCHIE: I beg to give Notice that I shall repeat this Question on this day week.

MAURITIUS—EMIGRATION OF COOLIES. QUESTION.

MR. ALEXANDER M'ARTHUR asked the Secretary of State for the

Colonies, Whether it is true that a large number of indentured Coolies, employed on a bankrupt estate in the Mauritius, have been improperly conveyed to Brazil; and, if so, what steps Her Majesty's Government took to secure the return of those labourers to the colony?

Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH: Two years ago the representatives of a Brazilian estate recruited between 100 and 200 time-expired Coolies in Mauritius for service in Brazil, and conveyed them to Brazil. These Coolies were free agents, and there was nothing at the time to prevent their emigration from Mauritius to Brazil. But a law has since been passed to prevent the emigration of Coolies from Mauritius to countries to which, like Brazil, direct emigration from India has not been permitted. The term of service was for three years, with due stipulations as to wages, rations, and free return passage to Mauritius. In the meantime the Brazilian estate became bankrupt, and through the intervention of Her Majesty's Representative in Brazil the Coolies have been sent back to Mauritius at the charge of the bankrupt estate. It was ascertained that the Coolies had no ground of complaint for their treatment on the estate.

INTEMPERANCE—REPORT OF THE LORDS' COMMITTEE.—QUESTION.

Sir WILFRID LAWSON asked Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Whether Her Majesty's Government intend to propose any legislation, during this Session, based on the recommendations contained in the Report of the Lords Committee on Intemperance?

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER: No, Sir. Her Majesty's Government do not intend to propose any legislation on the subject.

PRISONS (IRELAND)—MEDICAL OFFICERS.—QUESTION.

Mr. MACARTNEY asked the Secretary to the Treasury, Whether a scheme has yet been drawn up for arranging a system of payment to the medical officers of prisons in Ireland, who, being at the same time surgeons of the county infirmaries, have since the handing over of the prisons to Government, been performing the duties of medical officers of such prisons without any remuneration; and, if so, whether those medical officers are to receive payment for their services from the date of the transfer of the prisons from the county to the Government authorities?

Sir HENRY SELWIN-IBBETSON: Mr. Speaker, in answer to the hon. Member for Tyrone, I may say that a scheme has been drawn up by the Irish Government, and approved by the Treasury, for the payment of Medical Officers of Prisons in Ireland, and that the remuneration fixed by that scheme will be paid from the date of the transfer of the prisons to the Government.

SOUTH AFRICA—SIR BARTLE FRERE—THE DESPATCHES.—QUESTION.

Lord COLIN CAMPBELL asked the Secretary of State for the Colonies, If he will state on what day the Telegram from Sir Bartle Frere, dated November 5th, 1878, a Copy of which is enclosed in a Despatch from Sir Bartle Frere of same date, and printed in Blue Book C. 2222, p. 8, was received at the Colonial Office; and, whether in reply to that Telegram any telegraphic message was sent to Sir Bartle Frere?

Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH: The telegram in question was received on the 23rd of November. No reply was sent to it because it had been practically already answered by my Despatch of the 21st of that month, and because it would not have been possible, if a telegram had been sent to Madeira, to catch the mail which left England before that which conveyed that Despatch.

BAR EDUCATION AND DISCIPLINE BILL.—QUESTION.

Dr. KENEALY asked Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, If he can now inform the House whether it is intended to re-introduce the Bar Education and Discipline Bill during the present Session; whether his attention has been called to a statement made in the "Manchester Examiner and Times" that this Bill will be indefinitely postponed, in consequence of certain Amendments put upon the Notice Paper, during the last two Sessions, by the Member for Stoke-upon-Trent; and, whether there is any foundation for this statement?

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER: It is not intended to re-introduce this Bill at present; and, looking to the state of Public Business, I am unable to say whether it will be possible to do so in the course of the Session. My attention has been called to the statement to which the hon. Gentleman refers; and I can certainly say that the reason for not proceeding with the measure is not that which has been stated in the paragraph to wnich he alludes.

VACCINATION ACTS—CASE OF MR. HAWLEY.—QUESTION.

Lord FREDERICK CAVENDISH asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether his attention has been called to the statement of Mr. Hawley, who was committed to prison with hard labour for offences under the Vaccination Acts, as to the treatment which he underwent in the Wakefield House of Correction; and, whether he has ascertained if that statement is substantially correct; and, if so, whether such treatment is in accordance with the Rules issued under the Prisons Act, 1877?

Mr. ASSHETON CROSS, in reply, said, he understood that notice of legal proceedings had been given both against the Justices and the Governor of the prison, and therefore it would be very difficult for him to say anything now either as to the commitment or the treatment by the Governor. It was not the case of an order to pay money, but a conviction for an offence, and therefore Mr. Hawley was a criminal prisoner, and did not come within the meaning of the Act of 1877. He was not put to hard labour.

NAVY—COALING AT ST. VINCENT.

QUESTION.

Mr. T. BRASSEY asked the First Lord of the Admiralty, If he will give the names of all mail steamers which called at St. Vincent, while the hired transports were detained at the island, and what quantity of coal was supplied to each mail steamer; whether he will lay upon the Table a Return, distinguishing the transports fitted with compound engines from those fitted with engines not compound; and, showing further, what quantity of coal was supplied to each transport before sailing from England, and the consumption of coal daily in each vessel on the passage to St. Vincent?

Mr. W. H. SMITH: I have obtained the information asked for. There were eight mail steamers which coaled between the 7th and 13th of March, and five other steamers. The *Chimborazo*, Australian mail, which arrived on the 7th and left on the 8th, took 450 tons. The *Mondego*, Royal mail, which arrived on the 8th and left the same day, took 161 tons. The *Umberto*, Italian mail, which arrived on the 8th and left on the 10th, took 200 tons. The *Guadiana*, Royal mail, which arrived on the 10th and left on the 11th, took 300 tons. The *Poitou*, French mail, which arrived on the 11th and left on the 12th, took 270 tons. The *Italia*, Italian mail, which arrived on the 10th and left on the 12th, took 250 tons. The *Nord American*, which arrived on the 13th and left the same day, took 155 tons. The *Benzuella*, Portuguese mail, which arrived on the 13th and left on the same day, took 28 tons. The eight mail steamers coaled between the 7th and 13th of March took 1,814 tons, and five merchant ships took 770 tons—in all, 2,584 tons. I shall be very happy to procure and lay on the Table any further information on this subject that may be desired by my hon. Friend.

PRISON LABOUR—COMPETITION WITH TRADES AND INDUSTRIES.

QUESTION.

Mr. Serjeant SIMON asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether any and what measures have been taken since the passing of the Prisons Act, 1877 (40 and 41 Vic. c. 21), to regulate the system of prison labour in trades and manufactures, so as to prevent undue pressure on, or competition with, any particular trade or industry; whether his attention has been called to the fact that the Prison Commissioners' Report of 1878 does not state the various manufacturing processes carried on in each of the prisons within their jurisdiction, or the particulars as to the kind and quantities of, and the commercial value of the labour on such manufactures, as is required by the Act; what is the reason of these omissions; whether they will be prevented in future;

and, when the next Report will be laid upon the Table of the House?

Mr. ASSHETON CROSS: A very large proportion of the mat-making which used to be carried on in prisons has been given up. One great object of it was to supply the means of employment requisite for the prisoners themselves. The Report alluded to in the Question is not the annual Report of the Commissioners. The annual Report under the Act of Parliament cannot be made up until the end of the first year after the passing of the Act. Whenever it is completed it will be laid on the Table of the House.

SOUTH AFRICA — THE ZULU WAR — REWARDS FOR SERVICE AT RORKE'S DRIFT.—QUESTION.

Mr. OSBORNE MORGAN asked the Secretary of State for War, Whether it is intended to confer upon the non-commissioned officers and private soldiers, as well as upon the officers engaged at Rorke's Drift, and particularly upon the men singled out for special notice in Major Chard's Despatch of the 25th of January, any distinct and substantial recognition or reward for their services on that memorable occasion?

Colonel LOYD LINDSAY: Perhaps the hon. and learned Member will allow me to answer the Question, in the absence of my right hon. and gallant Friend the Secretary of State for War, who is detained by a great pressure of business at the War Office. With reference to the Question, perhaps from want of apprehension, I did not quite comprehend the precise meaning of the words that were used — "substantial rewards." Perhaps the hon. and learned Member alludes to the decorations which are given to soldiers who distinguish themselves by Her Majesty, and which are valued as coming from the Queen. It takes a considerable time to allot these, according to fairness and precision; but the matter is now under the consideration of the Commander-in-Chief and the Secretary of State for War.

ARMY — ARTILLERY AND ENGINEER OFFICERS.—QUESTION.

Major O'BEIRNE asked the Secretary of State for War, To explain why Colonels of the Royal Artillery and Royal Engineers are excluded from the command of a brigade depôt whilst Officers who have served exclusively in the Cavalry are at present eligible to such commands; and, whether any and what addition will be made to the present numerical strength of Non-commissioned Officers and Men at brigade depôts, or whether a reduction will be made of the number of combatant Officers?

Colonel LOYD LINDSAY: In answer to the hon. and gallant Member, I beg to state that the Warrant was never intended to apply to officers of the Royal Artillery, and there will be no objection to their being appointed to these commands provided they have fulfilled the requirements—five years' service in the brevet rank they now occupy. With those qualifications they may be appointed to those commands. With regard to the second point in the hon. and gallant Member's Question, he asks whether any and what addition will be made to the present numerical strength of Non-commissioned Officers and Men at brigade depôts, or whether a reduction will be made in combatant officers. Well, with regard to the number of combatant officers, I may remark to the hon. and gallant Member that if the duties were simple in connection with military functions it would be very well; but they have other duties connected with recruiting, pensioners, and general superintendence which are really heavy, and I can say that there are not too many of them at the depôts.

BRITISH BURMAH.—QUESTION.

Mr. RICHARD asked Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, If he can give the House any further information as to the state of affairs in Burmah; and, whether instructions have been sent to the Governor General of India not to take any step calculated to involve the Country in war with Burmah without express authority from home?

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER: Sir, I am not in a position to add very much to the knowledge which the House already possesses as to the state of affairs in Burmah. The House is aware of the circumstances which occurred at Mandalay. The Resident there and the British Commissioner at

Rangoon asked that reinforcements might be sent to protect British Burmah. We shall maintain the attitude of precaution, and the Resident will remain at Mandalay while he considers his safety not compromised. The telegraph keeps us in easy communication with the Indian Government, and my noble Friend (Viscount Cranbrook) assures me that we can rely upon their not taking any important steps without our consent.

CYPRUS—THE PIONEER REGIMENT. QUESTION.

GENERAL SIR **GEORGE BALFOUR** asked Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Whether the Cyprus Pioneer Regiment is to be dressed in uniform and armed, and what uniform and arms and accoutrements; and, if so, how the money for these and other regimental equipments is to be obtained; and, if a complete statement of the pay and allowances of the several ranks will be furnished?

MR. **BOURKE**: Perhaps I may be allowed to answer the Question. It is proposed that the Cyprus Pioneers shall be dressed in scarlet. I understand that it is intended that they shall be equipped like an English regiment of the Line—that is, as nearly as circumstances will permit. With regard to the expense, it is intended that it shall be provided out of the Vote which the hon. and gallant Member will find in Class 5 of the Civil Service Estimates. The Statement of payment and allowances will be laid before the House previous to the Vote being proposed.

GENERAL SIR **GEORGE BALFOUR**: The Vote alluded to in the Civil Service Estimates provides only for the pay of the men, and not for arms, uniform, and equipments.

MR. **BOURKE**: The hon. and gallant Member will find that uniforms are included under the heading of the Vote.

EGYPT—THE FINANCES.—QUESTION.

MR. **ERRINGTON** asked Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Whether Mr. Rivers Wilson has made any Report to the English Government as to the present state of the finances of Egypt; and, if so, if there will be any objection to lay it upon the Table?

THE **CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER**: No, Sir; Mr. Rivers Wilson has not made any such Report to the Government; nor is it his business to do so.

ARMY—THE DEFENCE OF RORKE'S DRIFT—BREVET-MAJOR CHARD. QUESTION.

COLONEL **ARBUTHNOT** asked the Secretary of State for War, Whether, by his recent promotion to the position of Supernumerary Captain in the Royal Engineers, Brevet Major Chard will permanently supersede, in regimental seniority as apart from Army rank, those Lieutenants who were senior to him in the corps, or whether he will continue to be Supernumerary until such time as he would be promoted in the ordinary course; and, in the latter case, whether arrangements will be made with the view of retaining his services during such interim?

COLONEL **LOYD LINDSAY**: I have said that Lieutenant Chard has been promoted to the rank of Captain and Brevet Major, and he will continue to remain supernumerary in his rank until such time as he naturally would have risen in his rank, according to ordinary promotion. But he will supersede those lieutenants in the Service who are now senior to him.

SOUTH AFRICA—THE ZULU WAR—THE COMMAND.—QUESTIONS.

MR. **OTWAY** asked the Secretary of State for War, On which of the four Major Generals recently sent on service in South Africa will devolve the office of High Commissioner and the command of the Army there, in the event of Sir Bartle Frere and Lord Chelmsford ceasing to fulfil the duties of their office and command?

MR. **ARTHUR MOORE** desired to be informed, Whether any of the four Major Generals sent out to aid Lord Chelmsford have seen active service in South Africa?

COLONEL **LOYD LINDSAY**: Major General Clifford is the senior Major General gone out to the Cape, and he has seen service in South Africa, having been engaged in the last Kaffir War.

MR. OTWAY: Will the command devolve upon Major General Clifford in the event of a vacancy?

COLONEL LOYD LINDSAY: Yes; as a matter of course, as senior officer.

MINES ACT, 1872—MINING EXPLOSIONS —SUPERVISION OF MANAGERS.

QUESTION.

MR. MACDONALD asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, If his attention has been drawn to the evidence given by Mr. Greaves, the manager of the Stanley Colliery, when under examination as to the cause of the explosion that killed twenty-one men, where he stated that he complied with the terms of the Mines Act, 1872, as to daily supervision, when he received simply the reports of the deputies and others; and, whether, if such be an incorrect view, he will instruct the inspectors to make known it is so?

MR. ASSHETON CROSS, in reply, said, he had already taken steps with the view of making the Inspectors aware of the incorrectness of the view stated.

SOUTH AFRICA—PAPERS AND DESPATCHES.—QUESTIONS.

SIR ALEXANDER GORDON asked the Secretary of State for the Colonies, If he has received copies of the following documents, and, if received, whether he will lay Copies upon the Table of the House:—

1. "A Despatch from Lieutenant General Lord Chelmsford, dated Rorke's Drift, 23rd March 1879," reporting the affair at Isandula on the previous day, referred to in Enclosure No. 4 of Sir Bartle Frere's Despatch of the 27th January 1879.

2. "Colonel Bray's very clear and useful Letters, dated Court House, Sandspruit, Umzinga, 8 a.m. and 1.25 p.m. January 23rd 1879," referred to in Enclosure No. 5 of Sir Bartle Frere's Despatch of the 27th January 1879;"

and, if he will lay upon the Table of the House Copies of his Telegrams to Sir Bartle Frere, dated 5th and 18th October 1878, referred to at page 79 of Blue Book, C. 2242?

SIR MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH: I have not received copies of a despatch from Lord Chelmsford dated the 23rd of March, nor of Colonel Bray's clear and useful letters; therefore, I am unable to lay them on the Table of the House.

SIR ALEXANDER GORDON: There is a misprint. It should have been the 23rd of January, not of March. Sir Bartle Frere refers to the despatch. I beg to ask the right hon. Gentleman if he is in possession of a despatch of that date?

SIR MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH: I am really very sorry; I did not notice the misprint; I replied to the Question under the impression that the date named was the 23rd of January. I have not received any such despatch nor a copy of Colonel Bray's letters. I am anxious to give the House the fullest information in my power. I thought the telegram of the 5th of October had been already presented. I find it is not so, and I will read it to the House. It was sent by me in reply to Sir Bartle Frere's despatch of the 10th of September, which was written from Cape Town, and received by me on the 5th of October. It was, as the House will remember, the first request for reinforcements. I replied by telegram on the same day—

> "I have received your despatch of the 10th of September suggesting reinforcement of troops. Her Majesty's Government will wait the result of your personal interview with Sir Henry Bulwer and General Thesiger before coming to a decision on the subject. I am led to think from the information before me that there should still be a good chance of avoiding war with the Zulus."

The House will remember Sir Bartle Frere's despatch was written from Cape Town; he was about to proceed to Natal, where he was to meet Sir Henry Bulwer and General Thesiger. The telegram dated the 18th of October was not from me; it was simply forwarded through my Office; it was a telegram from the Secretary of State for War to Lord Chelmsford, and I believe it was included in the War Office Papers presented to the House.

SIR ALEXANDER GORDON asked the Secretary of State for War, Whether he will lay upon the Table of the House Copies of his Message to Lieutenant General Thesiger, and of General Thesiger's reply thereto, both of which are referred to in the first paragraph of Sir Bartle Frere's Despatch to the Secretary of State for the Colonies, dated November 11th, 1878?

COLONEL LOYD-LINDSAY: If the hon. and gallant Member will turn to the Blue Book issued this morning, he will find the Papers there — pages 6 and 17.

Mr. MILBANK, without in any way wishing to cast the slightest doubt on the statement made in "another place" by His Royal Highness the Commander-in-Chief, desired to give Notice of his intention to ask the Secretary of State for War to-morrow, Whether he remembered to have seen or heard of in the War Office a letter or despatch from Lord Chelmsford to His Royal Highness to the effect that he was suffering from the strain of prolonged anxiety?

Colonel STANLEY: I may as well answer the Question at once. So far as I am aware, there is no such despatch. I am making every effort to trace it both in semi-private papers, such as there have been, in letters written to officers, and letters to myself; but up to the present time no trace has been found of any such Paper.

FRANCE—THE COMMERCIAL TREATY.

QUESTION.

Mr. NEWDEGATE asked Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Whether negotiations are contemplated or are being carried on for the renewal of the Commercial Treaty between Her Majesty and the French Republic, or for the conclusion of a new Commercial Treaty through Her Majesty's Representatives in France, or in any other manner; and, whether, in case such negotiations are contemplated or are being carried on, inasmuch as the conclusion of a Commercial Treaty with the French Republic may, and probably will, especially under the most favoured nation clause of other Treaties, fetter the discretion and power of this House in the performance of its financial and legislative duties for a considerable number of years, Her Majesty's Ministers will furnish to this House such information as may enable this House to form and to express an opinion upon the contemplated terms of such Commercial Treaty before this Country can justly be held pledged to the acceptance of such Treaty?

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER: The position of affairs in regard to the Commercial Treaty between this country and France is this—Notice was given to the British Government by the French Government at the close of last year for the termination of the Treaty between the two countries to expire at the end of this year. There have been several communications made to the Government by Chambers of Commerce and persons interested in the trade between England and France, in order to bring about a renewal of some Commercial Treaty between the two countries; but the French Government have informed us that it will not be possible for them to enter into any communications until the views of the French Legislature have been ascertained upon the general principles of commerce and commercial action to be adopted by France. The discussion will arise upon the General Tariff Bill which is now before the Chamber of Deputies; but it is not certain when the Bill will come on for discussion. At the present moment I feel myself unable to give a definite answer to the latter part of my hon. Friend's Question. Much will depend on the nature of the communications we are enabled to open before I can say whether and in what way it will be convenient to take the opinion of this House upon any terms that may be under consideration.

CRIMINAL LAW—THE CONVICTS THEODORIDI AND GORLERO.

QUESTION.

Mr. CALLAN asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, What were the special circumstances in connection with the application made on behalf of the convict Paulo Gorlero by the Italian Ambassador which caused it "not to warrant the same consideration" as the application successfully made on behalf of the convict Theodoridi by the Ambassador of His Majesty the Sultan of Turkey; when and through whom had "the lady concerned in the case strongly recommended Theodoridi to mercy;" what were the special grounds stated in the memorial of the convict Theodoridi himself; and, whether, taking into consideration the peculiar nature of this act of mercy, he will have any objection to lay all the Papers connected with the case upon the Table of the House?

Mr. ASSHETON CROSS, in reply, said, he had very little to add to what he said the other day in reference to the release of the convict Theodoridi. The Ambassadors of Turkey and Greece had called upon him at different times in a non-official capacity, and he told both that any formal application was to be made to the Foreign Office. He did not, however, believe any such application was made. With regard to Theodoridi, his offence was no doubt a serious one, and fully deserving of the punishment awarded; but it was an offence peculiarly affecting the lady herself. All the letters which she was anxious to obtain had been given up, and at the time the lady herself recommended him to mercy. Under these circumstances, he thought it right to release the man, and he thought that the absence of such a scoundrel from the country would be no loss to it.

ARMY—PORTABLE INTRENCHING TOOLS.—QUESTION.

Sir BALDWYN LEIGHTON asked the Secretary of State for War, Whether any of the regiments lately despatched to South Africa were furnished with portable intrenching tools; and, if not, whether her Majesty's Government think it desirable that any delay should occur in providing such equipment; and, whether Her Majesty's Government are aware that the Roumanian Army at the Siege of Plevna, and the Austrian Army in the disputed occupation of the Turkish Provinces, found such equipment of signal service?

Colonel LOYD-LINDSAY, in reply, said, our Infantry and Cavalry were always furnished with the ordinary equipment, which comprised intrenching tools, spades, and pickaxes; and, in addition to these, the regiments lately despatched to South Africa had 2,000 or 3,000 spades and pickaxes of a light character. Our *attachés* had furnished full information upon the use made of this equipment at Plevna and by the Austrian Army of Occupation, and a careful report was being made by the military authorities. It was obvious that while intrenching tools might be useful to enable men to protect themselves against a distant fire, they would have been of no avail as against a sudden rush like that at Isandula.

TREATY OF BERLIN—EASTERN ROUMELIA.—QUESTIONS.

The Marquess of HARTINGTON: I beg to ask the Chancellor of the Exchequer a Question of which I have given him private Notice, Whether Her Majesty's Government have received from the Russian Government any proposals on the subject of a joint occupation of the Province of Eastern Roumelia by the Powers who were parties to the Treaty of Berlin, upon the retirement of the Russian Army from that Province; and, if not, if he is able to give the House any information in regard to any negotiations that may have taken place in consequence of those communications?

Lord ROBERT MONTAGU wished also to put a Question, of which he had given the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer private Notice—namely, Whether there is any truth in a telegram from Berlin, dated March 26, which asserts that Article 16 of the Treaty of Berlin is to be set aside, and a "mixed occupation" of East Roumelia is to take place; and, whether the Porte has given its consent to and will take part in that occupation? Also, whether this course has been assented to by Her Majesty's Government in virtue of a secret agreement that Russia shall be free to advance to Merv and shall not oppose the advance of English troops to Herat?

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER: In answer to the noble Marquess (the Marquess of Hartington), I can only say that communications upon this subject have been received by Her Majesty's Government from the Government of Russia, and I believe also by the Governments of the other Powers who were parties to the Treaty of Berlin. The subject is still under discussion; and it would not, therefore, be convenient to express any opinion upon it at the present time. I have not seen the telegram to which the noble Lord (Lord Robert Montagu) refers. It certainly seems to contain some very strange news.

ORDERS OF THE DAY.

POSTPONEMENT.

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER moved, "That the Orders of the Day be postponed until after the Notice of Motion relating to the Zulu War."

Mr. RYLANDS asked what arrangements the right hon. Gentleman proposed to make with a view to the prolongation of the debate?

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER presumed the hon. Member meant to say with a view to the conclusion of the debate. He should suppose that the hon. Members for Glasgow and Cumberland, who had given Notices on going into Committee of Supply to-morrow, would not think it necessary to stand upon their rights, and that the House would be allowed to resume the adjourned debate.

MR. ANDERSON said, his Notice of Motion, which occupied the first place, was of paramount importance on account of the nature of the subject. In the present extreme depression of our manufacturing and agricultural industries the subject of technical education was one of the most important which could be discussed. The Government were also aware of the extreme difficulty that any private Member had in securing the first place on the Paper. It was rather hard, therefore, to be obliged to relinquish it after securing it. At the same time, he could not possibly resist the wish of the House to proceed with the adjourned debate; and he therefore would give way, hoping, however, that the Government would, if necessary, assist him in getting another day for his Motion.

Motion *agreed to.*

Ordered, that the Orders of the Day be postponed until after the Notice of Motion relating to the Zulu War.—(*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer.*)

MOTIONS.

SOUTH AFRICA—THE ZULU WAR—SIR BARTLE FRERE.

RESOLUTION. [FIRST NIGHT.]

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE, in rising to move—

> "That this House, while willing to support Her Majesty's Government in all necessary measures for defending the possessions of Her Majesty in South Africa, regrets that the ultimatum which was calculated to produce immediate war should have been presented to the Zulu King without authority from the responsible advisers of the Crown, and that an offensive war should have been commenced without imperative and pressing necessity or adequate preparation; and this House further regrets that after the censure passed upon the High Commissioner by Her Majesty's Government in the Despatch of the 19th day of March 1879, the conduct of affairs in South Africa should be retained in his hands,"

said, from the year 1843 down to a recent period, the Colony of Natal had enjoyed complete peace upon its Zulu Frontier; and, similarly, from 1852 downwards, a condition of general peace was the lot of the South African Colonies generally. During the past three years, however, and especially during the last two, the condition of affairs in South Africa had greatly changed. They had seen a rapid succession of wars, the number of which was variously estimated at four, five, and six, according to the degree of importance attached by different persons to the disturbances which had occurred. The state of things existing in South Africa at the time of the arrival of the present High Commissioner, Sir Bartle Frere, was clearly indicated in a private letter which he had received from an old Colonist. His informant said—

> "Sir Bartle Frere's predecessor, on leaving the Cape, declared that whatever difficulties might fall to the lot of his successor, it was satisfactory to know that the legacy of a Kaffir war was not one of them, unless the 'scare,' or war party, were allowed to work their will."

Well, "the scare," or war party, had been allowed to work their will, and the question naturally arose—Who was responsible for the change? In contrast with the circumstances of Sir Bartle Frere's arrival in the Colony, it was interesting to note his own account of the present condition of affairs there. Speaking of Natal, he said—

> "The capital and all the principal towns are at this moment in laager, prepared for an attack which, even if successfully resisted, would leave two-thirds of them in ashes, and the country around utterly desolated. From every part of South Africa, outside the Colony, where Native races predominate, come the same reports of uneasiness, and of intended risings of the Natives against the White man, while the majority of the Transvaal European population is in a state of avowed readiness to take any opportunity of shaking off the yoke of the English Government."

Some years ago, a dispute had arisen between the Zulu Kingdom and the Transvaal Boers with regard to the possession of certain territory; and when the Transvaal was annexed, Her Majesty's Government informed Parliament that the object in view was to restore tranquillity, and prevent a collision between the Zulus and the White population. When the South African Bill was discussed, his hon. Friend the Member for Liskeard (Mr. Courtney) warned hon. Members that they were being misled; but the Government and their supporters, who were themselves misled, and not misleading, adhered to their views. As for the House of Commons, their policy in the affair was undoubtedly one of peace and friendliness towards the Zulu nation. They desired that no more wars should disturb our Colonies in South Africa; and it was with that view that they supported the Government in passing the Bill. It was in the face of the protests and arguments of those who opposed the Bill that statements such as he had referred to had much weight with the great majority of the House. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Sandwich (Mr. Knatchbull - Hugessen), quoting the words of the Secretary of State for the Colonies, said that—

> "Her Majesty's Government could not accept or be a party to any of those monstrous extensions of territory by the Boers;"

and it was clear that the idea of the House was that by the policy to be adopted the Zulu Kingdom would be protected against the aggressive action of the Boers. As for the disputed land claims, they were told by Sir Arthur Cunynghame, who was the General in command at the time of the annexation, in a book he had recently published, that the Boers claimed a large extent of country which they asserted Cetewayo had sold to them, an assertion which he denied, and that, acting as mediator between the parties, Sir Theophilus Shepstone had taken the part of the Zulu King. That was a fair summary of the case. Now, with respect to those lands, something might be gathered from the rates at which they were sold. Sir Arthur Cunynghame stated that 1,800,000 acres had been sold at three-halfpence an acre, although the land was good. It was customary for the Boers, as each man came of age, to give him a plot of territory extending to 6,000, 10,000, and even to 12,000 acres; and Sir Arthur Cunynghame stated that a large number of farms had been measured by a Government surveyor, and that some of the farms which were represented as containing 6,000 acres each were found to contain 9,000 and some 12,000 acres. The measurement of one plot of land was stated to be 160,000 acres, but on being measured it was found to extend to 240,000 acres; and he added that, though most of the Boers had far more land than they could manage, yet every one of them desired to have more; and with reference to those claims generally, he said that quarrels and bloodshed were the result of their being made. Well, the Government of Natal—even Sir Theophilus Shepstone, who was at that time the adviser of the Government—and Her Majesty's Government itself had all stated their strong disapproval of the conduct of the Boers. Sir Theophilus Shepstone, however, appeared to have changed his mind about the time Sir Bartle Frere changed his. Which of the two had instigated the other to do so he could not, of course, say. All through the Papers it would, however, be seen that the Government of Natal had acted as a Government having a real head—a Government not run away with by passion or terror, a Government which was in complete contrast, from the first line of the Blue Books to the last, with the Government of Sir Bartle Frere. In one despatch the Government of Natal said that the Zulus had never given up their claim to the lands in dispute; that they had offered the land to the Government of Natal; had asked for the intercession of the Government of Natal, of which they professed themselves to be friends. After the annexation of the Transvaal the disputed lands were occupied by the Boers and were forcibly held by them, and the Zulus complained that they had been driven from their lands. He asked the House to remember that, for it was clear that Sir Bartle Frere, in the face of the plainest evidence, had altogether contradicted and denied the fact, and had said that the Zulus were taking the law into their own hands and had driven our people away from their lands. In another despatch the Natal Government pointed out that the messengers from Cetewayo had arrived, and had, in his name, asked for an arbitration on the question; and, as a matter of fact, at the end of 1877 or the beginning of 1878, an arrangement for arbitration was come to, and it was agreed between the Government of Natal and Cetewayo, and approved by the High Commissioner, that there should be arbitration on the subject. Arbitrators were appointed; and if this step was not taken at the suggestion of the Zulu King, at all events, when it was put to him by the Government of Natal, he at once assented to it. Messengers were sent to him on our behalf, and they reported that they were thoroughly satisfied as to the King's desire for peace, and that the story that he had invaded the disputed territory and set up a military kraal there was untrue. They said, too, that he had offered to abandon his claim to a considerable portion of the disputed territory, and had spoken of writing to the Queen, stating his strong desire to remain on good terms with the British Government, and they added that no one could doubt that he strongly wished that the dispute should be sent to arbitration. Sir Bartle Frere admitted that such was Cetewayo's wish; but he added that if the arbitration had gone against him he would not abide by it. It might be thought by some that if the arbitration went against Sir Bartle Frere he might avoid it by some convenient pretext. The Blue Book contained the answer in full of Cetewayo to the suggestion as to arbitration of the Natal Government, and it would be seen, on reference to it, that it was couched in the most friendly terms. The Government at home concurred in the view as to Cetewayo's friendliness. The right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for the Colonies wrote to say that he was disposed to think that it would be advisable to accept Cetewayo's offer, and he modified the proposal of the Natal Government, and accepted that of the Zulu King. Thus, it would be seen that there was then a general feeling of a conciliatory kind existing between the two Governments. Cetewayo received a second embassy, who informed him that negotiations for arbitration were on foot; he said what he heard had lifted a weight from his heart; that they were words he was glad to hear. They added that the chief men about the King did not wish for war; but appeared like men who had been carrying a heavy burden, and were told that they might put it down and rest. The Natal Government suggested that, as regarded the disputed lands, the *status quo* should be respected, and Cetewayo gave a promise to that effect. Sir Bartle Frere had since said that that promise was broken; but not only was there no evidence of that, but it was clearly the opinion of the Natal Government that the promise was kept throughout. The Papers in the hands of hon. Members set forth the arrangements which were made for the arbitration, and that Sir Theophilus Shepstone—and this was the first note of discord, the first sign that mischief was brewing—recorded his dissent. The Transvaal Government at that moment were against the arbitration, although they afterwards came round, apparently because they had been persuaded that the arbitration would be favourable to their views. Sir Bartle Frere accepted the inquiry, but asserted that it would be adverse to the Zulus. He said—

> "I cannot say that I see much hope of permanent peace being obtained by means of the intervention at present suggested. I should rather expect that the Zulu King, like many other military despots, will be willing to accept an intervention that will give him what he desires without fighting for it, but that he will not accept with equal readiness a decision adverse to his claims."

It proved to be Sir Bartle Frere who would not accept a decision adverse to his claims. What did Sir Theophilus Shepstone say at this time? At this moment he received a deputation of Dutch Boers, representing the people who had settled on the disputed soil, and told them that it was an absolute necessity for the Government to accept the arbitration. He said that when a man like Cetewayo proposed a resort to peaceable means for the settlement of a difficulty, it was the duty of a Christian country to accept his proposals. He also told them that the result of the arbitration would be in support of their views. His words were—

> "I told them that Cetewayo had consented to arbitration, and that, whatever our individual views might be as to the practical issue of the remedy, we were bound to show at least as great a desire for a peaceful settlement as the Zulu King was said to have shown, of whose character the memorialists had used such strong language. I told them that I would do all in my power to obtain for the State its just rights, but that the use of force was at present out of the question. I pressed upon them the necessity for abstaining from the commission of any act that might prejudice those rights, and begged of them to bear their burdens as best they could, in the hope of a fair and righteous judgment being ultimately secured."

Thus, he told the representatives of the Transvaal that he would maintain before the Commission claims which he now called their just rights, but which he had previously condemned in the strongest language. Sir Henry Bulwer, replying to the Government of the Transvaal that the Dutch Burghers had expressed their disappointment at what had been done in view of putting off war, said—"They object to arbitration, and they will resist any decision that goes against them." The Natal Government also said that the object of the memorialists was war with the Zulu nation, and that they seemed to lose sight of the fact that war with the Zulus no longer concerned Transvaal territory alone. The Natal Government pointed out how dangerous it would be for all the Governments to appeal to arms for a settlement of the dispute. A message was then sent to Cetewayo, who treated the embassy with high consideration; and yet, in the same month, Sir Theophilus Shepstone telegraphed that there was imminent danger of war with the Zulus; and Sir Bartle Frere, who was bound to believe the Government of Natal in preference to the Government of the Transvaal, expressed his approval of the views of the latter Government. He reported home that the Government of the Transvaal was in favour of war; but he failed to report home the views of the Government of Natal, which were in favour of peace. Sir Bartle Frere, as soon as the opinion of the Commission appointed to settle the boundary question was known to be opposed to his own views, began to seek for fresh occasion for war—a war which, in the opinion of the Government at home, would not be for the benefit of the Colonies. Sir Bartle Frere had, in his opinion, kept back the award for nine months. The Commission was appointed in March, and Sir Bartle Frere was informed in April that the views of its members would be in favour of the Zulus, and against the claims of the Dutch Boers. The Commission finally reported at the end of June. The decision was officially communicated to Sir Bartle Frere at the beginning of July, and he had known what it would be since the middle of April, yet he kept back his final award until the month of December. On the 15th of May, when Cetewayo had heard the details of the decision, he said—

> "He now sees that he is a child of this Government (the Natal Government), and that the desire of this Government is to do him justice; had it acted in any other way than it has now done, fear would have overcome him, and he might have fled from those whom he now feels satisfied are his friends and wish him to live in peace. Cetewayo and the Zulu people are awaiting with beating hearts what the Lieutenant Governor of Natal will decide about the land that the Boers have given them (the Zulus) so much trouble about, for the Zulus wish very much now to re-occupy the land they never parted with, as it is now the proper season for doing so."

The Governor of Natal, on the receipt of that letter, promised that no time should be lost in coming to a settlement, and yet the award of Sir Bartle Frere was not communicated until the month of December. The Government of Natal, writing in July, pointed out that Sir Bartle Frere had the whole of the case of the Commissioners in his hands; and Sir Bartle Frere then began those small, petty, unworthy, and miserable cavils, in which he continued to indulge for four or five months—cavils with the Commissioners, the Government of Natal, the Bishop of Natal, and others who represented the interests of the Zulu nation. The arguments of the Government of Natal were well worthy of consideration, as the party most interested in the maintenance of peace was naturally the Government of Natal, representing, as they did, the Colony upon which the brunt of a war with the Zulus must necessarily fall. The Colony, it should be remembered, had been the neighbour of Cetewayo for over 20 years, and during a large portion of that period it had been garrisoned by half a single British battalion, although the whole Zulu military system was lying upon its Borders just as well prepared for war as at the present time. The decision was expressed in July, and it ought to have been communicated at once. But Sir Bartle Frere had made preparations for an offensive war; he had laid his plans for the concentration of four columns upon the Zulu Frontier, and in July and August he was gaining time by cavilling in detail with the award. An admirable paper by Sir Henry Bulwer on the disputed boundary completely answered all the objections of Sir Bartle Frere. In August, Sir Bartle Frere expressed his views to the Government of Natal, and they again replied to them. The Government of Natal denied the statement of Sir Bartle Frere that the Zulus had taken the law into their own hands. The Government of Natal said—

> "In this matter it was the Government of the Republic, or its subjects with its sanction expressed or unexpressed, who, bent on acquiring a portion of the Zulu country—and, possibly, with the view of ultimately becoming masters of the whole country—pushed the boundaries of the Republic further and further into Zululand, disregarding the rights of the Zulu nation, and refusing to listen to their complaints and to the proposals that were made for the dispute coming under the cognizance and judgment of a neutral Government. By force of circumstances, the subjects of the Transvaal were enabled to hold the lands thus acquired by them for several years; and now, when the day of settlement has come, they may turn round and say that they are the aggrieved and that the Zulus are the aggressors."

These were not his words, but the words of the Government of Natal, and they accompanied those words by saying that the decision ought to be given to the Zulus without delay. Sir Bartle Frere, in his answer to this, cavilled and raised objections to the views of the Government of Natal, saying, as though he would put a kind of conundrum—"What precisely do the Zulus claim in the disputed territory? What rights do they wish to exercise there, and how do they wish to exercise those rights?" In reply, the Governor of Natal said—

> "I think it is clear that what the Zulus claim in the 'disputed territory' is actual possession and use of the country as Zulu country for the Zulus. Mere Sovereignty, with the colonization of the country by European colonists in any number, they know very well would, in a short time, come to mean either the sovereignty of the White man or conflict with him."

Such were the views of the Government of Natal. The Papers showed that Sir Bartle Frere wished at this very moment to send ships off the coast of the Zulu country; but the Natal Government prevented him from doing so. Again, we knew that the Government at home was informed early in September that all the arrangements had been made for an offensive war. In his Resolution he assumed that the Government at home refused to give leave for this offensive war; but, at the same time, it appeared to him that they must have been very remiss, if they did not see early in last year that it was the intention of Sir Bartle Frere to make an offensive war. Sir Bartle Frere continued his cavils by saying—"The decision of the Commissioners was not such as would have been given in a Court of Law." The Lieutenant Governor, in a dignified manner, replied—"It was the decision of a Court of Equity." In his opinion, no more dignified rebuke was ever administered by an inferior to a superior officer. Sir Bartle Frere, having become aware that he would have to give up the disputed territory, at all events in name, sought out other causes for a war which he, no doubt, thought necessary in the interests of the Colony. He said he considered that an organized Zulu Army threatened the very existence of the Government of Natal. But the Government of Natal, not having lost their heads, replied—

> "The maintenance of a standing and well-organized Army, it should be observed, is according to the custom of the Zulu nation, which in all its traditions and instincts is warlike, and does not in itself prove that there is any set purpose of aggression in the mind of the King.'

The Government of Natal had shown from first to last, according to the Papers, that it was not a Government to be frightened or to be easily put out of its mind. Sir Bartle Frere next raised a question which figured afterwards in the Ultimatum, observing that—

> "The Zulus had claimed a vast extension of the existing boundaries of the Zulu Kingdom."

There was no evidence whatever in the published Papers to justify that statement. Sir Bartle Frere used language which showed how determined he was that the Zulus should never again really possess the disputed land. He said, with regard to the comparative title of the Zulus and that of the Boers—

> "The Boers had force of their own and every right of conquest; but they had also what they seriously believed to be a higher title in the old commands they found in parts of their Bible to exterminate the Gentiles and take their land in possession."

Sir Bartle Frere added—

> "We may freely admit that they misinterpreted the text, and were utterly mistaken in its application; but they had at least a sincere belief in the Divine authority for what they did, and, therefore, a far higher title than the Zulus could claim for all they acquired."

"And, therefore, a far higher title." When a man wrote in language of this kind, was it right to censure him for one proceeding only, and not to blame his whole policy? Passages of this kind in his Reports showed that Sir Bartle Frere was a man who ought not to be left for one moment at the head of affairs. At page 49, Sir Bartle Frere used words of almost similar type, which were equally disrespectful to the opinion of his Commissioners. He said—

> "Had the means then at the disposal of the Transvaal Government sufficed, there can be no doubt that Government would have been justified in ejecting the Zulu intruders and replacing and protecting the Transvaal occupants."

Again, Sir Bartle Frere cavilled at the rejection of Transvaal evidence by the Commissioners, and he attacked them and the Natal Government upon this point. What did the Commissioners say, however, about this evidence which was produced on behalf of the Transvaal? They said—

> "The next document put forward by the Transvaal Government (No. 9), purporting, with other matter, to give an account of a meeting between Sir Theophilus Shepstone, the Secretary for Native Affairs of Natal, Panda, the Zulu King, and Cetewayo, is plainly a fabrication, because Sir Theophilus Shepstone did not arrive at Nodwengu from Natal to meet Panda and Cetewayo until the 9th of May, 1861, whereas the Transvaal document is dated the 16th of March of that year."

These Commissioners were thoroughly acquainted with the facts, and as competent to pronounce an opinion as any men who could be found. They were—Mr. Shepstone, the Secretary for Native Affairs in Natal, the Attorney General, and the gallant Colonel Durnford, who lost his life afterwards at Isandlana. All the dates were given, by which it became clear that Sir Bartle Frere had the facts really in his hands in April. The Commissioners began to sit in the early days of March, 1878, and all was over by June. By the end of July Sir Bartle Frere had all the Papers which were necessary for the consideration of the case, and by the end of July he was in as good a position as the Government of Natal to give his award on the case; but he kept back his award till the middle of December, when all his plans were prepared, and when he was ready with his troops and his Ultimatum. The last reference he had to make respecting the disputed territory was to Command Papers 2,222, p. 196. Lord Chelmsford was appointed British Resident in Zululand, and instructions were given to his Lordship as to what he was to do with regard to the disputed territory. Those instructions were—

> "His Excellency also knows that it is a part of the plan of the future settlement of Zululand that in the disputed territory all of the former White settlers who wish to remain on the farms occupied by them in the land now declared to be Zululand, shall be permitted to continue there under the protection of the British Resident, and subject to no further payments for their land than they would have paid to the Transvaal Government had the district been assigned to the Transvaal."

So that these Boers, who had taken all the good land and had acquired their title in the nefarious manner he had described, were to be protected not only in their lives and moveable property, but in the possession of the whole of their lands on the same terms as they held them from the Transvaal Government. In Command Papers 2,252 would be found a long argument between Bishop Colenso and Sir Bartle Frere on the question of the award. The Bishop attacked him for having taken back with one hand what he pretended to have given with the other, and on the other points of the Ultimatum. It was strange that Sir Bartle Frere had not put the Government in possession of the Bishop's last letter. There was no document which he had seen in which the position of Sir Bartle Frere was more triumphantly refuted. He said so, because it was stated on Tuesday in "another place" that the Bishop approved Sir Bartle Frere's proceedings. But he did not. In the Paper he had referred to, the Bishop from first to last demolished the defence which Sir Bartle Frere had set up. Sir Bartle Frere was still in command in South Africa; though he had been censured he had been continued in command. In Correspondence 2,260, p. 24, would be found this passage—

> "After what I had seen of the disposition of the Natal officials where Dutch interests were concerned, it would be a mockery to have entrusted the care of the poor Transvaal farmers to them."

How could officials be expected to carry out a policy which they disapproved, when they were condemned in the language he had read? [Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH asked him to read on.] The rest of the passage was, "Even if I could have been assured of a continuance of the just rule of Sir Henry Bulwer." The right hon. Gentleman himself would be of opinion that that did not alter the matter. He had the highest respect for the character of the Governor of Natal, and the greatest pleasure in reading that testimony, though it came from Sir Bartle Frere. When the Zulu

King was waiting our decision and had been kept quiet by the promises of the Governor of Natal, surely it would have been wise that Sir Bartle Frere should be able at the earliest date to report the decision and award? A message was despatched from the Commission to Sir Bartle Frere, showing which way their opinion would go, as early as the 14th of April. But he had begun his preparations for the Zulu War as early as the month of January, 1878; he had sent ships to the Zulu coast in March; and had spies out at that time, who were learning the best way to invade Zululand. Sir Bartle Frere, as appeared from the Papers, expected a decision in his favour; but the decision went against him, and he then looked out for a cause of war, which he thought would be necessary for the Colony of Natal. On the 25th of July occurred the raid of Sirayo's sons, and the pretext for war was given which Sir Bartle Frere wanted. He would now prove that the whole of the points put forward in his Ultimatum were of two kinds—either points on which satisfaction could be obtained, or points upon which in no circumstances was it possible to obtain satisfaction. Sir Bartle Frere spoke of the raid of Sirayo's sons as an outrage on the Natal territory; but the Government of Natal did not see it in that light. The Government of Natal had been in the habit of sending for prisoners into Zululand, and had, therefore, violated Zulu territory. It appeared that two of the wives of the great Chief Sirayo had fled with lovers into Natal; they had been followed by the sons of Sirayo; had been taken back, and, it was said, killed. The view of the Natal Government was that a large compensation for this outrage should be demanded, and the view of Cetewayo was that a large compensation should be paid. He would prove that from the Papers; but he believed they had not before them the whole of the documents which passed between the sending of the Ultimatum and the crossing of the Frontier. The second of the outrages was that on the engineers, which was not an outrage at all, because the two engineers were military spies of the English Government, sent out to make a survey with a view to invasion. While they were engaged in that survey Zulus came down, took away a pipe and a pocket-handkerchief, detained the engineers an hour or an hour and a-half, and sent them back again. For that no compensation should have been asked; but it was demanded, and an offer was made that it would be paid. The next point put forward by Sir Bartle Frere was that of the Swazi territory and of Umbellini. Umbellini was, as a matter of fact, the rightful heir to the Swazi Throne. This man, over whom Cetewayo had no control, had invaded our territory; but because he came from Zululand, Sir Bartle Frere assumed that he was a subject of Cetewayo. He had heard that this very man had gone back and was now aiding Cetewayo in his war with us. If that was true, it would only show with what astounding rashness Sir Bartle Frere had added to the difficulties which already existed in that country. There was another demand for the fulfilment of the promises made by Cetewayo on his Coronation; but it was never for one moment supposed that we were to hold Cetewayo to the performance of those promises. If he had dreamed that they would be put forward in an ultimatum, he never would have entertained them. He hoped there would be no defence by the Government of Sir Bartle Frere on this ground. He believed the Government themselves had been deceived with regard to the missionaries. The leaning of Sir Bartle Frere's mind from the first had been in favour of an offensive war; but the Secretary of State had been prompt in repudiating that object. He had been prompt, also, in repudiating what had been put forward on the part of the missionaries. When similar claims were proposed in favour of the missionaries in China, the great societies with which they were connected altogether repudiated them. He believed they would now be repudiated by their leading Representatives in that House, who would never be parties to the steps which were recommended by Sir Bartle Frere in order to force the Gospel on a savage people. Then came the question of the British Resident in Zululand, who was to try all cases in which the missionaries were concerned. The last point concerned the Zulu Army. That Army had never been a terror to Natal. At one time Natal was wholly stripped and denuded of troops, through the policy of Sir Bartle Frere, yet Cetewayo did not invade the Colony and committed no act of aggression. It was true he had assembled his troops, but only after a greater force of British troops had been assembled in Natal, his only object being to meet apprehended aggression. Sir Bartle Frere repeatedly tried to justify himself on this point with reference to the Zulu Army. He frequently referred to the expression used by the Zulu King of "washing his spears," as if it had been used against the British. But it was altogether otherwise. It was used with reference to his enemies on the Frontier, who had taken his cattle and plundered his border. He asked us to allow him to punish them and to "wash his spears." Yet Sir Bartle Frere had put forward this expression in such a way as to deceive the Government. Sir Arthur Cunynghame declared that throughout Cetewayo had been on good terms with us, and that his Army was not improved as a military machine. Sir Bartle Frere had greatly exaggerated the strength of the Zulu Army. It was not adequate to an offensive war, and was only intended for defensive purposes. Sir Bartle Frere spoke of the Zulu Army as numbering 40,000 to 60,000, well armed, prepared to invade the Colony. Sir Arthur Cunynghame stated the whole population of the country to be only 150,000 men, women, and children, the Army not being more than 20,000. The Colonists themselves did not believe that the Force was capable of overrunning Natal. Sir Bartle Frere had pictured the Zulu King as burning to invade Natal. On the other hand, Sir Arthur Cunynghame said he spoke of the Queen as his mother, and used the phrase—"We are the children of the Queen; come and save us from our enemies," meaning the Boers. Throughout, his language was most friendly. Sir Bartle Frere tried to make out that Cetewayo's conduct had been suddenly changed, and that he had become atrocious, warlike, and bloodthirsty; but he admitted that it was merely a supposed intention of which he was speaking. The man had been 23 years virtually upon the Zulu Throne, and had never made any hostile use of the warlike machine under his control. Sir Bartle Frere admitted that the Natal Government told him that the great majority of the Zulu people were altogether in favour of peace, not of peace with us alone, but of peace as a principle; that the great mass of them did not want to go to war at all; yet he said that the younger men wanted to "wash their spears." So far from this phrase being a menace to ourselves, it was used in a friendly conversation between Cetewayo and the Native messengers of the Natal Government, and it was understood that the people he wanted to attack were the Amaswazies. The Papers showed that up to the last moment the language of Cetewayo was friendly; but yet Sir Bartle Frere insisted, without any evidence, that his intentions were otherwise. He told the embassies that his intention was to remain at peace; and he assembled his fighting men only because our preparations caused him to be apprehensive of attack. There were several statements which went to show that the man was not an aggressive savage, but one who wished to remain friendly with us. His language was friendly long after the annexation of the Transvaal, which Sir Bartle Frere thought had changed his disposition. An important document, which had attracted little or no attention, was to be found in Command Papers 2,220, of December, 1878, at page 35. It was a despatch dated the 13th of May, 1878, but sent on the 30th of July. The despatch communicated the report of a spy who had been sent over a large tract of country between the Transvaal and the sea. It was spoken of as Swaziland; but, judging from the map, it appeared to include Zululand also, and in the despatch accompanying the report, Sir Bartle Frere said—

> "It will be found necessary, sooner or later, to extend the British Protectorate in some form or other over all the tribes . . . between the sea and the present Transvaal Frontier, and the longer it is deferred the more troublesome will the operation become."

Here annexation was distinctly spoken of; but the Government did not then, as they now did in view of this debate, repudiate annexation. They said, in reply, that they "would not express a definite opinion." It was clear that Sir Bartle Frere commenced aggressive operations when there was no reason to begin them at all; yet language had been used on behalf of the Government which suggested that they took a different view, for they said that Sir Bartle Frere was censurable for beginning war without permission, as if they suspended their judgment on the further question whether the war was necessary, which was abundantly negatived by the evidence in the Papers. Sir Bartle Frere told the Government that, in his opinion, a settlement could not be delayed, and he spoke to them in the tone of a despotic Sovereign addressing a Minister of whose proceedings he disapproved. He quoted their words, and said he could not agree with them, in a tone which implied that they were a set of nincompoops, and he was sorry for them; and yet the Papers furnished abundant condemnation of the course he had pursued. He talked of the necessity for immediate action, and he sent a telegram to the Government, in which he said—

> "Troops asked for urgently needed to prevent war of races. On the other side of fordable river Zulu Army 40,000 to 60,000 strong; well armed, unconquered, insolent, burning to clear out White men. Diplomacy and patience have absolute limits."

But it was on his own side, and not on the other, that the limits existed. His excited language proved that he had lost his head in a great emergency. It was clear that, so far from being the fittest man to be there, even under a Vote of Censure, he was about the most unfit man who could be found. He tried to bribe the Government, by pretending that he was carrying out a part of their great Imperial policy. In a sort of peroration to his despatch, he said—

> "I have no doubt that if the Lieutenant General Commanding in South Africa had adequate means at his disposal he would settle the Zulu difficulty as promptly and effectually as he did that in the Cape Colony, and that any troops now sent to this country might, in a few months, pass on to India, improved in organization and training."

And he added that the Colonists—

> "When their own difficulties were settled, would yield to none of their fellow-subjects in other Colonies in their desire to send a Colonial contingent to assist Her Majesty's Forces in any extended scheme of Imperial defence."

Here he tried to bribe the Government, by adopting their grand language; and in another passage of a similar kind he assured them that he would give them "peace with honour." Sir Bartle Frere evidently contemplated aggressive warfare, for in one despatch he said—

> "When the sickly season is over, about March next, we may hope that all difficulties with the Zulus will have been settled."

He announced that he proposed to "follow up" the award with a statement of guarantees, which he considered necessary, in order to insure peace in our future relations with the Zulus. Could it be believed that the demands accompanying the award were of a character to secure peace? He not only asked for reparation for alleged outrages, but he asked the Zulu King to destroy the whole fabric of his power, to give up his Army, to give up his power as an independent Sovereign, and to place himself and his Administration entirely in the hands of a British Resident. It was clear Sir Bartle Frere knew these demands meant a war, which he hoped would have been over by this time. Questions were put in this House in December, and it was clear, from the answers of the Secretary of State for the Colonies, that he had been misled, if not deceived, by Sir Bartle Frere. He stated, in reply to the hon. Member for Gateshead (Mr. W. H. James), that Sir Bartle Frere had informed Cetewayo that he was prepared to communicate to him the award with respect to the disputed territory. Being asked by the hon. Member for Liskeard (Mr. Courtney) whether Sir Bartle Frere had addressed an Ultimatum to the Zulu King, the right hon. Baronet the Secretary of State for the Colonies said—

> "The last telegram which I received from Sir Bartle Frere was dated November 19, and was in the following terms:—'We have desired Cetewayo to summon his councillors, and send proper persons to receive the award regarding the disputed territory, and further communications regarding our future relations.' That, I think [continued the Secretary of State], must be the message which is described in *The Times* telegram of November 26 as an ultimatum. So far from bearing the character ordinarily attached to that term, I think there is good reason to hope that it may lead to a peaceful settlement of the question at issue."

Thus, while everybody else knew that an Ultimatum had been sent, the Government were in profound ignorance of it. They were told by Lord Chelmsford and Sir Bartle Frere that preparations were being made for the defence of the Colony. At the same time, Lord Chelmsford was sending home Memorandums to the War Office which, if attentively read, must have shown the Government that the "defence" contemplated by Lord Chelmsford and Sir Bartle Frere was what was ordinarily understood by "offence," and that it was to take the shape of an advance by four columns of troops upon Cetewayo's capital. Nevertheless, the fact remained that Sir Bartle Frere did undoubtedly hold to the Government language of the same character as that used by the Government in that House; and the question was whether, that being so, he ought to be retained at his post? Sir Bartle Frere showed clearly his disgust at the award in the matter of the disputed boundary being given against him, and that circumstance contained the key to the whole of his subsequent conduct. In defence of his Ultimatum—having been beaten upon all his smaller grounds—he alleged the necessity of putting down Cetewayo, because he was a savage despot, and because he was in the habit of killing his subjects. But Sir Bartle Frere ought to have known, what every Colonist knew, that Cetewayo was in the habit of killing malefactors, simply because he had no prisons to put them in; and it was just at the time when, according to the Natal Government, Cetewayo was about to abandon that practice, and build a prison, that the Ultimatum was sent to him. The war, moreover, was undertaken in the face of Cetewayo's consent to yield some of the points demanded of him. What opinion the Government ultimately expressed upon Sir Bartle Frere's policy the House was aware; but during a long period they did nothing but "mark time" to his proceedings. They received from him despatches which clearly showed his intention of committing offensive and aggressive acts, and yet they contented themselves with a simple acknowledgment of them. From the 23rd of January till the 19th of March not a word of censure was passed upon his acts. That Sir Bartle Frere contemplated annexation was clearly revealed in his statements as to the necessity of replacing Cetewayo by a White Ruler; and it was a remarkable fact that the despatch in which he declared for annexation was written the very day after he had received his first censure from the Government. His answer, in fact, to the slight censure first passed upon him was virtually to tell the Government that they did not know what they were writing about—that he was master, and intended to have his way. Knowing perfectly the opinion of the Government with regard to the war which he was about to begin, Sir Bartle Frere seemed to have argued with himself that if he gained a triumphant success and added a new Province to the British Empire all his faults would be forgiven. No doubt, he was challenged by many only because he had failed; but if the Papers before the House proved anything, it was that he deserved to be challenged whether he gained a triumphant success or not. The war was commenced with very inadequate preparations. From a Report of Colonel Pearson's, we learnt that few of the officers or non-commissioned officers of the Native Contingent could speak Kaffir, and some not even English. The result was seen in Lord Chelmsford's despatch of the 3rd of February—

> "Of the seven battalions of the Native Contingent, all but three have disbanded themselves; these three have not been engaged."

The Natives were allowed to leave in batches, receiving a month's pay and their blankets, at which they were naturally delighted. The Government censured Sir Bartle Frere and still allowed him to remain at his post, and they acted as they had done notwithstanding the extraordinary imprudence which he had displayed. His policy had led to an offensive war, which he had commenced before he had received the whole of the reinforcements which were necessary for carrying it on. Yet it was contended that he was the only man to whose charge the administration of our South African Colonies ought to be committed. The Government had placed the Resolution which was now submitted to the House in their despatch of the 19th of March; it censured Sir Bartle Frere, but yet he was given to understand that he still retained their confidence. Again, in the despatch of the 20th of March he was told that even the terms of peace were not to be laid down by him, and that he was not to carry out the policy of annexation. The Government, in fact, would not trust him to make a single move; and yet the man whose hands were thus tied up, and who had been utterly discredited, was the only man whose authority in South Africa they were prepared to support. When the Government had been that day asked a Question as to Burmah by his hon. Friend the Member for Merthyr (Mr. Richard), it was stated that they would communicate by telegraph with the Indian Viceroy; but there was no telegraph to Natal, and for that reason our Representative there should be a man who possessed the confidence of his superiors to the fullest extent, not only as regarded the making of war, but of peace. To tie his hands as those of Sir Bartle Frere had been tied was to treat him like a whipped child; and if the High Commissioner, acting like a man of spirit, should resign, all the plans of the Government would be upset. Would it not, then, he would ask, have been better for the Government boldly to have made up their minds to censure his policy? Were they sure that the course they had taken would not set a bad example in other portions of the world? If the offence of Sir Bartle Frere were condoned, how was it possible to say that some English Governor or Viceroy, inspired by his example, might not pursue a course of policy which was his own, and not that of the Government whom he served? Sir Bartle Frere said that danger might have come upon us had we waited, and he therefore rushed to meet it. Now, there could be no policy, he maintained, more likely to prove fatal to the British Empire than that of digging up our dangers in every quarter of the globe. It was an evil policy for any country to adopt; but it was a still more fatal policy for us than for any other nation, seeing the responsibilities which rested upon us in every direction. Was it not the more prudent course to follow, instead of exhibiting a knight-errant boldness, for an English statesman to act in a spirit of watchful care? Sir Bartle Frere's conduct, although censured by the Government, had been, to some extent, defended by Members of the Ministry in "another place;" and we had now no security against being plunged into repeated wars, in defiance of the wishes of the Executive at home, whenever war was recommended to a British Governor by his fears, by his temper, by his poetical fancies, or by his religion. The hon. Baronet concluded by moving his Resolntion.

Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That this House, while willing to support Her Majesty's Government in all necessary measures for defending the possessions of Her Majesty in South Africa, regrets that the ultimatum which was calculated to produce immediate war should have been presented to the Zulu King without authority from the responsible advisers of the Crown, and that an offensive war should have been commenced without imperative and pressing necessity or adequate preparation; and this House further regrets that, after the censure passed upon the High Commissioner by Her Majesty's Government in the despatch of the 19th day of March 1879, the conduct of affairs in South Africa should be retained in his hands."—(*Sir Charles W. Dilke.*)

COLONEL MURE, in rising to move at the end of the Motion to add—

"And that a war of invasion was undertaken with insufficient forces, notwithstanding the full information in the possession of Her Majesty's Government of the strength of the Zulu Army, and the warnings which they had received from Sir Bartle Frere and Lord Chelmsford that hostilities were unavoidable,"

said, he felt that he was placed at great disadvantage after the very able and eloquent speech of the hon. Baronet—a speech in which he thought even those who differed from the hon. Baronet would admit that he had shown a power and grasp of the subject rarely equalled. For his own part, in placing upon the Paper his rider to the Motion of the hon. Baronet, he entirely disavowed being actuated by any Party motives or considerations. He thought it was pretty well known on both sides of the House that he regarded Foreign and Colonial affairs from an independent standpoint, and formed his opinion on his own judgment. Knowledge acquired in early days of the countries with which England was now dealing, and many melancholy recollections connected with those countries, and with the loss of friends and relatives in war, combined to lead him to take an interest in this question for which he need not apologize. When the news of the despatch of the Ultimatum was first received in this country, he was very chary of forming an opinion as to the action of our Commissioner. Colonial Governors were often placed in difficult positions, and especially those who governed Colonies bordering on savage but warlike nations, and a decision was often more difficult when warnings reached the seat of government that the natives were restless and discontented. After war was declared the Colonists knew their position, and could go into the fortified towns and villages, and in them find shelter and succour. He thought but too likely that experienced Colonists living upon the Border had come to Sir Bartle Frere and said—"Is it to be peace or war? Are we to leave our homesteads, or are we to remain where we are? For God's sake let us know!" It did not appear, however, from a study of the Blue Books, that in the present instance anything of the sort had taken place. The English had admittedly, almost from time immemorial, been at peace with the Zulus. The Zulus had never committed raids upon our territory, and even in the unsettled state of matters consequent upon the annexation of the Transvaal, Cetewayo had declared with perfect truth that not one chicken, not one goat, and not one man of ours, had ever been hurt by him. He believed that the Zulu King spoke the truth; and, unquestionably, the balance of opinion in the Colony as to the danger of an invasion by Cetewayo was in favour of the belief that he had no such intention. The real reason of Sir Bartle Frere's policy was his dread of the large Army of the Zulu King. Our High Commissioner had, as all hon. Members must have, a horror of the practices of the Zulus and of this Monarch; but, instead of taking a broad and statesmanlike view of the difficulties which surrounded us in South Africa, Sir Bartle Frere would appear to have had but one idea in his mind—his determination at once and for ever to crush Cetewayo. When that determination was formed, the whole of South Africa was in a very restless state. We had just concluded a contest with the Kaffirs; the Pondoes were in a state of semi-warfare, there were the difficulties connected with the annexation of the Transvaal, and, contrary to all the expectations which had been formed in this House, and in this country, it had by degrees transpired that instead of the Boers being satisfied with the annexation, only a very small section desired it, while a large proportion were exceedingly discontented and even disaffected to our rule. There was not peace and tranquillity, but dissatisfaction and turbulence in every direction. In these circumstances, what policy ought Sir Bartle Frere to have pursued? What could one have expected him to say to himself? One would have expected him to say—"These Zulus are terrible people. Their King is cruel. Their laws are abominable, and the time may come when we must fight them; but surely this is not the time." The first thing he should have done was to have endeavoured by every peaceful means, trusting to the influence of time and good government, to secure the friendship of the Boers; but this was not done. As it was, it appeared to him (Colonel Mure) that the real interest of the Boers at that moment, in order to prevent the Zulus from making a raid upon their country, was to profess themselves to be no friends to the British. Sir Bartle Frere was undoubtedly a good man and equally an able man; but he was a man of a very strong will and of a very determined—and even autocratic — disposition, and when he arrived in that country he seemed to have said to himself—"It is my mission to crush this cruel people and this horrible King," and the result was that they were now plunged into this unfortunate and disastrous war. In his Amendment he had said that Sir Bartle Frere had warned the Government that hostilities would take place, and that they were inevitable. These warnings were given to the Government from time to time, from the very first moment that Sir Bartle Frere set his foot in South Africa. Even before he went up to the Transvaal, he began to warn the Government that, in his opinion, war with the Zulus was unavoidable. The first despatch which he wrote on the subject was dated not in the Transvaal, but from Cape Town, on September 10. In that despatch he said that while everything within the Colony bordering on Kaffraria proper seemed settling down satisfactorily, it was clear that along the whole Border of Natal, wherever the Zulu influence was felt, the war feeling had not been allayed, and that it must be mitigated or crushed before they could ever have a condition of permanent peace. On the 12th of September he wrote home that reinforcements must be sent out. What did that point out? It pointed out that Sir Bartle Frere anticipated immediate war. He had even then resolved that the whole force at General Thesiger's disposal in Natal would, with the reinforcements, still be less than was necessary. Could anything be clearer than this—that at that early date Sir Bartle Frere and Sir Frederick Thesiger's opinions were, rightly or wrongly, pointing in the direction of war. Well, in the despatch that was received at home on November 1st Sir Bartle Frere said that, on a review of the whole situation, he was bound to state that, in his opinion, it was impossible to imagine a more precarious state of things. What did that mean but a bordering upon a state of war? Sir Bartle Frere also said that while the Zulu King professed to desire peace every act of his showed an intention to bring about a war, and that intention was shared by the majority of his people. He said, further, that there was no hope of peace, and that it was the intention of the Zulu King to put England in the wrong, if possible, by compelling her to strike the first blow. In the despatch Sir Bartle Frere went on to remark upon what Sir Garnet Wolseley had said. When he spoke of the two regiments that were necessary, he said that even with these there would be a smaller Force at the Cape than Sir Garnet Wolseley had thought to be necessary even before the Transvaal was annexed. After describing, in more or less forcible terms, the danger of the situation, Sir Bartle Frere went on to say that there was nothing but the forbearance or incapacity of the Zulus which would prevent the whole Colony from being devastated by an invading force. He might quote despatch after despatch to show that from the very first moment that Sir Bartle Frere was in the Colony he had been warning the Government that the Native Tribes were manifesting a desire for war, and that the Colonists were in the greatest danger. So much for Sir Bartle Frere and the warnings he gave to the Government that hostilities were probable. In his Amendment he stated that Her Majesty's Government had full information of the Zulu power. It was unnecessary for him to enter into a description of that power. Unfortunately, they had had lately only too good evidence of what that power was. They knew how their gallant soldiers had suffered from the ability and bravery of the Zulu Army, and he would only quote the despatch of November 5 upon that subject. That despatch said that on one side of a fordable river were from 40,000 to 50,000 Zulu soldiers, well armed, well trained, and burning to destroy the White man, while on the other were the British Forces, consisting of about four regiments of Infantry, and no Cavalry whatsoever, excepting a few mounted levies. Under those circumstances, he was sure that Sir Garnet Wolseley's estimate of the number required was not too large. He might here remark that at this time a most unprecedented step was taken by Lord Chelmsford. He was so impressed with the power of the Zulu Army, and with their ability, that he actually had a pamphlet printed describing their numbers, their discipline, their courage, and the way in which they moved, and other details, and had it circulated amongst the commanding officers of his Force. He (Colonel Mure) had had some experience of war; but he never remembered, in his experience, any commanding officer being so impressed with the power of a savage enemy as to publish a pamphlet and circulate it among his officers. He now came to what appeared to him to be a very grave question, and that was the frequency of the demands for re-inforcements, and the refusal of those demands. He confessed that he felt a very great sense of pity for Lord Chelmsford. He was not now talking of the disaster at Isandlana. Whether they believed or not that Lord Chelmsford acted wisely, he was quite certain that every man in that House, and in the country, sincerely pitied him. He pitied Lord Chelmsford on account of the unhappy position in which he was placed by the Government. Whether rightly or wrongly Lord Chelmsford believed, and Sir Bartle Frere believed, that an invasion was imminent. Nevertheless, they had those two honest men, who, from the best advice they could obtain, believed the invasion of Natal to be inevitable, sending home for re-inforcements for purely defensive purposes, in order to save the Colony from one of the greatest calamities that could happen to any country, and, in answer to these earnest appeals, receiving refusals or contemptuous silence. On the 10th of September Sir Bartle Frere, writing from Cape Town, and before he reached Natal, suggested the expediency of two more battalions being sent from this country; and again, on the 14th of September, he wrote stating that General Thesiger, in a telegraphic communication to him, expressed his desire to be supplied with two more regiments and a Cavalry regiment. Sir Bartle Frere trusted there would be no delay, thus emphasising the General's demands. What could be stronger? One would have imagined that there being no telegraphic communication with the Cape, which was many thousands of miles away, on a demand made for troops, not for aggression, but in order to save the Colony from a calamity of the most terrible kind, re-inforcements would have been sent out, even if it were not so very clear to the Colonial Minister that they were immediately required. But what did the Secretary of State for the Colonies do? The right hon. Gentleman wrote a remarkable despatch, dated October 17th, which they might call the famous refusal despatch — a despatch unparalleled in the history of the Colonies for the responsibility it undertook—

> "Her Majesty's Government are not prepared to comply with the request for the re-inforcement of troops. All the information which has hitherto reached them with respect to the position of affairs in Zululand appears to them to justify a confident hope that by the exercise of prudence, and meeting the Zulus in a friendly spirit, war may be avoided."

What was the use of Sir Bartle Frere and all his advisers on the spot if this was the way their opinion was to be treated? He was not saying whether the views held by Sir Bartle Frere were wise or not. He was putting before the House the extraordinary incompatibility of counsels that existed at home and abroad. There was incompatibility of counsels in the Colony, because Sir Henry Bulwer did not agree in the belief that war with the Zulus was imminent. He (Colonel Mure) believed that the Secretary of State for the Colonies was as anxious for peace as any man in that House, and that he clung to the skirts of Sir Henry Bulwer. But Sir Bartle Frere, with his powerful will and his determination to destroy this Zulu people ever before his eyes, was more in harmony with the War Party in the Cabinet. He now came to the three despatches not published in their proper place in the Blue Book; but, on an after thought, published in a supplementary sheet. The House would remember how he pressed the Government to give information as to those re-inforcements. He had no doubt that the unearthing of these despatches was the result. On the 30th of September Lord Chelmsford sent home for three additional British regiments for the defence of the Colony. That was received on November 1. On the 1st of October he again wrote—

> "The Zulus are more menacing, and I want those three regiments to defend my Colony."

But there was no recognition of that. On the 2nd October a despatch was written by Sir Bartle Frere which was received on November 18th, stating that the news from Zululand was more and more threatening, and that Sir Henry Bulwer—observe, now Sir Henry Bulwer was convinced! — and Lord Chelmsford both concurred in the opinion that it would not be safe to delay sending out more troops. The demands for re-inforcements were, indeed, quite spasmodic. The High Commissioner, the Governor, and the Lieutenant General, were in a state of mind bordering on panic or despair, for week after week they sent home asking for these re-inforcements. Three times they were peremptorily refused by the Minister for the Colonies, who wrote saying that he had received information from another quarter which convinced him that Sir Bartle Frere was talking nonsense. [Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH dissented.] Had not the right hon. Gentleman stated that

> "All the information we have received shows us that these re-inforcements are not required, and therefore I refuse them?"

Was that not the case? This was the first recorded censure of the High Commissioner. Could the House conceive a greater censure on a High Commissioner, who had sent home for troops to defend his Colony, than a message informing him that the Minister at home had received other counsel, on which he preferred to act? It was nice encouragement for the Governors of the Colonies of this great Empire when they learnt that a Governor thousands of miles away from home had sent six successive telegrams for re-inforcements only to have them refused. [Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH: No, no!] He had hitherto been dealing only with the defence of the Colony. The House would allow him to say a word upon the invasion. On September 28, Lord Chelmsford wrote a despatch which was received on November 1, saying that the troops asked for were for defensive purposes only, and that the Natal and Transvaal Colonies required three battalions of Infantry in addition to what they had already received. In the despatch of November 11, he says—

> "Three and a-half battalions of British Infantry, 14 guns, and a few mounted police and volunteers, are all the troops at my command for the defence of 300 miles of an exposed border frontier. I venture to express an opinion that the demand for two extra battalions cannot be considered unreasonable even for purely defensive purposes."

Observe the words "defensive purposes only!" When this was written, the General did not know that the Secretary of State for the Colonies had at last, on the sixth application, agreed to send out more troops. It was in the despatch of the 21st November that the right hon. Gentleman declared his intention to send out re-inforcements. Lord Chelmsford said—

> "A defensive plan, however, cannot be considered as satisfactory unless there is the possibility of taking the offensive at the right moment. This I am doing my best to prepare for; and so soon as my Native contingent is mobilized, I shall be ready, so far as my limited means will allow, to enter Zululand, should such a measure become necessary."

He pitied Lord Chelmsford, knowing, as he did, the power of the Zulu Army, preparing to invade their country with his limited means. What did the poor man say?—

> "I cannot but feel that my columns are barely strong enough for the purpose, and it will be difficult for me to keep open my lines of communication."

Three more battalions were sent out to him; two from England, and one from the Cape Colony, thus denuding it entirely of protection! He added—

> "It will be wise economy to send out strong re-inforcements to bring matters to a speedy settlement."

Surely this expression "strong re-inforcements" referred to something further than these three—the three regiments being, he considered, sufficient for defensive purposes only: "strong re-inforcements" undoubtedly referred to the possible necessity of an invasion by us as a defensive measure. He (Colonel Mure) now came to a recommendation by the Secretary of State for the Colonies to take one of the most dangerous courses ever adopted in South Africa. In his despatch of the 21st November he recommended the Colony to provide means for its own defence against the dangerous Natives within and the dangerous Natives without the Colony; and then, in the next sentence, he recommended that those dangerous Natives within the Colony should be armed, and should be employed as auxiliaries with the British Army. He thought the right hon. Gentleman would admit that recent terrible occurrences had raised in his mind some misgivings as to the wisdom of this advice. A more dangerous and disastrous recommendation was never given by a Home Minister to a Colonial Governor. He could understand a certain number of Natives being employed as auxiliaries; but, as a matter of fact, these Native levies formed the main Army, and a small body of English troops were the auxiliaries. These Natives numbered 8,000, and there was only one rifle to every 10 men; on the whole, perhaps, that was as well. He contended that the position of Lord Chelmsford was not one in which the Cabinet of a great country like England should have placed a general officer in command of a British force. It was, in his opinion, one of the most melancholy epochs in our Colonial history. The right hon. and gallant Gentleman the Secretary of State for War sent out as many troops as were necessary for merely defensive purposes, and evaded the fact that Lord Chelmsford would probably have to undertake an invasion of Zululand. The next part of his subject dealt with a matter in regard to which Her Majesty's Government undertook a most terrible responsibility. The House knew that we had no telegraphic communication with the Cape. It took five weeks or a month for the re-inforcements to arrive, and two weeks for telegraphic communication to reach this country. On the 27th of December the Secretary of State for the Colonies knew that Lord Chelmsford had invasion in prospect, or that he might be obliged to invade. The General also knew that his regiments were not sufficient for the purpose of invasion, but only for defence. The Minister, at the same time, was well aware that Lord Chelmsford had barely a sufficient force even for that purpose—in fact, he knew that Lord Chelmsford was in about as bad a way as any General ever was in this world. But Lord Chelmsford, like all good English soldiers, obeyed orders. There was a sentiment in the heart of the English soldier, an un-written law, which told him to obey the command under any circumstances. Lord Chelmsford knew he had not a sufficient force at his command, but he did his duty and obeyed orders. He was placed between Scylla and Charybdis; if he obeyed, he courted defeat and disaster. If he had refused, he would have been disgraced. He did not refuse, and everybody knew what the result had been. Then Sir Bartle Frere wrote a despatch, giving a short and merely sketchy account of the Ultimatum which was sent out to Cetewayo. Inclosures, giving full details, should have accompanied it; they were, however, delayed, and did not reach the Colonial Office till the 2nd of January. On the 25th of November, however, Lord Chelmsford wrote to the Secretary of State a despatch, in which he told of the terrible Ultimatum, the main point in it being a demand for the disbanding of Cetewayo's Army; it reached England on the 27th December. Therefore, it was clear that on the 27th of December the Secretary of State knew the condition of our Army in South Africa, and that the Ultimatum had been sent to Cetewayo. It was impossible to conceive that an English General, the Governor of a Colony, and the person in command of the Frontier, could have sent an Ultimatum to a savage Ruler, and then wait for the enemy to attack. Of course, the Ultimatum was followed immediately by an attack by us. But what course did the Minister adopt, having now clearly everything before his eyes? The Minister took no notice of the first despatch for a whole month—namely, Lord Chelmsford's. The inclosures arrived on the 2nd of January, and from that time to the 23rd of the same month—the day on which Lord Chelmsford walked amongst his dead comrades on the battle-field of Isandlana—no answer was sent to the despatch. He quite understood the propriety of delay for the proper consideration of the startling policy that had developed, in order that a well-considered answer should be sent to Sir Bartle Frere; but no delay was justifiable for the consideration of the military position, for it was too well known. One would have thought that if no answer was sent out for some little time to Sir Bartle Frere, the Secretary of State for War would have sent out troops to place Lord Chelmsford in a better position. But he did not do that, and, indeed, nothing was done until a month elapsed and news of the terrible event at Isandlana was received. Of course, nothing could have saved our troops from the fate they met at Isandlana; but the Secretary of State for War might have sent out troops at once, so that they would have arrived at Natal immediately after that disaster, and relieved the intense strain of feeling to which we had been subjected. The Secretary of State would have acted like a wise Minister, if he had said—"Here is a great and terrible event; an Ultimatum has, without our knowledge, been sent to Cetewayo; this leaves no other course open but an invasion; an invasion has commenced. I must at once send out forces." Small bodies of English soldiers have been sitting on the Frontiers of Cetewayo's Kingdom paralyzed in the presence of a savage foe; Colonel Pearson has been cooped up in Ekowe, with nobody venturing to relieve him; and hundreds of our countrymen lie unburied on the field of Isandlana, none of their friends and comrades daring to go near them and bury them. What a melancholy picture! He wished to point out the present position of the Colony. Whether in June last Lord Chelmsford wrote the sad letter to the Duke of Cambridge, whose receipt and disappearance was a mystery not yet unravelled, he knew not. His Royal Highness had no recollection of its receipt. At any rate, it was clear from this communication that, at the time in question, Lord Chelmsford felt unequal to his task; and it was equally clear that the present time was one at which there ought to be in charge of the Army a Commander full of strength and confidence. Then they had Sir Bartle Frere, as their High Commissioner, lying under a heavy censure—the second censure—he was, in fact, no longer their High Commissioner, with plenary powers; he was the censured agent of the Colonial Minister. A more excellent or a braver man than Sir Bartle Frere never lived; but if they had a High Commissioner who was, in the eyes of the Colonists, disgraced, and a Commander of our Forces who, by his own admission, felt weak for the task he had before him, and who was discredited already by disaster, by what terms could we describe our position? It certainly was not a position likely to encourage the Colonists to come forward and give their best services to the British authorities. The fact was, that the minds of Her Majesty's Government had been all this time in Afghanistan, and that the Zulu War had stolen upon them like a thief in the night, and with the disastrous results they all now deplored. The hon. and gallant Gentleman concluded by moving his Amendment.

Sir ALEXANDER GORDON rose to second the Amendment of the hon. and gallant Member for Renfrewshire (Colonel Mure), because he considered it to be a very useful addition to the Motion of the hon. Baronet (Sir Charles W. Dilke), inasmuch as it directed attention to several points of importance upon which would, probably, take place an extended debate. After examining the Papers presented to the House, he felt that he could only arrive at the conclusion that the war in South Africa had been undertaken by Sir Bartle Frere both with inadequate means and with inadequate preparation. He was, moreover, of opinion that Her Majesty's Government had received sufficient warning to induce them to send out to the seat of war certain re-inforcements, which, however, they had omitted to send—especially the re-inforcement of Cavalry, so urgently asked for, and which had been described by Lord Chelmsford as "of enormous importance." What could have been stronger than the language employed by him on that occasion? Yet on the 12th of October, 1878, the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for the Colonies telegraphed to Sir Bartle Frere his reason for not sending the troops in these words—

> "It may be possible to send out some special service officers; but I feel some doubt whether more troops can be spared."

He would like Her Majesty's Government to tell the House what were the occurrences taking place during the month of October last which constituted a sufficient reason for the troops not being spared? That wretched bugbear, the Russian aggression, had disappeared at the time in question; so that could not be the reason which induced Her Majesty's Government to say that they could not spare a regiment of Cavalry from Aldershot when it was so urgently required at the Cape. He would remind the House of what some hon. Members would, no doubt, recollect—namely, the remark of Captain Gardner, who had given evidence at the Court of Inquiry upon the Isandlana disaster, and said—"If we had had a squadron or two of Cavalry this could not have occurred." On that occasion, owing to the want of Cavalry to reconnoitre the country, the Zulu Army passed the preceding night within two miles of the camp, and in sight of our head-quarters. On those grounds, therefore, he very greatly sympathized with the officers at the Cape for not having had at their disposal the materials necessary to carry out the needful operations. He also desired to draw attention to the notice of Sir Bartle Frere's conduct which was taken by the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for the Colonies, both before and after the news of the disaster reached this country. The news had not arrived on the 23rd of January; on which day the right hon. Gentleman wrote to Sir Bartle Frere, acknowledging the receipt of five despatches, which extended over a period of more than a month—from the 8th of November to the 12th of December—and said—

> "I have now before me the full statement of the demands with which Cetewayo has been called upon to comply, together with your own description of the situation with which you have had to deal, as well as three very important memoranda by Sir Henry Bulwer, Sir Theophilus Shepstone, and Mr. Brownlee. There are, in addition to these documents, many others which are very voluminous, but the perusal of which is necessary to a complete understanding of your position and of the conclusion at which you have arrived, and, as yet, it is, of course, impossible for Her Majesty's Government to examine the whole of the case as it is now placed before them; but I observe that the communications which have previously been received from you did not entirely prepare them for the course which you have deemed it necessary to take. The representations made by Lord Chelmsford and yourself last autumn as to the urgent need of strengthening Her Majesty's Forces in South Africa were based upon the imminent danger of an invasion of Natal by the Zulus, and the inadequate means at your disposal at that time for meeting it. In order to afford protection to the lives and property of the Colonists, the re-inforcements asked for were supplied, and in informing you of the decision of Her Majesty's Government, I take the opportunity of impressing upon you the importance of using every effort to avoid war. The terms which you have dictated to the Zulu King are evidently such as he might not improbably refuse, even at the risk of war; and I regret that the necessity for im-

mediate action should have appeared to you to be so imperative as to preclude you from incurring the delay which would have been involved in consulting Her Majesty's Government upon a subject of so much importance as the terms which Cetewayo should be required to accept before those terms were actually presented to the Zulu King. In making these observations, however, I do not desire to question the propriety of the policy which you have adopted in the face of a difficult and complicated condition of affairs."

There was no distinct statement that the Secretary of State for the Colonies did not question the policy adopted by Sir Bartle Frere And further on, the right hon. Gentleman says—

> "I sincerely trust that the policy you have adopted may be as successful as the very careful consideration which you have given to it deserves; and that, if military operations should become necessary, the arrangements which you have reported may secure that they should be brought to an early and decisive termination, with the result of finally relieving Her Majesty's subjects in Natal and the Transvaal from the dangers to which they are exposed."

Now, it was his (Sir Alexander Gordon's) contention that if the result of that policy had been successful they would never have heard of that reprimand which had been passed upon Sir Bartle Frere, and which was written after the news of the disaster had arrived; and he therefore sympathized very greatly with the two distinguished officers—Civil and Military—who were carrying on the affairs at the Cape, for the manner in which they had been treated. He would also remind the House that Sir Bartle Frere gave it as Sir Garnet Wolseley's opinion that a much larger Force was necessary for the safety of the South African Colonies when the war broke out than had been considered sufficient by Her Majesty's Government. With reference to the recall of Sir Arthur Cunynghame, he would point out that the whole of the operations conducted by him at the Cape were successfully carried out, and that, notwithstanding this, he had been recalled, without any warning, without being informed why, and after he had been told that he should remain. That officer had, however, expressed his opinion of the policy which had been pursued with regard to the purchase of arms by the Natives, and had said—

> "You are encouraging the Natives to purchase arms for the sake of the revenue which it brings to the Colony, and you will rue it at some time or other.",

Those words ought to have acted as a warning to Her Majesty's Government; but they did not like his advice, and therefore took steps for his recall in, as he (Sir Alexander Gordon) considered, a most improper manner. Further, it was stated in one of the last despatches to Sir Bartle Frere, that he was not to conclude peace until he had consulted with Her Majesty's Government. He asked the House to reflect what was the meaning of such an order? It meant that the war was to be continued until communications could take place with England. He need not remind the House that in the conduct of military operations it was most important to know when peace could be demanded. It would be a very serious thing to be obliged to say—"We will send home to ascertain when peace can be concluded;" because it would be easily understood that during that interval the enemy was not likely to stand still. He hoped that the Government would make up their minds to send out instructions to Sir Bartle Frere to make peace as soon as the proper moment arrived—if, indeed, they could make up their minds—for it appeared to him that they were acting in the present case in precisely the same manner as they had in the case of the Afghan War, and were waiting to see the course of events, so as to shape their opinion according to circumstances. He had considered it right to make these remarks in seconding the Motion of the hon. and gallant Member for Renfrewshire.

Amendment proposed,

> At the end of the Question, to add the words "and that a war of invasion was undertaken with insufficient forces, notwithstanding the full information in the possession of Her Majesty's Government of the strength of the Zulu Army, and the warnings which they had received from Sir Bartle Frere and Lord Chelmsford that hostilities were unavoidable." —(*Colonel Mure.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there added."

Mr. MARTEN said, he could not agree either with the Motion or the Amendment. In his opinion, they were mutually destructive. The great argument of the hon. Member for Chelsea was that throughout Sir Bartle Frere's communications with the Home Government he had concealed from them the plans which he had in contemplation, and which were calculated to precipitate war. On the other hand, the hon. and gallant Gentleman the Member for Renfrewshire (Colonel Mure) had attacked the Government because, having, as he said, been fully informed both by Sir Bartle Frere and Lord Chelmsford of the necessities of the case, they had failed to send out the needful re-inforcements after they had been demanded. One hon. Member seemed to think the Government had been kept in ignorance, while the other implied that they had been fully supplied with information. With regard to the Preamble of the Resolution, affirming the willingness of the House to support the Government in all necessary measures for defending our Possessions in South Africa, he congratulated the Opposition on their new-born zeal for the maintenance of our Colonial Empire. The Preamble, however, was, so to speak, but the sweetmeat with which the bitter pill was accompanied in order, if possible, to make it palatable to the House. The second part of the Resolution was a severe censure upon Sir Bartle Frere; and the last part was a censure on the Government because they retained that officer in his post of High Commissioner. Well, he thought it could easily be proved that the Government were really not to blame in the sense attributed to them by the Motion. The addition proposed by the hon. and gallant Member for Renfrewshire was ambiguous, it being open to question whether it was a charge against the Government for not anticipating an invasion of Zululand, or whether it was a further condemnation of Sir Bartle Frere. The hon. and gallant Member had called the Colonial Secretary's despatch of October 17, 1878, the despatch of refusal; but anyone who read that despatch dispassionately could see that Her Majesty's Government were in favour of peace, and peace only; that the principle to be acted upon by the High Commissioner was defence, not defiance; and that the troops were to be used, not for aggressive, but strictly defensive purposes. The Colonial Secretary's despatch to Sir Bartle Frere, dated November 21, 1878, said that the Government had resolved to send out some re-inforcements, not to furnish the means for a campaign of invasion and conquest, but to afford such protection as was necessary at that juncture for the lives and property of our Colonists. The despatch further stated that the primary duty of making some adequate provision for defence against the Natives had been deplorably and discreditably neglected by the Colonies; adding the expression of a hope that a strong contingent of Volunteers or of Militia would soon be established, and the organization of Native levies be proceeded with without delay. With respect to the boundary question, the Secretary of State wrote also that he trusted Cetewayo would be informed that the decision respecting the disputed boundary would be speedily communicated to him. Again, on December 18, 1878, another despatch from the Secretary of State explained that the re-inforcements had been sent out to assist the Local Governments in providing for the protection of the Settlers in the present emergency, and not to carry out any aggressive operations. That showed that the Government took a firm and, at the same time, a moderate course. The hon. and gallant Member for Renfrewshire had asserted that there were two antagonistic policies striving for mastery in the Cabinet—that of peace, and that of war. He should have thought that the time had come when hon. Members would discard these idle rumours, and would be satisfied that, whatever might be the private opinions of the Members of the Cabinet, they had only one public policy, and that was a policy of peace all over the world. The right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for the Colonies had shown throughout his despatches the utmost desire for peace in those parts of Her Majesty's Dominions. To say that Sir Bartle Frere had calculated upon being backed by the war party in the Cabinet in the event of the invasion of Zululand being successful, was a most unfair and a most unjust charge to make against him. The real policy of Her Majesty's Government was that of an honourable peace. Turning to the speech of the hon. Baronet the Member for Chelsea, it was characterized throughout by a very strong condemnation of Sir Bartle Frere, and he had laboured to show that the High Commissioner had always kept Her Majesty's Government at home in complete ignorance of his plans. The hon. Baronet's attacks upon the High Commissioner were of a most serious kind, and required to be supported by the strongest proof. He trusted to be able to show the House that the hon. Baronet had completely and grievously misrepresented the conduct and language of Sir Bartle Frere in several particulars. The conduct of the Government in reference to the High Commissioner at the present crisis was characterized by a feeling which the House would respect. The circumstances under which they had to act were of peculiar difficulty. Sir Bartle Frere was an officer of high rank and of great experience, both in India and the Colonies, and had shown in a great crisis—that of the Indian Mutiny—that he possessed great coolness, courage, and firmness, as well as intelligence. It was for that very reason that he had been selected for his present duties, and entrusted with extraordinary powers, which would enable him to take any measures which he thought necessary for the defence of the Colony and the maintenance of its peace and safety. The Government would never allow itself to be influenced by personal motives; and if it was thought advisable for the public service to recall Sir Bartle Frere that would be done, but such a course appeared to him (Mr. Marten) fraught with evil. In the House of Lords, the other night, a distinguished Member of the Liberal Party stated that in a similar case Lord Palmerston defended an absent Governor in public, but in a private letter conveyed to him expressions of severe condemnation. The hon. Member opposite said that the Government ought to have done the same now; but they would have been greatly to blame if they pursued so disingenuous a course. This was, however, a high question of State. There was a war in progress, and the Government had to deal with an existing state of war. They were hardly in a position to be able to discharge the High Commissioner. Who could be appointed in his place? There would be great difficulty in finding a man offhand ready and capable of taking up the reins of power under present circumstances. If Her Majesty's Government had found it difficult to control their Representatives in distant parts of the world, the missionary associations had found it equally difficult to restrain the ill-regulated zeal of those connected with them, and who frequently brought these wars about with savage countries. Putting the Zulu War out of the question, Sir Bartle Frere had been, in many respects, a most successful High Commissioner, and had conferred great benefits on South Africa by his measures. The hon. Baronet had referred to the controversy between the High Commissioner and the Bishop of Natal. He thought the details of this controversy, as they were recorded in the Blue Books, had furnished the hon. Baronet with a great deal of his thunder. But anyone who read the account of that controversy would see that it was only certain points of the High Commissioner's policy which were objected to by the Bishop; and, after all, it was surely not for the Bishop, but for the High Commissioner, to decide. There were several particulars in regard to which the hon. Baronet had not done justice to the views of the High Commissioner. He had, for example, made merry over a passage in which the High Commissioner referred to the Boers' belief in a divine authority to exterminate "the Gentiles" and take possession of their land. But, if the whole passage were read, it clearly showed that Sir Bartle Frere was only describing the origin of the colonization by the Boers. His argument was, that the Boers had come into a country in which brute force constituted the only title to possession, and that, therefore, they had as good a right to the land as the savages themselves. There was another point which had been misrepresented. The hon. Baronet could not find words to express his disgust and indignation that the High Commissioner should go into such minute details after he had received the Report of the Boundary Commission. This he characterized as mere cavilling on the part of Sir Bartle Frere. He supposed the hon. Baronet would call a great proportion of the arguments in a Court of Justice cavilling. But these matters of detail could not be rejected as unworthy of attention. It was the High Commissioner who had to make the award, and he was bound to consider all the details of the matter. Then, again, to pass to another point, the hon. Baronet urged that even before the Ultimatum was presented Sir Bartle Frere had decided who was to be Resident in Zululand. But the passage in which the hon. Baronet founded his argument did not bear out this suggestion. The High Commissioner was merely deciding what should be done in the event of certain contingencies occurring. He was stating who the Resident would be, and what would be his duties in the event of a favourable answer being returned by Cetewayo; and at that time it was believed that a favourable answer was not out of the question. He would notice one more passage that had been misrepresented by the hon. Baronet—that, namely, in which Sir Bartle Frere had spoken of the Natal officials. The whole of the despatch in question should be read; but it would be enough for him to state to the House that it discussed the position of the Boers who had occupied the disputed territory. It was clear that Cetewayo had not fulfilled the promises made by him in 1861, and the question was—What would happen to the 80 Boers who had settled in the debatable land, if they were summarily ejected or left to Cetewayo's tender mercies? Sir Bartle Frere had only said that their case ought not to be left to the Natal officials. The House, then, would see that one single deprecatory remark of that kind did not amount to a general condemnation. Passing from minute details to more important matters, he would point out that by the hon. Baronet and others the Zulu Force had been considerably under-estimated. Instead of its consisting of no more than 20,000 men, as the hon. Baronet had stated, it appeared, from the most authentic information that could be obtained, that Cetewayo's Army numbered quite 40,000 men, in 33 regiments, 26 of which were able to take the field. The total population, too, was not 150,000, but 300,000, or thereabouts, and the Zulu country was extraordinarily difficult for military operations. As for Cetewayo's disposition, he did not believe that he had ever been friendly to us; but, on the contrary, that he had followed the policy of his predecessors, and that, while endeavouring to play off the Dutch and the Boers against us, he had temporized with all his neighbours for his own purposes. His high-flown language, therefore, would not have much significance if used at a time when he favoured the Boers. However, there was a very marked change in his tone towards us after the annexation of the Transvaal, as was abundantly evident from the arrogance of his messages to the Lieutenant Governor of Natal. In conclusion, he begged the House to remember that the question involved the welfare of one of our South African Colonies, and that the Government were charged with an extraordinarily difficult duty. The recall of Sir Bartle Frere would have had the effect of disarranging everything, and of interrupting the measures that it was imperative on us to take for the safety of the Colony and for our own honour. Instead of recalling him, the Government had expressed their disapproval of the course he had taken in declaring war without consulting the Home Government. That was a warning that would not be lost on any of our pro-Consuls; but, at the same time, he hoped that the House would concur with the Government in considering that, though the censure they expressed openly was necessary for the public service, yet the circumstances of the case did not require the withdrawal of the confidence placed in the High Commissioner.

MR. CHAMBERLAIN said, the debate had turned mainly on two despatches, and what needed explanation was the apparent inconsistency in the conduct of the Government in having, in the first place, branded a high official in the strongest censure ever passed in this generation; and, in the second place, assured him of their continued confidence, and desired that he should retain his post. He thought the hon. and learned Member (Mr. Marten) had not contributed much to the solution of the difficulty; nor did he think the Government would thank him for his suggestion that they had borrowed their policy from the conduct of certain missionary associations who had not recalled their missionaries, even when they had provoked hostilities and outbreaks among the tribes to whom they were sent. At the same time, he thought there was in the hon. and learned Member's suggestion great injustice to the missionary societies in question; and, as he had said, something not very complimentary to the Government. Up to the last week no one would have supposed there were more than two courses open to the Government—these two courses being completely antagonistic and inconsistent the one with the other. The Government might, on the one hand, have given Sir Bartle Frere their cordial support. On the other hand, they might have recalled him; but one never would have supposed both these courses would have been taken, and that in one paragraph of a despatch he would be severely censured, discrediting him in the eyes of this country and the Colonists among whom he lived, and in another sentence he would be assured of continual approval and support. Hon. Members on his side of the House sometimes thought the Government were inclined to strain the Prerogative of the Crown, and had neglected to consult, as fully and as promptly as they should have done, the House of Commons on the question of peace or war; but here was a self-willed official usurping the Prerogative of the Crown, and waging war on his own account against the express warnings sent out by the Government, and then the Government meet the contemptuous disregard of their authority with an expression of continued confidence in the experience, ability, and energy of this official. No one could deny the energy of Sir Bartle Frere—he had energy, and to spare. Indeed, it would have been better for our South African Dominions if he had been a little less energetic. He would not for a moment presume to doubt the ability of the High Commissioner. In other positions he had shown it, and might in other positions still show it in the service of the Crown. He would admit, also, he was a man of high integrity of purpose and great conscientiousness; but these qualities only made him the more dangerous, because ability misdirected was more fatal than ignorance itself. The conscientiousness of Sir Bartle Frere could only lead to one conclusion—that he was not likely to change opinions he had maturely and deliberately formed, and which he had so frankly expressed. The hon. and learned Member (Mr. Marten) thought that continued confidence in Sir Bartle Frere was necessary, in order that he might bring present difficulties to a satisfactory conclusion. But he (Mr. Chamberlain) did not see the logic of the argument. He thought that the man who had unnecessarily raised these difficulties was the least likely person now to allay them. Sir Bartle Frere was sent to the Cape to accomplish a great object—the Confederation of the South African Colonies—an object which it was presumed all would think desirable. At the same time, he was instructed to place on a proper footing the relations between the White and Native population. Well, what he could not help saying now, on a review of all the circumstances, was that Sir Bartle Frere had shown himself incapable of performing this great task. He had raised obstacles in the way of its accomplishment, and his recall was desired, not as a personal retribution for an error committed, but to accomplish the great object more rapidly. The Government had shown some doubt of the propriety of the course they had taken, because never had a high official been complimented with such warm assurances, and, at the same time, been fettered with instructions so precise as those sent to Sir Bartle Frere in the last despatch. There were good reasons for these instructions. As late as February, 1879, Sir Bartle Frere was found to be still contemplating the subjugation and annexation of Zululand. The Government had enjoined him to take no steps to ensure that object without their approval. Yes; but they sent him instructions, perhaps not quite so explicit, but just as clear to an intelligent man with the ability with which Sir Bartle Frere was credited, to take no steps likely to lead to war. If those were disregarded, what security was there that the later instructions would not be disregarded in the same way? Again, another reason for urging this course on the Government was this: Surely the circumstances under which the war was commenced should lead every reasonable fair-minded man to consideration for the vanquished. The time would come—and, no doubt, soon—when our arms would be again victorious, and those unfortunate savages would have to sue for mercy. The past, of course, could not be recalled; the blood shed would never be wiped away; and the lives lost on the bloody plain of Isandlana were gone for ever; but he would have greater hope for the future of our South African Dominions, and greater hope for that "peace with honour" which Sir Bartle Frere promised, if he thought that at the conclusion of the peace not only British interests would be regarded, but due consideration would be shown towards the Native population. A distinction was sought to be established between the cases of Sir Bartle Frere and Lord Chelmsford, and it had been said—he thought with little generosity to the latter, who, in his opinion, had received but a scant measure of justice—it was said that, whilst Lord Chelmsford was not wanted in the Colony, Sir Bartle Frere was still needed there. Now, the accusation against Lord Chelmsford at the present moment amounted to this—that he failed to take the necessary precautions in an enemy's country. He had paid dearly for this error, and no one imagined he would be likely to repeat his mistake. But what possible security was there in the case of Sir Bartle Frere, where the error was not one of detail, but one affecting his whole policy? What security was there that he would be able to change his whole course at the bidding of the Government, and that he would be able to adopt and carry out a policy which approved itself to the Government, but of which he (Sir Bartle Frere) could hardly find language sufficiently contemptuous to express his disapproval? It was a mistake to suppose Sir Bartle Frere's error was one of detail, and he hoped to show the House it was a mere incident in the policy of the High Commissioner, and if there had been no Zulu War, none the less we should have been involved in difficulties perhaps as great in other quarters. His hon. Friend (Sir Charles W. Dilke), in his able and exhaustive speech in moving the Resolution, mentioned that before Sir Bartle Frere's appointment in South Africa the Colony had enjoyed a period of nearly 30 years' profound peace. For nearly a generation—although, of course, there had been outbreaks here and there—there had been nothing approaching an Imperial war; but now, in the short space of two years, all was entirely changed. Tribes previously friendly, relying on our support, became irritated, alienated, and disquieted throughout the whole of our vast Dominion. These tribes lived under various conditions, and were spread over the country, and separated by hundreds of miles of territory; therefore, it was reasonable to suppose that a sudden visible change of sentiment was due to a change in our policy and treatment of them. A despatch from Sir Bartle Frere, dated December 14, was the key-note of his policy, and gave his idea of the relations which should exist between a civilized State and the Native Tribes on the Border. He said experience, especially in India, proved the possibility of a comparatively uncivilized Power co-existing with a civilized Power, and being gradually raised to a more civilized state, provided that the supremacy of the civilized Power was established. This meant that the civilized Power should at once try conclusions, and assert the supremacy over the uncivilized. There might be in most periods of our Colonial history a precedent for such a doctrine; but he wished to show the House that it was this doctrine that led to the Zulu War, and the irritation excited in that part of the world. And how did Sir Bartle Frere propose to carry out his policy? Dr. Sangrado said that there were only two remedies for all diseases—the bleeding his patients, and dosing them with hot water. The practice of the High Commissioner was equally simple. He, too, bled his patients, and gave them plenty of hot water, his treatment being embodied in one prescription, which he called an Ultimatum. He would call attention, briefly, to the circumstances of six wars in Africa, because he thought they illustrated the doctrine which Sir Bartle Frere had been propounding. First, there was a war with a tribe called the Galekas on the north-east of Cape Colony. Some years ago some land was confiscated and given to the Fingoes, who were formerly slaves to the Galekas. This transfer did not contribute to cordial relations between the two tribes, and there were continually petty outrages between the Galekas and the Fingoes, until Sir Bartle Frere appeared on the scene. He adopted the cause of the Fingoes, and, with regard to the Galekas, took his usual course—that of sending an Ultimatum to them. That war cost £500,000. The second war was the Galeka War. The Galekas consisted of several tribes, the Chief of one of which was friendly to the British. No sooner did the Chief enter into British territory than Sir Bartle Frere insisted on immediate disarmament. The tribe had been warriors for generations; they threw themselves upon Sandilli, a Chief of the neighbouring tribes of Galekas, and a very much more powerful warrior, and thus we had two enemies instead of one; because Sir Bartle Frere wished to impress the tribe with a due sense of our superiority. The third war occurred in Griqualand West, a large territory on the west side of the Orange Free River State. The rights of the Native Settlers were interfered with, and they were left to get their remedy in the British land Courts. The procedure therein was totally foreign to them, and they could not afford the expense of it. They lost their lands, and they were driven to such a state of irritation, that a rebellion broke out. There was another war in Griqualand East, which he believed also arose out of land difficulties, which might have been settled in an equitable spirit. And, lastly, before the Zulu War began, there was a fifth war which had been going on with Secocœni, and which had only been postponed until we had settled with Cetewayo. Previous to the annexation of the Transvaal, the Earl of Carnarvon wrote that the war of the Boers with Secocœni was unjust. Yet, within a month of the annexation, Sir Theophilus Shepstone sent Sir Bartle Frere's usual remedy to Secocœni—he sent an Ultimatum. In all these struggles, the real cause of dispute was the ownership of land which the Natives originally possessed, and which British subjects had either encroached upon or coveted. A disgraceful indication of the spirit which was only too prevalent in our South African Colonies was to be found in a notice, signed by Lieutenant A. C. Potts, 80th Regiment, and posted outside the Court House at Pretoria during the late hostilities against Secocœni. This advertisement was conceived in the spirit of the bill of a music-hall on the Surrey side of the Thames, and contained the following passages:—

> "Volunteers wanted for the front. Grand attack on Secocœni's town. Loot and booty. Better prospect than Blue Bank Diggings. Same rations as the General. Enrol before it is too late."

One of the terms offered to volunteers was—

> "Half share of money realized by sale of cattle and spoil captured from the enemy."

Let the House consider what was likely to result from such temptations as these He was informed that in the course of these wars with the Natives friendly Natives had their places looted, their property taken from them by the volunteers, which business the volunteers found more convenient than storming Secocœni's town, near to which they had not got yet. The policy against which he protested—and especially the policy of disarming the Natives—had embroiled us with powerful tribes, and we might hear at any day that an addition had been made to the number of our enemies in South Africa. He did not charge upon Sir Bartle Frere the direct responsibility of the several wars to which he had referred; but he did say that the doctrine embodied in the despatch of our Commissioner covered the whole of them: and that the spirit of which he was the chief spokesman at the Cape was certain, if carried out, to lead us into further and greater difficulties. If the policy of Sir Bartle Frere was to be further developed, then they were only at the beginning of their difficulties. He had never seen a more extraordinary document than a memorandum which Mr. Rudolph, the Landdrost of Utrecht, Transvaal, had supplied to Sir Theophilus Shepstone as to the relations between the Transvaal Government and the Swazi King and people. Mr. Rudolph said—

> "The Swazies are a very stupid and obstinate people, and their young King almost an imbecile. I am sorry to say that, although the Chiefs and people pretend to show the greatest respect, love, and friendship for the Government, I have noticed that they wish to remain a free and independent people."

So it was a crime for a nation to wish to remain free and independent. Although, however, such a theory was repugnant to all the natural instincts of Englishmen, it followed naturally, from the doctrine of Sir Bartle Frere, that all our Native neighbours must be at once brought into proper subordination to British authority. Suppose that Sir Bartle Frere thought fit to annex Zululand in spite of Her Majesty's Government, where would he find himself? He would find himself in direct contact and conflict with other tribes—more barbarous than the Zulus, more fierce and savage, equally men-destroying gladiators, and equally proud of their independence; and so we would be called to fight tribe after tribe, in order to impress upon the Natives a due sense of our superiority, until we had taken possession of the whole Continent of Africa. We were undoubtedly the greatest colonizing nation on the face of the earth. Surely it was time for us to lay down clearly and plainly—to define accurately—the spirit and temper in which we were going to discharge the vast obligations which we had undertaken. Everywhere we held territories acquired in the first instance by aggression and conquest; everywhere, with a reputation which he was sure was not calculated to secure the love of our neighbours, we came into contact with tribes more or less savage, more or less independent, more or less powerful; and everywhere our Colonists called upon us to exert the whole force of this country in order to secure the proper subordination of those Native tribes to the handful of Englishmen who claimed the right to be supported by the whole power of the British Empire. He asked the House, where was this policy to stop? It seemed to him, if it went on as it had commenced, they would have very shortly the whole responsibility of the government of South Africa on their hands, as well as of vast areas of country in other parts of the world. When a man like Sir Bartle Frere asserted the high moral obligation of imposing their superiority on his neighbours, they might be sure that a pretext for war would not be wanting. Sir Bartle Frere said in his despatches—which read more like the productions of a partizan than of a statesman—that Cetewayo had been anxious to fix a quarrel upon the English nation; that his system had been likely to produce a conflict; and that war with him was not only a precaution against attack, but also a duty, in order to save the Zulu people from the tyranny to which they were subjected; but, throughout all the Papers on the question, there was not sufficient proof of these allegations. Sir Bartle Frere talked of the King's messages being empty excuses, and often insolent defiances. He was unable to read between the lines, as Sir Bartle Frere had done. His messages were the messages of a man—ignorant, if they liked—but of a man perplexed and in despair that those to whose support he had been accustomed had suddenly changed their policy and temper. He saw the toils slowly gathering around him, and he began to lose faith in the honour, justice, and fair dealing of the British people. In a certain sense it was true the position of Cetewayo had been a standing menace to the Colony of Natal. It was true, in the sense that every powerful State was a standing menace to all its neighbours with whom it might have a difference of opinion; and it was an argument—if it was an argument at all—against all strong neighbours. The British Empire could bear no strong country in its neighbourhood; but there was no occasion of recklessly forcing on a war before it became necessary. The representations about the character of the King were curiously in contrast with a message of Sir Henry Bulwer, that he would do "nothing to forfeit the good opinion he had gained in the eyes of the great Queen;" yet two years afterwards this man was described as a monster of iniquity, who was not to be allowed to live. He was not going to say that Cetewayo was a model Ruler according to our ideas of a Monarch. His message to Sir Henry Bulwer betrayed evident signs of irritation at our interference with his Sovereign authority; but when he said that he would go on killing as he had hitherto killed, he referred to those executions which he regarded just as reasonable and proper as when we hanged men at Newgate for premeditated murder. As to the Zulus who were said to have left Zululand and settled in Natal, they were not, he believed, Zulus in reality, but rather the original inhabitants of the country who had been expelled some years ago, when the Zulus swept down from the North in obedience to the law which had obtained in South Africa as well as in Europe. But there were signs that these people now preferred to live under this intolerable tyranny of Cetewayo to remaining under the beneficent government of the High Commissioner; and in the last year or two the emigration of Natives from Natal into Zululand exceeded the immigration into the Colony from the kingdom of Cetewayo. Cetewayo was no better nor worse than other savage Chiefs; and he was much better than some of those Turkish Pashas whose conduct incurred the censure of Her Majesty's Government, but who still occupied a high position in the Turkish service. There had been a sudden change in Sir Bartle Frere's conduct, and the difference between the sensitiveness which Sir Bartle Frere displayed recently contrasted strangely with the perfect indifference with which the conduct of the Zulu King was regarded before it was desired to annex and subjugate his territory. The Zulu King was called upon to disarm his people, and change their customs. What did that amount to? It amounted to the entire extinction of the Zulu power as it was now. No doubt, disarmament was very desirable, not only in South Africa, but in Europe; and he did not suppose England proposed to force disarmament upon Europe by war, and without regard to time or opportunity. In his opinion, it was a piece of pedantic obstinacy. In the last few weeks there had appeared in *The Times* a most ominous suggestion, to the effect that Her Majesty's Government had it in contemplation to disarm the Native Princes of India. That would be an act more defensible than in the case of the Zulus, because the Zulus had to protect themselves against their hereditary enemies, the Swazies; whereas the Indian Princes could have no enemies but ourselves. At the same time, it did not require a prophet to predict that if any such attempt were made they would drive the Native Rulers into a rebellion, because they would regard it—and not unnaturally, and not unwisely, and not untruthfully—as the inevitable precursor of the taking away of what remained of their independence. If the Ultimatum to Cetewayo had been submitted to the Government, it would have been disapproved of. The Government repudiated responsibility for this war, he thought justly. But they had thrown upon Sir Bartle Frere the heaviest charge that could be brought against any man in his position. They charged him with engaging in a war not urgently necessary, and, consequently, he was blamed for having lost valuable lives, and plunged hundreds of families into mourning, and placed burdens on our finances which they could ill bear. Still, the Government gave him their continued confidence. He thought he could understand the difficulty in which the Government was placed. Although they had shown themselves disposed to hold back this self-willed official, they might find it painful altogether to condemn him for having pursued in South Africa the identical policy which he recommended, which they adopted and approved, and which was now being carried out in Afghanistan. He (Mr. Chamberlain) could not see any great distinction between the pro-Consul in Africa, who waged a war on his own responsibility and against the express warnings of the Government, and the General who annexed a Province larger than England and Wales, 70,000 square miles in area, which it would cost millions of money and thousands of men to defend, under general instructions to detach Native tribes from their allegiance. The Colony of Natal was just as much or just as little in need of a scientific Frontier as India was. This new Imperialism of the Government had affected the minds and judgments of those to whom were necessarily delegated the power and authority of this country in distant lands. Unless this spirit were, either by Parliament or by the people at large, severely and sternly repressed, there could hardly be a limit to the responsibilities which might be fastened upon us, and none to the difficulties and even disasters yet in store for this country.

Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH: For some weeks past, in view of the grave disaster which has occurred, and the serious danger of the moment, there has been, I think, but one feeling in this House and in the country—a feeling that everything should be done to help Her Majesty's Government in repairing that disaster, and that no discussion should be raised on the subject which now engages us, until everything was before us that was demanded by justice to the absent. On behalf of Her Majesty's Government, I wish to acknowledge that feeling; and I recognize it also in the action of the hon. Baronet the Member for Chelsea; but I would add, that I think I detected in his action some little restlessness under the obligation of silence which he so very properly felt to be incumbent upon him. Because, on the first evening of the present Session, he somewhat roundly accused Her Majesty's Government of being the authors of this war in South Africa, as part of some general policy of aggression which he was good enough to attribute to us; and on a subsequent evening, not very much later, he is reported, in addressing a meeting in the country, to have said that—"This war was one of the latest and most flagrant cases of distinctly aggressive policy that he had noticed." But when the hon. Baronet came to read the Papers, I think his views must have been somewhat modified, because he then put a Notice of Motion on the Paper of the House, censuring nobody in particular, but regretting the fact of the war; and, after that consultation with other authorities on that side of the House, which I have no doubt he felt to be necessary, he so far modified even the vague terms of that Motion as to make it almost indistinct in its censure, and absolutely indistinct as to the parties on whom that censure ought to rest. And now, having everything before him, he has added a rider, which is the real kernel of the discussion which we have commenced this evening, for it censures Her Majesty's Government for not having recalled Sir Bartle Frere. I listened with great interest to the able speech of the hon. Baronet—a speech which, if he will permit me to say so, showed not only ability, but an amount of research into this question which did him the greatest honour. But it showed also an absence of fairness, which I am sure was unintentional, in the consideration of the question, which really entirely marred the character of the speech. It seemed to me that when he told the House that Sir Bartle Frere was wanting in that temper and that spirit of calm power which ought to belong to an English Governor, and that such want on his part made it wrong for Her Majesty's Government to leave him for one moment longer at the Cape, the hon. Baronet entirely forgot the character and history of Sir Bartle Frere. He must have forgotten that Sir Bartle Frere was appointed, not by Her Majesty's present Advisers, but by Her Majesty's former Advisers, as Chief Commissioner to Scinde and Governor of Bombay; that he was entrusted by them with a most important mission to Zanzibar on the subject of the Slave Trade; and that his conduct in the Indian Mutiny was of such a character that he received, on two separate occasions, the thanks of Parliament. I think the hon. Baronet the Member for Chelsea, in his desire to censure the conduct of Sir Bartle Frere in South Africa, must at least have forgotten the manner of man with whom he was dealing, and the way in which that man has devoted his life to the service of the country. I do not think, moreover, that was the only evidence of a want of fairness in the speech of the hon. Baronet the Member for Chelsea and that of the hon. Member for Birmingham (Mr. Chamberlain). To both of those hon. Members the King of Zululand was the type of everything that is good. Let me, therefore, describe the condition of Zululand as set forth by an authority which I think will not be disputed by either of the hon. Members—

> "The internal misgovernment of the country had gone on from bad to worse. . . . It is plain that it is now reduced to great misery, and that the Sovereign and people are killing and 'eating up' one another. We learn that multitudes of Zulus, including at least three Christian converts, are, in Zulu phrase, 'smelt out' as witches and put to death, nominally on this ground, but really because the King and Chiefs want their property. The murder of a number of young women for refusing to marry Cetewayo's soldiers appears unquestioned; and to our remonstrance against these barbarities, Cetewâyo replied by furiously declaring that he intended to govern his own country in his own way, and that the blood he had already shed was a mere foretaste of what he intended to do."

These are not the words of Sir Bartle Frere, but of Lord Blachford, whom I believe to be one of the authorities principally relied upon by hon. Gentlemen opposite in the treatment of this question. I do not quote these words as showing any necessity for interference on the part of Her Majesty's Government with the affairs of Zululand; but as some little proof to the contrary, when we hear such descriptions of the character of the Zulu King and his rule as we have been favoured with to-night. As I have always understood, the hon. Baronet the Member for Chelsea and the hon. Member for Birmingham are opposed to the principle of standing Armies; but on this occasion they appear as the advocates of a standing Army, not in their own country, but in Zululand. And when the hon. Baronet the Member for Chelsea spoke of the killing practised by the Zulu King as a mere punishment of criminals, and of the philanthropic intention of the King to provide a prison for those who had committed offences, I confess my mind reverted to the views maintained by many hon. Gentlemen opposite as to the policy of capital punishment in this country, and to the singular and very strong expression of opinion we heard from them last year with respect to the failure of a certain nation in Europe in the proper treatment of criminals. The Resolution of the hon. Baronet the Member for Chelsea proposes, in the first place, to censure Her Majesty's Government for not recalling Sir Bartle Frere. I will postpone dealing with that point for the present; for I think the speech of the hon. Baronet was not entirely directed to his Resolution. His Resolution is a censure upon the Government; his speech was a censure upon Sir Bartle Frere. He would also censure Her Majesty's Government for their failure, as he conceives it to be, in two other respects. He says we ought to have seen long ago that Sir Bartle Frere meant to go to war. That sentiment was cheered by many hon. Members opposite, and I would say, with respect to it, that it is very easy to be wise after the event; but I would also ask hon. Members to be good enough to look for themselves carefully at the despatches which we have received from Sir Bartle Frere, and to see at what date the first idea of an aggressive policy, so to speak, appears in those despatches. I will venture to assert—and I do not believe it can be contradicted—that the first hint of the kind appears in a despatch received by us on the 11th of December. It is all very well to say—as I think was said by the hon. and gallant Gentleman the Member for Renfrewshire (Colonel Mure)—that before that time there were preparations reported by Lord Chelmsford with regard to a possible invasion of Zululand. That is quite another matter. The despatches of that date, and up to that time to which I refer, distinctly point to a defensive policy against a Zulu attack; and, of course, it is obvious that it may become a very necessary part of a defensive policy against attack to invade your enemy's country after he has attacked you. There was good reason for fearing an attack at the time, for there had been action on the part of the Zulu King—not merely in the shape of raids into Natal territory, but notices to quit issued to British subjects at Luneberg and the disputed country, and the absolute driving of peaceful farmers from their holdings in other places. All of these things might have necessitated a Zulu War, which would have been by no means an aggressive war; and it was with that view that the despatches were written in which Lord Chelmsford referred to the possible necessity for an invasion of Zululand. The third charge which the hon. Baronet the Member for Chelsea brought against Her Majesty's Government was that for two months, between the 23rd of January and the 19th of March, we delayed to express our opinion upon the action of Sir Bartle Frere. The hon. Baronet, perhaps not unnaturally, thinks that our action should have been similar to his own, and that we ought to have taken some step or other without having full information before us; but we, on the other hand, thought it only fair and right to a man in the position of Sir Bartle Frere, holding a high and distinguished, as well as an extremely delicate, post on the other side of the globe, to wait for a reasonable time in order to hear what he had to say in his defence; and, therefore, we felt it absolutely impossible at first to express a more definite opinion than was expressed by me on the 23rd of January. For aught we knew, there might have been good grounds why he, acting under the powers and with the responsibilities of his commission, might have felt it necessary to take action without consulting Her Majesty's Government, and why we should, after hearing what he had to say, have exonerated him from blame. I think we should have failed in our duty if, before hearing his defence, we had expressed any opinion beyond that which was expressed on the 23rd of January on his conduct. I will now turn to the terms of the Resolution of the hon. Baronet the Member for Chelsea. I can assure him that Her Majesty's Government share fully in the regret which he asks the House to express—

> "That the Ultimatum which was calculated to produce immediate war should have been presented to the Zulu King without authority from the responsible advisers of the Crown."

I need not dwell upon that point; but I would add, if it was necessary to discuss it, that it is at least questionable whether there is any real reason for asking this House to express an opinion upon it. The Resolution then proceeds to ask the House to affirm its regret

> "That an offensive war should have been commenced without imperative and pressing necessity."

Now, I think that that is scarcely a fair representation of the question that should be put to this House. The question is not so much whether an offensive war should have been commenced without imperative and pressing necessity, as whether the demands contained in Sir Bartle Frere's Ultimatum were necessary and justifiable; because really the whole question turns upon the demands made in that Ultimatum. I do not suppose anyone will argue that those terms, having been once dictated to the Zulu King, it was possible, with any safety, to withdraw from them. There is no question, I think, judging from the Papers, as to the view taken by the Zulu King of those requirements. He never formally acknowledged even the receipt of the Ultimatum. He sent contradictory messages through his agent, Mr. Dunn, as to his intentions with regard to it; but I do not think the hon. Baronet stated—and I am confident there is no proof in the Papers—that any further delay would have led to the acceptance of those terms without war. It is fair to Sir Bartle Frere to say that he stated in one of his despatches that if Cetewayo had even temporized, or availed himself of any opening left for discussion, he would have postponed any active operations. But I think the Papers clearly show that Cetewayo never really meant to accede to any of the demands at all. Therefore, I will pass from that question, and proceed to the demands themselves. Now, the first of these is the boundary award. The hon. Baronet the Member for Chelsea accused Sir Bartle Frere of delaying this award by what he called small, petty, miserable cavils, and he said that when Sir Bartle Frere thought the award would be against the Transvaal he began to seek fresh occasion for war. I am bound to say that, in my opinion, that view is as entirely unwarranted as the statement of the hon. Baronet that Sir Bartle Frere ever put forward Cetewayo's request to "wash his spears" in such a way as to deceive the English people into thinking that Natal was to be attacked. I do not believe that Sir Bartle Frere ever did anything of the kind. Then the hon. Baronet accused Sir Bartle Frere of delaying the award. He admitted that the award did not reach Sir Bartle Frere till July; but he failed to tell the House that at that very time Sir Bartle Frere was engaged in the Cape Colony at the conclusion of the war there, in a way which rendered it absolutely impossible for him to leave the Cape Colony before the time at which he did leave, and that the delay was by no means Sir Bartle Frere's fault, but was absolutely incumbent upon him if he was to perform his duties to Cape Colony. As soon as he could he went to Natal. It was necessary for him to go there to discuss the question with those who were well acquainted with it before he pronounced the award that he was authorized to make; and when he got there, of course he found that the subjects requiring discussion were many and important, and that it was necessary for him to continue that discussion until they were settled to the satisfaction—as they were ultimately settled—of all the authorities in the Colony. Then the hon. Baronet, I noticed, also blamed Sir Theophilus Shepstone, and I must say that of all the statements the hon. Baronet made, I thought there were few really more unfair than that. Sir Theophilus Shepstone, the Administrator of the Transvaal, was absolutely blamed by the hon. Baronet for supporting, as he said, the just rights of the Transvaal in the matter of this boundary award. It might be true that Sir Theophilus Shepstone had changed his views. But why had he done so? Because he had evidence placed before him which he had not before seen; and if a man in that position were not open to change his views, his opinion, I think, would not be worth much, either at its inception or at its conclusion. Now, I proceed to the points of the boundary award. The hon. Baronet found great fault—and it has been found elsewhere—with the reservation by Sir Bartle Frere of the private rights of the European Settlers in that part of the disputed territory which was to be made over to the Zulus. Now, I think it should be remembered that in great part of the disputed territory there had been for many years past a *bonâ fide* exercise of Sovereignty by the Transvaal Republic and a *bonâ fide* occupation by the farmers, who had built on their farms and cultivated and improved the land; and that many of these farmers, during the winter of 1877-8, had actually been driven away from their farms by notices to quit sent by Cetewayo through his agents, and, consequently, their homesteads had been ruined and deserted. I think it is a fair argument that when a private person settles in a country where there is a latent dispute as to the Sovereignty, he ought not to lose his estate by reason of the Government under which he took *bonâ fide* possession of his land being finally ousted. I make this statement, because this is simply what we ourselves have admitted in South Africa under similar circumstances. What happened in the case of Griqualand West? It was taken over by the English Government in October, 1871, to the exclusion of the Orange Free State, which claimed it, and, with Lord Kimberley's approval, the titles of private holders of farms granted in the Province by the Orange Free State were recognized by Sir Henry Barkly; although, by our very action in taking it, we denied that the Orange Free State had any right to grant those titles. That is precisely what Sir Bartle Frere really proposed in the matter of this disputed territory. Bishop Colenso stated that Sir Bartle Frere intended to take from Cetewayo by an afterthought what had been solemnly ceded to him in the Queen's name. But what does Sir Bartle Frere say? He

> "had no intention of recognizing any rights except those of *bonâ fide* possession, occupation, and improvement by persons who had every reason to believe that the Transvaal Government had full right to grant a valid title."

He "wished to secure against loss those who had settled, built, and stocked farms" from which they had been driven by the Zulus. If hon. Members would take the trouble to look at the boundary award—which, after all, is the real and authoritative statement of Sir Bartle Frere on this question—they will find the same principles carried into effect there. I am bound to say — as I have before remarked—that there seems to me to be a singular inconsistency in the view taken of this question by the hon. Member for Chelsea, and by many of those who sit near him, as compared with the view which they take on similar questions nearer home. They, I suppose, are the great supporters of tenant-right, fixity of tenure, and everything that has been ever asked for on behalf of farmers or occupiers of land in any part of the United Kingdom; and yet they object to grant these very similar rights to *bonâ fide* occupiers in Zululand, which Sir Bartle Frere wished by his award to secure to them. The next demand was for compensation for the raid of Sirayo into the Natal territory. The hon. Member for Chelsea did not, I think, dwell very much upon that, and I will not detain the House at any length upon it. But I would say that Sir Henry Bulwer, who seems, very properly, to be accepted as a high authority by the hon. Member for Chelsea, described it as a most serious offence. Unquestionably it was a very serious violation of British territory, and there was very cruel treatment of the persons taken out of British territory. It was absolutely necessary to prevent similar violations in the future, and for the security of both the White and the Native population of Natal, that proper redress should be made for this violation. What was the redress offered? A mere payment of £50. What was the redress demanded by the Natal Government in August, and most properly insisted upon by Sir Bartle Frere in December? The surrender of the offenders. That had been an old bargain between Cetewayo and the Natal Government. It was a bargain that should especially have been carried out in a case of the kind; and, therefore, Sir Bartle Frere was entirely justified in including this in the message which he sent to Cetewayo. Then, as to the treatment of the surveyors, that I shall not dwell upon. I think it a very small matter. I said so in my despatch to Sir Bartle Frere; and I think Sir Bartle Frere himself attached no very great importance to it, and it could have been easily settled one way or another. Now I proceed to the further demands in the Ultimatum, which were unknown to Her Majesty's Government until December 19. I had every reason to suppose that Sir Bartle Frere would communicate the boundary award to Cetewayo as soon as he had made it, and, from what had passed between Sir Henry Bulwer and Cetewayo previously, that he would accompany it with the demands for redress to which I have referred. In adopting that course, I think he was perfectly justified. But of the demands not known to me until the 19th of December, the first was that a British Resident should be placed in Zululand. I need not discuss that, beyond stating that Cetewayo himself had, in February, 1876, requested that a representative of the Government should be sent to him. For every reason, I think it desirable that someone duly authorized by the Government should have been placed in Zululand to represent the views of the Colonial Governments of Natal and the Transvaal to the Zulu King, and to protect the interests of British subjects who might be passing through Zululand. I do not think that is a matter which needs discussion, and, therefore, I will pass on to the next demand—the extradition of Umbilini, who had made a raid of considerable importance into British territory. The hon. Baronet the Member for Chelsea admitted that Umbilini had made that raid, but said that he was not a subject of Cetewayo. What does Cetewayo himself say? He says—

> "That at the time when he ordered the German settlers of Luneburg to leave that place, he did not know that they were subjects to the Government; but that, as he knows now that they are such, they may remain and occupy the land, as they will not be molested by any Zulus or by Umbilini."

Is not that a distinct assertion of his authority over Umbilini? ["No, no!"] I think it is; and, if it is, the argument of the hon. Baronet the Member for Chelsea falls to the ground. The next demand is with respect to the missionaries. I quite admit what the hon. Baronet said on that point. My Predecessor informed Sir Henry Bulwer that Her Majesty's Government could not undertake to compel Cetewayo to permit the maintenance of mission stations in Zululand. I regret that Sir Bartle Frere should have included that demand in his Ultimatum. I quite adhere to the opinion that the enforcement by the Government of missionary enterprize is a thorough and entire mistake; and certainly, so long as I hold my present Office, I should be not only reluctant, but entirely disinclined, to take any steps for that purpose. Then comes the final demand, and the important one of all—the demand for the disbandment of Cetewayo's Army. That, I think, is the real question in the Ultimatum. The hon. Baronet the Member for Chelsea has expressed the opinion that Cetewayo's Army was not a terror to Natal or the Transvaal. If he had reflected for a moment on the position of Natal and the Transvaal, he might have found reason to change his opinion. Natal and the Transvaal have a White population of about 1 in 10 to the Black population—that is to say, in Natal there is, I believe, a population of about 25,000 Whites to 250,000 Kaffirs, and in the Transvaal a proportion of about 35,000 to 350,000. Cetewayo's Army was organized under a thorough military system, and was well armed; and when the hon. Baronet meets me with an opinion as to the want of power of that Army, I fear I can only refer him to what actually happened at Isandlana. That, I think, is a sufficient proof of the danger to the neighbouring communities from the existence of an Army such as that maintained by the Zulu King, because it cannot be compared with the Armies maintained by civilized nations. A savage despot, like the Zulu King, whatever his good qualities may be, cannot be expected to be restrained by those feelings by which Rulers nearer home who maintain large Armies are influenced. And I must say, whether we look to facts, or whether we look to the opinions of those who are most competent to form them, there can be no question whatever of the serious danger that this Army has been to Natal and the Transvaal. I believe the danger is such as to have rendered a war at some time or another with Cetewayo absolutely inevitable. I think some confirmation of that view may be found in the history of the case. What had been Cetewayo's previous position? He had been distinctly subordinate to the Natal Government—that is to say, he had invited a representative of the Natal Government to assist at, and sanction, his Coronation, and had voluntarily made to that representative certain promises relating not to the dealings of the Zulu with Natal, but to the internal government of his country. I do not want to dwell on these promises themselves; I merely allude to them, as showing the position in which Cetewayo found himself with regard to the Government of Natal. But what followed? The hon. Baronet the Member for Chelsea, I think, attributed a good deal of what has occurred to the annexation of the Transvaal; but he ought to have gone further back. The source of the evil, I believe, was this—the sale of guns in large numbers at the Diamond Fields to the Kaffirs throughout South Africa. That gave them arms, if not equal, at any rate nearly equal, to those possessed by the

Whites. With the knowledge that they possessed these arms came the growth of a new generation who had not known defeat by the Dutch Boers or by the English. Then came also the desire for war, natural to a people whose Constitution will be admitted by all to be based on preparation for war. The young men appealed to Cetewayo for an opportunity to "wash their spears." In September, 1876, many months before the annexation of the Transvaal, Cetewayo, recognizing the position which he had held towards the Government of Natal, asked leave of the Government to "wash his spears." That leave was refused. What says Sir Henry Bulwer in his Despatch 165 of Blue Book 1,748? He states that—

> "It is evident, if the information that has reached us is correct, and there is no reason to doubt its correctness, that Cetewayo has not only been preparing for war, but that he has been sounding the way with the view to a combination of the Native races against the White men. Whether that combination has been effected, or whether it can be effected, we are not yet in a position to form an opinion; but that messages have been passing on the subject between Cetewayo and other Native Chiefs there can be little doubt."

Sir Henry Bulwer—I agree with the hon. Baronet the Member for Chelsea—is no alarmist; and those are his views distinctly stated to the Home Government at the time. He goes on to say—

> "In the present message Cetewayo throws off any concealment of his intention to 'wash his spears,' and repudiates the moral influence which this Government has exercised with him since his father's death, and especially since his formal recognition and installation as King of the Zulus by Sir Theophilus Shepstone."

What was the message? No doubt it is familiar to many hon. Members. What did Cetewayo, this moral despot, say?

> "I do kill, but do not consider that I have done anything yet in the way of killing. Why do the White people start at nothing? I have not yet begun; I have yet to kill. It is the custom of my nation, and I shall not depart from it. Why does the Governor of Natal speak to me about my laws? I shall not agree to any laws and rules from Natal. Have I not asked the English to allow me to wash my spears since the death of my father Umpandi, and they have kept playing with me all this time, treating me like a child. Go back and tell the English that I shall now act on my own account. The Governor of Natal and I are equal; he is Governor of Natal, and I am Governor here."

That was the condition of Cetewayo in the autumn of 1876. He was then aware of the weakness of the Transvaal, and it may have encouraged him to take the line of declaring himself independent of the Natal Government; but there is, at all events, a clear distinction between the independence he then assumed and his former position. Then, in the spring of 1877, came the collapse of the Transvaal, owing to the bankruptcy of the Government and the internal dissensions of the country. It has been said that the annexation of the Transvaal to the English possessions led to the war with the Zulus. I would say, on the contrary, that I believe it postponed the war. Had it not been for Sir Theophilus Shepstone's action, I think it clear from what passed that Cetewayo would have attacked the Transvaal, which he naturally believed to be in a desperate condition. Had he done so, he would have overrun the country, to the great loss and destruction of the inhabitants, many of whom were British subjects, who had petitioned for protection. Having succeeded in this, his position would have been one of great menace and danger to the Colony of Natal. Therefore, I am inclined to think that the annexation of the Transvaal rather postponed than precipitated the Zulu War. But the identification of Natal with the Transvaal by the annexation had, no doubt, an influence on Cetewayo. His object had been, as is clear from the passages I have read, to "wash his spears." He saw the position of affairs was entirely changed; that he was surrounded by territories either belonging to English subjects or under their protection; closing the safety-valve for the warlike spirit of the Zulu nation that had existed before. The result of all this was a great distrust, in his mind, of Sir Theophilus Shepstone, who had only done his duty—which distrust showed itself in the action which Cetewayo took on the occasion of the interview between his delegates and Sir Theophilus Shepstone in the autumn of 1877. If hon. Members would refer to the record of that interview at the Blood River, they will see a tone of insult, almost of defiance, on the part of the Zulus never exhibited before towards Sir Theophilus Shepstone. While the meeting was being held to discuss the question of disputed boundary, notices to quit were sent by the Zulu Indunas to the farmers who were living on disputed territory; and the difficulties of Sir Theophilus Shepstone's position were very considerable, bearing in mind the small force at his disposal, the natural desire of the farmers to protect their homesteads, and the desire he felt to avoid a war with the Zulus. It has been stated by the hon. Member for Chelsea that Cetewayo made no such claim to large increase of territory as is attributed to him; but he unquestionably did make claims to a part of South Africa which had never been considered to belong to him, beyond the Pongolo River. Sir Henry Bulwer stated that Cetewayo had no just claim to that territory. That I believe to be the absolute fact, and that claim was not included in the question referred to the Boundary Commission; but it still remained unsettled in spite of the Commission, so that the Report of the Boundary Commission, even if adopted in full, would not have satisfied the full claim of Cetewayo. Another important point of it was not touched upon by the hon. Member for Chelsea; but I think there can be no doubt that Cetewayo's action with regard to other Native Tribes had been of the nature which is described by Sir Henry Bulwer. Unquestionably, Cetewayo had been sending emissaries for some time past to the various Native Tribes, with the view of enlisting them in a general rising against the Whites, or of getting promises of assistance provided he himself got involved in a quarrel with the Whites. The hon. Member for Birmingham (Mr. Chamberlain) stated that we had taken up the quarrel of the Transvaal Republic against Secocoeni. That is contrary to the facts reported by Sir Theophilus Shepstone. Secocoeni and a neighbouring Chieftainess—I believe his sister—attacked Natives under the protection of the Transvaal Government, and initiated the war. There had been a demand for the tribute which Secocoeni had agreed to pay to the former Transvaal Government, but Sir Theophilus Shepstone had waived it for a time; and the quarrel which we now have with Secocoeni is entirely owing to that Chief's own action, and was not, so far as I can judge, due to the former war in the Transvaal. In 1878, Sir Theophilus Shepstone inclosed a despatch from Captain Clark, stating that Secocoeni had received a messenger from Cetewayo, telling him that his people had by strategy taken one of the houses of the White people; Secocoeni, therefore, should begin at once, and he would easily get the upper hand. In other parts of South Africa, according to Mr. Brownlee—for some time member of the Cape Government and possessing a greater knowledge of Native affairs in the Cape Colony than perhaps any other man—Cetewayo's hand had been clearly traced in our recent troubles on the Cape Frontier. In Pondoland, in July and August, 1877, after satisfaction had been expressed with the decision of Sir Bartle Frere in regard to the surrender of the murderers, Cetewayo appears upon the scene, and matters are changed. A mission was sent for the establishment of friendly relations with the Pondos; and it was reported that the Pondos had been urged not to comply with our demands. In July, 1877, it was reported that Cetewayo had sent messages to other tribes that he wished to combine against the White man. In October, 1877, Sir Henry Bulwer reported that Cetewayo had made offers of support to the Pondos if they took up arms against us. Several other statements of this character, with regard to the Natives in Griqualand West, appear in these Papers, and I can assert confidently that the general opinion of all competent to express one was that Cetewayo was everywhere engaging in action of this kind. A Report, received by Sir Henry Bulwer from Delagoa Bay, stated that Cetewayo despatched an Induna—Deenessa — to inquire why the Governor of Delagoa Bay would not let him have any more powder; also to tell the Governor that Cetewayo could see by his refusal to do so that the Portuguese were on friendly terms with the English, who were the Zulu's deadly enemies. The Report continued:—

> "Deenessa went on further to say that within a very short time the Zulus would overrun Natal, pillage, set fire to everything, and kill every White person they came across. He stated further that the policy of Cetewayo, at the commencement of hostilities, would be to endeavour to draw on the English troops to the centre of the Zulu country, and then surround and massacre all with what he terms his legions." —[P.P., C-2,220, page 311.]

I do not wish to attach too much importance to that as an evidence of Cetewayo's feeling; but I quote it as corroborating what I have stated to the

House as to the views of those who are qualified to express an opinion on this subject. From the facts I have stated, I think it is, at any rate, clear that there was some reason for the demands which Sir Bartle Frere made upon Cetewayo for the disbanding of his Army. At any rate—and this is a point the hon. Member for Chelsea omitted to refer to—this, as well as all the other demands made had the concurrence of all authorities, official and non-official, in the Colony of Natal. I need not quote Sir Theophilus Shepstone and Mr. Brownlee; but I may quote Sir Henry Bulwer as one who, according to the hon. Member for Chelsea, is not carried away by passion or terror. Sir Henry Bulwer said—

> "I have read and considered with attention the Minute of the High Commissioner regarding the terms to be proposed to the Zulu King. I beg leave to express my concurrence generally in the views of the High Commissioner, and in the terms which His Excellency proposes to lay down. I entirely concur in His Excellency's decision on this point, as also in the conditions which he has laid down, and which have been communicated to the Zulu King. They are conditions for the better government of the Zulu people and for their great advantage, and conditions also which it may be said are indispensable for securing peace in South Africa."

Now, the hon. Baronet referred to Bishop Colenso's opinion. I should not have quoted that opinion had it not been for the reference the hon. Baronet made. Bishop Colenso said—

> "I hoped and believed that Cetewayo would agree to those demands"—namely, the demands relating to the sons of Sirayo and the surveyors —"and expressed my cordial assent to the main points of the message—namely, those requiring the disbandment of the military forces, and an entire change in the marriage system, as being, though measures of coercion, yet such as a great Christian Power had a right to enforce upon a savage nation like the Zulus."

Subsequently, no doubt, Bishop Colenso wrote a letter to the effect that he did not like the manner in which those demands were made, or the steps by which it had been sought to enforce them; but I really fail to see how he could have proposed to enforce the demands, of which he approved, when they had been complied with, except by an invasion of the Zulu country, which he deprecated, or by taking the property of the King—in other words, the Zulu cattle. I come now to the question raised by the hon. and gallant Member for Renfrewshire (Colonel Mure) as to the adequacy of the Forces for invasion. On this point, I think the hon. and gallant Member is under a misconception. When I wrote the despatch of October 17—as will be clear from the Papers before the House—it appeared to me that the great difficulty with the Zulus was the boundary question, and that if that question could, as I hoped it would, be satisfactorily settled, the danger of a Zulu War might be avoided. I expressed that opinion more than once. I declined, in that despatch, on the part of Her Majesty's Government, to comply with a request for reinforcements on that ground. Subsequent despatches pointed to a danger of another kind—the imminent danger of an invasion of Natal by the Zulus for other reasons than those connected with the boundary dispute. These despatches reached England about the beginning and middle of November. They were considered carefully by Her Majesty's Government, and were replied to in my despatch of the 21st of November, in which I stated that certain reinforcements, which were described in detail by my right hon. and gallant Friend the Secretary of State for War, and which satisfied all the demands that had been made, would be sent. Well, these reinforcements were sent out, of course, with a view to a defensive policy. Her Majesty's Government, in that despatch, deprecated any aggression. It was not until we received, on the 19th of December, Sir Bartle Frere's despatch, stating the demands that had been made on Cetewayo that we had any reason to anticipate anything that could be fairly characterized as an aggressive policy. After those reinforcements had been sent, no further reinforcements were applied for. We had every reason to believe that Sir Bartle Frere and Lord Chelmsford possessed all the means they thought necessary for carrying out the policy they had proposed.

Colonel MURE: I distinctly quoted the despatch, which states that three regiments only were sent; but what I complain of is that when it was known that the Ultimatum had been despatched and that consequently invasion was a certainty, reinforcements were not sent.

Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH: I have merely to repeat that no further reinforcements were applied for—that all the reinforcements asked for had been sent; and that we had every reason to believe that all the authorities concurred in thinking that the reinforcements sent were adequate to the occasion. And I am bound to say that I think the military authorities on the spot were not without grounds for that opinion. Now, why does the hon. and gallant Member for Renfrewshire reproach me for my recommendations to Sir Bartle Frere to employ the Natives of Natal as the Natives of Cape Colony had been employed?

Colonel MURE: The Kaffirs of Cape Colony never were employed in the Kaffir War. The Fingoes were employed, as being the enemies of the Kaffirs and the friends of the English, but Kaffirs never.

Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH: Well, I think the facts warrant another view. However, I will not argue as to whether Fingoes or Kaffirs were employed. I recommended that, as had been done in the Cape Colony, the services of the Native population should be employed, if necessary, in the defence of Natal. That recommendation was made on the 21st of December; but before it could have been received in Natal, the authorities on the spot—including, I believe, all those who thoroughly knew the Natives of Natal—had taken active steps towards raising the very Native levies which I suggested should be raised, and they certainly had, I think, many good reasons at the time for forming a favourable opinion of the qualities of the Native regiments. The report of the first engagement, before the disaster of Isandlana, clearly, I think, showed that but for the panic caused by that disaster the Natives would have proved a very valuable Force indeed. The Forces that were engaged were considered to be adequate for all that was required. It was thought, by such authorities as Sir Henry Bulwer and Sir Theophilus Shepstone, that the Zulu power was likely to fall to pieces when touched—that as soon as our troops crossed the Border it would fall to pieces suddenly. If hon. Members refer to the number of troops engaged in the Kaffir War, they will find that four times the number of British troops were engaged in Zululand. Of course, it may be argued that events have shown that even such a Force was inadequate; but the disaster at Isandlana might have happened if 50,000 British troops had been engaged instead of 6,000 or 7,000; and, although it is now absolutely necessary to send out a very large Force to repair the disaster which has occurred, it by no means follows that the smaller number would not have been sufficient if the disaster had not occurred. Sir, the last clause of the Resolution is this—

> "That the House regrets that, after the censure passed upon the High Commissioner by Her Majesty's Government in the Despatch of the 19th day of March 1879, the conduct of affairs in South Africa should be retained in his hands."

Now, first of all, I should like to repeat what has already been stated "elsewhere" as to the blame which has been awarded to Sir Bartle Frere by Her Majesty's Government. The hon. Member for Chelsea spoke of Sir Bartle Frere as discredited. I do not know why; but those who have been most anxious to see Sir Bartle Frere recalled have, I think, been disposed to attribute the greatest weight to the blame conveyed in the despatch of the 19th of March. It is right that the extent to which blame has been awarded should be clearly understood. That blame has been awarded, because Sir Bartle Frere took a certain course of action without first consulting Her Majesty's Government. On the question of policy, I think, as I have ventured to put before the House, there is a great deal to be said on the part of Sir Bartle Frere. I have not entered into that question so much in order to justify the action of the Government as with a view to controvert some of the statements which appear to me to be unfair to Sir Bartle Frere, and which have been made by the hon. Baronet. Whether it was wise or whether it was not wise to send the Ultimatum which was sent to Cetewayo at the time it was sent is a matter which, it seems to me, can scarcely be decided now. The present state of circumstances in South Africa, at any rate, requires us to look rather to the future than to the past. The point which Her Majesty's Government have felt themselves called upon to deal with is whether Sir Bartle Frere was justified, under the circumstances, in acting as he did without their sanction. On that point they have expressed their opinion in the despatch of the 19th of

March. But when it is said, as I have heard it said, that this is an unprecedented censure on a Governor who is retained in office, I think it would be very easy to show, without any very lengthened research through the archives of the Colonial Office, that it is nothing of the kind. I do not like to re-open questions that have been settled, or to mention names in a way which might, perhaps, give pain to valuable servants of the Crown; but the House may take this from me—I hope it will, at least—that within not many years past a censure ten times exceeding in severity that which has been awarded to Sir Bartle Frere was awarded by the Colonial Office to a Governor of a Colony for acting against directions which he had received from Her Majesty's Government, and a distinct line of future policy was laid down for that Governor different from that which he himself had wished to follow, and yet he was not recalled, but was maintained in his office to the great benefit of the Colony, and now holds, also to the great benefit of the Service, the government of one of the most important Colonies of the Empire. The despatches on that subject were laid before Parliament, and any hon. Member who likes to look at them can trace the matter for himself. Therefore, Sir, what has been done, so far from being unprecedented, is a very slight reproof, indeed, compared with what has formerly occurred. It is given solely upon the ground I have mentioned. I myself—and I think I may venture to say Her Majesty's Government—retain complete confidence in Sir Bartle Frere; and when the hon. Baronet the Member for Chelsea tells us in one breath that he wishes to support Her Majesty's Government in all necessary measures for defending the possessions of Her Majesty in South Africa, and in another, censures us for not recalling the Agent in whom we have confidence, I venture to say that his Resolution is a little inconsistent in itself. I should hope that the House will support us, not only in such expenditure as may be required, but in our right, as Her Majesty's Government, to the selection of Agents to carry out our policy. We are, of course, responsible for failure, if failure occurs; but unless the hon. Baronet is ready to take the responsibility of the measures he desires to aid us in, I do not think he ought to ask the House to pass the Vote of Censure he proposes. Now, it is asked why we do not recall Sir Bartle Frere. I say, because we have still confidence in him; because the fact that he has been blamed for exceeding his authority—great though that authority is; greater, in fact, than that of any other Governor in the Colonial Service—will not, we believe, detract from his power for usefulness and good work in South Africa. We have not blamed him for incapacity. The blame that has been cast upon him has been rather for excess of zeal—for excess of zeal in a course which was, I believe, considered by every man in South Africa, at the time that he took it, to be the right one—and which has commended him more than ever to the good wishes of the Colonists of South Africa. I know it will be said that the Colonists will support any Governor who spends Imperial money. But remember what has happened in South Africa. Sir Bartle Frere has not only dealt with Imperial money in the operations he has felt it necessary to take. He has guided the actions of the Colonists at great cost of men and money to themselves; and their action has been, through his influence, in almost unprecedented harmony with the Home Government. If there has been anything which has in previous years rendered the difficulty of South African policy especially great, it has been, I will venture to say, the disinclination of the Cape Government to co-operate with the rest of South Africa in a complete and uniform Native policy. Sir Bartle Frere has done not a little to bring that co-operation about. There are further difficulties before us. I think that if hon. Members fairly consider what those difficulties are, they will not readily weaken the hands of Her Majesty's Government at this crisis. You have to deal in South Africa with a vast Native population within the Borders of your Colonies—a population in every state of civilization, varying between the civilization of the Whites and actual barbarism; a population whom you would desire by every means in your power to wean from their savage customs and gradually to bring under the influence of our laws; the authority over whom you would wish by degrees to transfer from the Native Chiefs to White magistrates, and upon whom you would specially impress the doctrine of individual property in the soil, as one which, above all others, will tend to lead them to those habits of labour and industry which will make them a valuable and useful population to our Colonies. By so doing, I believe you will better deal with that other difficulty, the vast tide of Native immigration into our Colonies from the North, than by any other means that you can devise; for I think that if the Native population in our Colonies is fairly regulated under equal laws, there will be less temptation than there has been for fugitives or tribes to move from the North to a State which they have hitherto considered to be merely one of barbarous and safe independence. Then, again, you have a White population, which is still, I am sorry to say, divided to a great extent. I think, in the whole of the speech of the hon. Baronet the Member for Chelsea, the omission which, perhaps, was most noteworthy, was this—that he appeared entirely to forget the views and even the prejudices of the Dutch population. That is a difficulty, perhaps, greater than any other which has to be dealt with at this moment in South Africa. But all these difficulties may be dealt with by that policy of Union or Confederation—call it by what name you like—which would secure self-government to local White communities, and at the same time the adoption of a uniform and coherent Native policy—a policy which, commencing under the necessary control of this country, might by degrees be freed from that control as the Colonists become—as they are now becoming—alive to a sense of their own true interests and responsibilities, and thus ultimately tend to relieve this country from those responsibilities in South Africa which now so heavily press upon it. I will venture to say there is no man who could have been chosen who is so well qualified as Sir Bartle Frere to carry out such a policy. Look at what he has done already!—[*Ironical cheers.*] If hon. Members opposite had waited until I had finished my sentence, they would have seen to what I alluded—look what he has done already for the Cape Colony! I do not wish to find fault with any action of my Predecessors; but I do think that it was, at any rate, a doubtful policy to give the boon of self-government to the Cape Colony without, at the same time, securing that that Colony should take measures for its self-defence. Sir Bartle Frere, since he has been there, has guided the Cape Colony into those very measures which have too long been delayed, even against the powerful influence of the Ministry whom he found in office. He has induced the Parliament of the Cape Colony to pass most valuable measures for the establishment of a Yeomanry Force, a Burgher Force, a force of Volunteers and of Cape Mounted Riflemen, for regulating the possession of arms by the Natives; and he has induced the Parliament to give even more practical proofs of their anxiety to move in the same direction by the very great expenditure in men and money—not less a sum than £1,250,000—which they have incurred in repressing the rebellion and the war on the Borders of the Cape Colony, and also by entirely denuding themselves of Her Majesty's troops in order that those troops might be sent to the defence of Natal, at a moment when, owing to the disaster which had occurred, the Cape Colony itself must necessarily have been in the most serious danger from the Native population within its Borders. Well, I think that if hon. Members had known what I was about to allude to, they would, at any rate, have admitted that this was no slight service in a path which I believe they would wish Her Majesty's Representative in South Africa to pursue. I do not understand that anything which we have laid down as to our future policy in South Africa has been objected to by those who have spoken to-night. It has been said that that policy is inconsistent with Sir Bartle Frere's ideas. I distinctly deny that assertion. If the hour were not so late, I would quote, as I could do, from repeated despatches of Sir Bartle Frere, his views as to a system of Residents among the Native Tribes on our Borders similar to that which I believe will be the best solution of the future of Zululand. Other main points included in my despatch of the 20th of March are practically in accordance with the views which Sir Bartle Frere has expressed. I believe that if you maintain him, he will carry out the policy which you approve better than any other man. I believe that this war—if you but support us on this occasion—costly in men and in money as it may be, will in the end prove to be a turning-point in the history of South Africa. And of this, at any rate, I am confident—that you have in Sir Bartle Frere—although on this occasion he has taken a course with which fault has been found—a man thoroughly qualified not only to act with firmness and judgment in the crisis which even while we are debating may be passing in South Africa, but also to lead our Colonies in that Continent on the path of prosperity, peace, and self-government, including in that term those necessary measures of self-defence which their sisters in other quarters of the globe have before now taken upon themselves.

Mr. KNATCHBULL-HUGESSEN said, that the hon. and learned Member for Cambridge (Mr. Marten) had commenced his speech with a sneer at what he was pleased to call the newly-awakened zeal for the Colonies upon that (the Opposition) side of the House. He (Mr. Knatchbull-Hugessen) had heard such remarks before; they generally appeared in the articles of second-rate newspapers, or in letters from anonymous correspondents; but even when they came from such an illustrious quarter as to-night, he only noticed them to give an emphatic denial to their justice. The affection which existed between Her Majesty's subjects resident in these Islands, and those who inhabited our Colonial Possessions, was deep, genuine, and general, and was not to be claimed as the peculiar property of any one political Party. It was the desire of every Party, and of every section of a Party which possessed any influence whatever, to maintain and cherish the connection between the Colonies and the Mother Country. The right hon. Gentleman who had just sat down had stated that he did not wish to find fault with his Predecessors, and he (Mr. Knatchbull-Hugessen) might appeal to him to admit that from him (Mr. Knatchbull-Hugessen) he had never received factious criticism since his accession to Office. And if he thought that any harm to the Colonies could result from the vote which he intended to give that night, no power on earth should induce him to give it. On the contrary, he should vote in the firm belief that the course he was taking was that which, in the interests of the Colonies as well as of England, ought to be taken. It had been said that night that the present war arose out of the Transvaal annexation. He was happy to be able to commence his speech by a cordial agreement with the right hon. Gentleman opposite that such was not the case. He had given a loyal support to the Government upon that question. It appeared to him that there had been an overwhelming preponderance of argument in favour of the action of the Government. A great deal of nonsense was sometimes talked on both sides of the House—he begged pardon, on both sides of the question outside the House, for within those walls, of course, no nonsense was ever spoken—upon this subject of annexation. In such a country as ours, it was just as foolish to say—"We will never annex," as to say—"We will always annex." The fact was that each question of proposed annexation must depend upon the condition and circumstances under which the proposal was made, and in the case of the Transvaal the balance was in favour of the step. But one great reason why he (Mr. Knatchbull-Hugessen), and many others on that side of the House supported the Government upon that occasion, was their belief that whilst greater tranquillity and a more settled state of things would be obtained in the interests of the White population, the Zulus and other Native Tribes would be treated with more consideration and kindness. And they never would have supported the annexation, if they had not felt that this would be a certain consequence, and one imperatively necessary. Whatever might be said in favour of the Dutch Boers, they had not treated the Natives well. It had been said that night that they had emigrated in order to practise their religion with liberty. No description could be more erroneous. They had pushed on from British Settlements, because they desired the institution of slavery, which in such Settlements could not be allowed; and they had persistently acquired land from Native Tribes by means which could not be defended. Large tracts were sometimes obtained by the payment of a few head of cattle in a manner which was by no means just or fair. And when we talked about the Zulus giving notice to Boers to quit their lands, we must consider who were the original aggressors in this respect. The Zulus might not be a very ancient tribe, but they were in the country before the Boers; and if a proof of the iniquity and the enormity of the land transactions of the latter was desired, he might point to the Proclamation of a recent President of the late Transvaal Republic, in which he coolly claimed as Transvaal territory the whole of the country up to the Portugese Possessions at Delagoa Bay. But he would now quit the general land question, in order to come to its particular bearing upon the conduct of Cetewayo, with whom they were principally concerned that night. Now, let them first look at the evident feeling of Cetewayo towards the inhabitants of the Transvaal before its annexation by us. In the Papers presented in April, 1877, upon the Transvaal War, it was conclusively shown that the origin of the war was the claim by the Boers of lands belonging to the Natives. At page 14 was Cetewayo's message to the Lieutenant Governor of Natal, complaining of the message he had received from the Transvaal Government to the effect that all Zulus in the Amaswazi country were to remove at once, and also from the territory in dispute between the Boers and the Zulus; "if not, they would be removed by force." He goes on—

> "Cetewayo asked, in reply, what he had done to be turned out of his own house? He urged that the Zulus had not been aggressors in any way. He desired his messengers to urge upon the Government of Natal to interfere to save the destruction of perhaps both countries—Zululand and the Transvaal; he requests them to state that he cannot and will not submit to be turned out of his own home. He 'is fully aware of the cause of jealousy'—namely, that he was crowned by the Representatives of the British Government. He concludes by saying that Zulus heretofore occupying the lands now claimed by the Transvaal Government have been already ordered to desist from cultivating the soil. The matter is, therefore, urgent, and as he does not intend to submit to this dictation, great mischief will happen unless the Government can take some measure to avert it."

There was, therefore, fair warning to the Cape Government that the hostility between the Boers and the Zulus was likely, if left to itself, to break out into open war; but these Papers all showed that, whilst Cetewayo was animated with hatred to the Boers whom he longed to fight, he was always deferring to the Natal Government. As one among many pieces of evidence to this effect, in April 1877, a young Zulu who had killed a White man, having been sent to Cetewayo for trial by the Natal Government, he refused even to try him, saying that "the White people were his, Cetewayo's fathers, and this Zulu who had killed one must die;" and, accordingly, he killed the offender at once. And now let them ask what was Cetewayo's feeling about the change in the ownership of the Transvaal? Be it remembered that up to the time of annexation the Zulu King had held but one language to the Natal Government with reference to the land disputes. It was the fashion now, among a certain class of politicians, always to represent Cetewayo's words and actions as those of a wily savage playing off one country against the other for his own purposes. He (Mr. Knatchbull-Hugessen) felt bound to say that the evidence scarcely bore out that view. No doubt, the Zulu King often complained of the Boers to the Natal Government; but it was clear enough that he perceived the difference between the policy of his two neighbours, the Boers continually seeking to encroach upon Zululand, whilst the Natal people were satisfied with their existing boundary, and only wanted to be let alone. The language of Cetewayo was uniform throughout the whole negotiations up to a very recent period. As far back as 1861 he and his father sent to complain that the Boers were threatening them with hostilities, and endeavouring to cheat them out of land. In 1863 (c. 1961, page 8) he complained that—"The Boers were eating into his country to an alarming degree," and said—

> "He feels certain that before long he will be compelled to quarrel with them, or he will have no territory left."

Instances of the same kind might be multiplied throughout the mass of Papers that had been presented to Parliament; and there was always a profession on the part of Cetewayo of respect for the Natal Government and the English people, which might have been more or less owing to his belief in their power, but of the sincerity of which there was no reason to doubt. That being the case, let them come to the 4th of July, 1877, when Mr. Fynney, of whom Sir Theophilus Shepstone wrote that

> "He speaks the Zulu language as fluently as he does his own, and is intimately acquainted with Cetewayo personally,"

makes a most interesting Report, after a lengthened interview with the Zulu King, held at the request of Sir Theophilus Shepstone. Mr. Fynney had represented to Cetewayo the disquiet caused in the Transvaal by rumours of warlike preparations in Zululand, and the complaints that he had not fulfilled the promises made at his Coronation. Of these promises, by the way, he (Mr. Knatchbull-Hugessen) thought that a great deal too much had been made; and when Sir Bartle Frere spoke of Cetewayo as not being an independent King, he had always thought that, so far as a savage Monarch could be independent, there was no more independent King than the Ruler of Zululand. The assumption that these promises were made us at the command of a superior Power was wholly unwarranted. In his interview with Mr. Fynney, Cetewayo, after replying that if the English would have stood aside he should have successfully fought the Boers, and swept them out of the country altogether, declared—"I am glad to know the Transvaal is English ground; perhaps now there may be rest." He then went on to say—

> "The Boers are a nation of liars; they are a bad people—bad altogether. I do not want them near my people. They lie, and claim what is not their's, and ill-use my people. Where is Thomas?" (Mr. Burgess, the President of the Transvaal Republic.)

Mr. Fynney told him that Mr. Burgess had left the country. "Then," he said, "let them pack up and follow Thomas." Throughout the whole of this interview, there was the same friendly spirit towards the English evinced by Cetewayo; but there were three things which should be steadily kept in view by anyone who wished to judge fairly of the sequel. The first is that the land disputes between the Boers and his people were prominently in the King's mind, and that their settlement was imperatively necessary on every account. Secondly, the King had an exaggerated opinion of his power, but that power was undoubtedly considerable; and he was very proud of his Army, which was, in fact, the main support and foundation of his authority. Thirdly, both he and his people had become much annoyed by the missionaries. His ministers (p. 47) spoke very bitterly on the subject of the missionaries endeavouring to make converts of the Zulus. Umnyamana said—

> "We will not allow the Zulus to become so-called Christians. It is not the King says so, but every man in Zululand. If a Zulu does anything wrong, he at once goes to a mission station, and says he wants to become a Christian. If he wants to run away with a girl, he becomes a Christian. If he wishes to be exempt from seeing the King, he puts on clothes, and is a Christian. . . . This Christianizing of the Zulus destroys the land, and we will not allow it. We do not care if the missionaries go or stay; but they must not interfere with the Zulus, that is all. The missionaries desire to set up another power in the land, and as Zululand has only one King, that cannot be allowed."

And Mr. Fynney says (p. 50)—

> "I found there were all sorts of wild rumours going about from station to station—one that the British Government intended to annex Zululand at once. I am afraid that this, and like rumours, have done harm. Several of the missionaries have been frequently to the King of late, and, as he told me, have worried him to such an extent that he does not want to see them any more."

Now, bearing these three things in mind, let the House recollect that the three things upon which especial emphasis was laid in the Ultimatum were the disbanding of the Zulu Army, the settlement of the land question in a manner eminently unsatisfactory to Cetewayo, and the reception of the missionaries who had already worried him so much. And Sir Bartle Frere had received ample warning of the irritation these conditions were likely to occasion. In November, 1878, Sir Theophilus Shepstone had informed him (c. 2,222, page 133) that he, indeed, agreed with him that the Zulu military organization must be changed, and other points in the Ultimatum enforced; but he added these significant words—

> "These measures are what appear to me to be necessary before any commencement even can be expected in the change that is required to make the Zulu people safe neighbours and an improving community. But they involve the extinction of the Zulu power as it now is; and the attempt to adopt them must, if decided upon, be made with the knowledge that the Zulu Chief will oppose them, whatever course the head men and common people may adopt."

Of the means which Cetewayo had to oppose these changes Sir Bartle Frere had also full warning, for Mr. Fynney had reported his opinion after having seen the kraals of fighting men upon the occasion of the interview with Cetewayo already mentioned, and he estimated the number as exceeding 40,000 warriors. But with regard to the position of the Zulu King, and the effect which the aggressive policy of Sir Bartle Frere was likely to have upon that position, perhaps the most important despatch in the whole of the Blue Books presented to Parliament was that from Sir Henry Bulwer, bearing date September 30, 1878 (No. c. 2,222, page 33). In this despatch, after a lucid statement upon the boundary question, he points out the manner in which the annexation of the Transvaal had altered our position with regard to the Zulus, and said that they "look with great suspicion upon the new state of things." Then, after alluding to the character of the King, his standing Army, his desire to employ it, and his apprehension of danger from our doings in the Transvaal, Sir Henry Bulwer uses words which it would have been well, indeed, if his superior officer had laid to heart—

> "Nor does Cetewayo stand alone in this apprehension. The nation at large is ill at ease as to what our intentions are, and alienated as are the sympathies of his people from him, gladly as they would welcome relief from his personal rule, and readily as, it is believed, a large portion of the nation would accept English protection and the establishment of a just rule among them, they are not prepared to accept the invasion and loss of their country without fighting for it. The defence of Zulu soil would, in fact, it is thought, be made a common cause, and rally the whole of the Zulu nation round the King."

These were words pregnant with meaning—words which, if they had been understood and appreciated by the High Commissioner as they should have been, might have saved hundreds of precious lives, averted disaster from the British arms, and left to many and many a British home the light which was quenched on that fatal day of Isandlana. Yes, Sir, for what warning did those words convey? The Zulu King and nation had, indeed, become suspicious of England; but they had still their respect for British power, and their belief in British prowess. Insecure upon his Throne—uncertain of his policy, exposed to all those manifold dangers which surround tyrants — the King dared not attack the Power to which he had so long deferred, and to which many of his people still looked with no unfriendly eye. One step only could be taken which should solve his difficulties and place him at the head of an united and enthusiastic people. With all their faults and weaknesses, these untutored savages held close to their hearts one virtue—or that quality, at least, which we White men had ever lauded to the skies as a great and noble virtue—they loved their country. Her soil was sacred to them, and the feet of the intruder could not be set therein without rousing to the utmost their patriotic ardour. Persecuted, enslaved, oppressed; liable to be slain at any moment at the will of a despotic and bloodthirsty King, the moment their country was invaded they forgot their injuries and their oppression, and saw in him only the representative of the nationality whose existence was threatened. This one step—the invasion of Zululand — could alone unite Zulus against England, and this step we took. And now—how did we take it? With Forces scarce sufficient for the defence of our own Colony. What said Lord Chelmsford on that point? Upon the 28th of September, 1878, Lord Chelmsford writes—

> "So soon as my Native contingent is mobilized, I shall be ready, as far as my limited means allow. I cannot but feel that my column will be only barely strong enough for the purpose, and that it will be difficult to keep open our means of communication. . . . No greater mistake can be made than to attempt to conquer the Zulus with insufficient means."

His (Mr. Knatchbull-Hugessen's) contention was that, even supposing that Sir Bartle Frere had been right in declaring war, he did so with an inadequate Force; though, as a matter of fact, there was no immediate occasion for declaring war, and a pretext of equal justice might have been found at any time during the last 10 years. He had listened to the speech of the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for the Colonies, and had been unable to discover whether or not his object had been to justify Sir Bartle Frere. He sympathized with the difficulty under which the right hon. Gentleman had laboured, of having to do two things at the same time. Hon. Gentlemen opposite said that the censure passed upon Sir Bartle Frere only referred to his doing something without orders; but they did not make it clear whether, after the receipt of orders, he would have been supported in the same policy. What he complained of was that the House did not, even up to the present moment, know what the opinion of the Government on the question was, and that it had received no indication of their policy. The Government had not yet told them what was their view of Sir Bartle Frere's policy, and that was a point on which the Government ought to have an opinion. It was not fair to the House or to the country that the Government should be in the position of having no definite opinion upon this policy; that they should place themselves in such a position as would enable them hereafter to say, if the policy succeeded, they approved of it; or, if it failed, they did not; and it was because the Government would not give an opinion on that policy that they on the Opposition side of the House were obliged to ask the House to express an opinion. But, to allude to the last despatch of Sir Bartle Frere, he might observe that while deploring in that despatch the disasters which had happened to our troops, he ascribed it to a disregard of the orders of the General. Now, he was not going to discuss the military capacity of those who were serving in South Africa; but although he suspended his judgment on that point, he must altogether decline to follow Sir Bartle Frere in his endeavour to bury the faults of the living in the graves of the dead, and against that attempt upon the part of a person in Sir Bartle Frere's position he must record his indignant and solemn protest. Sir Bartle Frere went on to say that the Army of Cetewayo might invade Natal; but everybody was aware, months and years ago, that that Army existed, and that, notwithstanding its existence, Cetewayo continued to be our friend, and not our enemy, so long as affairs were properly managed. The last paragraph of the despatch referred to the inexpediency of making peace until Her Majesty's unquestionable superiority was acknowledged as far as Delagoa Bay; and that sentence gave, to his mind, the key to the whole of Sir Bartle Frere's South African policy. Let it not be supposed that he wished to say an unkind word of Sir Bartle Frere. He was quite aware of his eminent services. But the more eminent the services he had rendered in one part of the world, the more it was to be regretted that he had failed in another; and in this instance he had brought about a war which had not only shaken British but European prestige in South Africa, and which would probably still lead to the shedding of much blood. He (Mr. Knatchbull-Hugessen) could sketch out a future of South Africa, which he thought every Member would approve. He would wish that all the territories of South Africa were well governed and civilized, and he could see a distant future for South Africa in which this might be the case, and Zululand included in confederation with Natal, the Tranvaal, Basutoland, the Orange Free State, Griqualand West, and the Cape Colony, might be part and parcel of a civilized and prosperous community, from Table Bay at the South-Western, to Delagoa Bay on the North-Eastern extremity. We White people had a theory—very comfortable to our own vanity, and possibly true — that wherever White and Black nations came into contact, and savages were placed in juxtaposition with civilized communities, the Black savages became absorbed, and eventually disappeared. Very likely Sir Bartle Frere had the same idea; but such a result was the work of generations, only to be gradually effected, and a man who could not wait, but tried by force to bring about that result, which required a long series of years to be worked out, was likely to ruin himself and to cause disasters to his country. He believed that Sir Bartle Frere's fault was that he could not wait. It was with regret that he (Mr. Knatchbull-Hugessen) rose to speak words in condemnation of the course adopted by a distant Governor. He felt for Sir Bartle Frere; but duty to one's country rendered it impossible not to blame the course he had adopted. He thought the conduct of Her Majesty's Government with reference to Sir Bartle Frere was unfortunate. Either he had been guilty of only a trivial offence, in which case their censure was undeserved, or if they were of opinion that he had been guilty of grave indiscretion, it was their duty to recall him, and not to express their continued confidence in him in the sentence following that in which they charged him with want of prudence.

What had the Government done? They had censured Sir Bartle Frere, but they had taken refuge in this—that they had expressed no opinion on his policy. It was difficult to deal with an Administration like this. It was impossible to know what they would do next. The last thing they had done was to forbid Sir Bartle Frere to annex Zululand; but from his (Mr. Knatchbull-Hugessen's) knowledge of the antecedents of hon. and right hon. Gentlemen opposite, that very order convinced him that if they were in Office for three or four years more they would certainly annex it, for he had never known them assert a principle with unusual vehemence without being about to abandon it at the right moment for their convenience, and to start again from a fresh point. The Government could come to speedy conclusions. Everyone recollected "the 10 minutes'" Cabinet meeting, when an important change was made in the whole of the British Constitution in consequence of the resolution arrived at in that short space of time. Let the experiment be repeated. Let the Cabinet hold a meeting to-morrow. They had condemned Sir Bartle Frere; now let the Government follow that up with its legitimate sequence, and recall the individual who was responsible for the policy. They would in any case be followed by what it was the fashion to call their "numerical" majority; though for his (Mr. Knatchbull-Hugessen's) part, he had never yet known a majority which was not numerical, and they had a precedent without going far to look for it. It would not be the first Governor who was recalled by them. Sir Benjamin Pine had been recalled for an act falling far short in its consequences of that laid to the charge of Sir Bartle Frere—namely, for the energetic repression of a rebellion for which he received the gratitude of the White population of Natal. But this was not merely a question of the discretion or indiscretion of a Colonial Governor, nor a question of the conduct or misconduct of a Ministry; but it was a question of the relations in which Colonial Governors should stand towards the Government at home. It was, therefore, one of the utmost importance in regard to our Colonies generally, for if it was to go forth that a Governor might declare war without having to submit the case for instructions from home, with only a censure hanging over him and not his recall, the greatest mischief might be done. If he was not recalled, then the Government ought to have identified itself with his proceedings. He knew very well that the people of England would not be satisfied until the slaughter at Isandlana had been avenged, and knowing what the consequence might be, he thought it aggravated the error of Sir Bartle Frere. That was a fatal error; but he thought the error of the Government in censuring him and according him their confidence was still more fatal. They did not know how Sir Bartle Frere might take the censure passed on him. He might wish to come away, and then the Government would be in a worse position than ever. Throughout the whole of the last two years, Sir Bartle Frere appeared to have attributed all Native misbehaviour in any part of South Africa to the machinations of Cetewayo; but there was no evidence to support such a theory. The only conclusion to be drawn from the facts was, as far as he could judge, that Cetewayo had been to Sir Bartle Frere what "old Bogey" was to naughty children. He appeared to have Cetewayo on the brain, and to have acted accordingly. In the course of the debate, the House had heard much of the Old Testament. He wished they would not forget the New, in which it was written that they who take the sword shall perish by the sword; and that there would be no further persistence in the attempt to force Christianity down the throats of the Zulus at the point of the bayonet. Sir Bartle Frere, whose eminent services to the country he desired to acknowledge, had made an initial error in this matter, and the Government had fallen into one of equal magnitude, which he feared would not be easily, if at all, explained away; and he was confident that the course which they (the Opposition) had felt bound to take would meet with the ultimate approval of the English people.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Debate be now adjourned."—(*Mr. Hanbury.*)

Motion *agreed to.*

Debate *adjourned* till *To-morrow.*

[*First Night.*]

ORDERS OF THE DAY.

EAST INDIA [LOAN].

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

MR. E. STANHOPE, in moving leave to bring in a Bill for an East India Loan, said: This Bill gives a power to borrow money in England upon the security of the land in India, and I shall ask the permission of the House to make a few observations upon it. In the first place, the necessity for this loan is in no way connected with the cost of the war in Afghanistan. The House is well aware that the expenditure for that war was estimated in 1879-80 at £2,000,000; and as the Government proposes, with the sanction of Parliament, to apply for a similar sum out of the Imperial Exchequer, it will be understood that our difficulties do not arise from that cause. Nor, Sir, is it asked for in order to introduce or to facilitate any scheme whatever for altering the standard or the currency laws of India. Our position is this—our borrowing powers are completely exhausted. We have done our best to prevent such a state of things. The Secretary of State has strongly and repeatedly urged upon the Government of India the necessity of making remittances to England in order to reduce the Debt contracted here for the purpose of the recent Famine. He has directed that one-half of the Famine Insurance Fund shall be specially reserved for the purpose; but these efforts have been of no avail. In the present state of the Exchanges, it is practically impossible for us to accomplish what we desire. Having no borrowing powers, we have this year to bring over a sum of £15,000,000 to this country. The first suggestion that would naturally occur would be—"Why can you not, by reducing your Home Charges, diminish that amount?" But anyone who will carefully examine the Home Charges—and I propose to place upon the Table of the House some figures which, I hope, will much assist in so doing—will find how very large a proportion of those Home Charges consists almost entirely of items which are practically fixed, and which it is impossible that any immediate action, at any rate, would enable us to bring down. With regard to the Expenditure in India the case is different; and I hope to be able to show the House, when I make a more complete Statement, that we are making considerable efforts in this direction, and especially in respect of public works. But any reduction of the Expenditure in India would not help us in our present condition. By far the greater part of this sum of £15,000,000 must be met by the sale of our bills. And although we have reduced the amount which we offer weekly to a much smaller extent than before, not only has the price which we have obtained for them sunk lower and lower, except during the present week, but the tenders for them have diminished in amount. And, as I have said, having no borrowing power at our back, we are obliged to force the bills upon the market at a time when there is no demand for remittances. We are thus placed practically at the mercy of those who tender with the full knowledge that we must, at any sacrifice, get the money. Moreover, if we, by any reasonable sacrifices, tide over the present difficulties, yet it would be impossible for us to face the long Parliamentary Recess, when the state of the silver market might, at any moment, absolutely prevent us from selling our bills at all. There is one other point. The principle has been laid down over and over again, and has been accepted by this House, that all money that is required to be raised for the purpose of public works must be borrowed in India and not in England. To that principle we still unhesitatingly adhere, and we are prepared to press it upon the Government of India even at a time when, like the present, circumstances are specially unfavourable; and, accordingly, a Loan has been announced in India. But the information which has recently reached us tends to show that, under some circumstances, it may be found impossible to raise in India the whole amount required to be borrowed during the coming year. And we shall be landed in the dilemma of not being able to pay our way. We feel, therefore, that we are bound to place ourselves in such a position as to be able to render assistance if it unfortunately becomes necessary. I hope I shall not be asked to express myself more fully upon this point at the present moment, because, until full information arrives from India, it is very necessary to speak with great reserve on the subject. On these grounds, we ask Parliament to give us additional borrowing powers to the extent of £10,000,000. We hope it will not be necessary to make any addition to the permanent Debt of India; but, on the contrary, we trust to be able to reduce it by the application of the Famine Insurance Fund in future years. We intend to use the powers for which we propose to ask as sparingly as we possibly can, as we believe that a reserve of borrowing power is a great strength to our financial position; and whatever sum we are compelled to raise, we will endeavour to pay off as soon as circumstances are more favourable for sending remittances to this country. It will be obvious that if hereafter the relations between gold and silver should be restored to anything like its former condition, which is at least as likely as the contrary supposition, we shall derive positive financial advantage from borrowing here and not in India. But we do not base our proposal upon any sort of speculation as to the future position of silver; we ask for these powers simply because we believe them to be absolutely necessary for the reasons which I have given, and which I shall be prepared on a future occasion further to explain and to justify. I have now only to ask the House kindly to forbear from entering at this moment into any elaborate criticism of the financial position of India, for we have not yet received from India the detailed statement of its finances. In these circumstances, I venture to think that we cannot discuss what they propose there with satisfaction to ourselves, or justice to those in India who make the proposal. I ask for leave at the present moment to bring in the Bill, which I hope the House will grant; but it is not the intention of the Government to press it now to a second reading. We will leave the second reading until such time as we have the figures from the Government of India, which will enable us to discuss the subject as a whole.

Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That it is expedient to authorize the Secretary of State in Council of India to raise in the United Kingdom any sum or sums of money not exceeding £10,000,000, for the service of the Government of India on the security of the Revenues of India."—(*Mr. E. Stanhope.*)

Mr. GOSCHEN said, it was by no fault of the hon. Gentleman the Under Secretary of State for India that he had been obliged to make the remarkable, he would even say startling, statement which had just fallen from his lips at that late hour in the morning. But, notwithstanding the very great issues raised by the debate that had just been adjourned, and although there were but few hon. Members present at that moment, it must none the less be felt that the proposal was one of the most serious ever made by the Government in connection with finance during its whole term of Office. The Under Secretary of State had requested the House not to discuss, and not to criticize for the present, that most important proposal which had just fallen from him, and which he had placed officially before the House. But he (Mr. Goschen) desired to know the object of the Government in asking for leave to introduce at that moment a Bill that they only intended to proceed with in May? Nor could he tell why they took at the same time the extraordinary step of asking the House to refrain from criticism. One thing, however, was certain—that if hon. Members present did not criticize, there would be plenty of criticism out-of-doors, both in England and in India; and it was equally certain that the scheme would be criticized in the City and in other financial circles likely to be affected by the Loan. The present subject was not only of supreme importance to India, but to this country also; and he had felt, during the earlier portion of the speech of the Under Secretary, that the moment had arrived when Parliament must set to work to consider the whole question of Indian finance, and that the time was come when the whole situation must be reviewed. One effect of the Loan, it appeared to him, would be to raise the price of silver, and that drafts of the Council would be sold during the next two months at a very much higher price than they sold for before; and, further, that there would be speculations on the silver market on the strength of this Loan. If, indeed, he was not mis-informed, that speculation had already set in, and a remarkable rise in the price of silver had been the consequence; for, although the Loan had not become public, somehow or other the impression had got abroad that the Loan would be raised. Personally, he attached little importance to the rise in the price of silver, excepting so far as it showed the extreme sensitiveness of the silver market. It had always been considered right that all fiscal measures should be discussed with the least possible delay, so that no time might be given for those fluctuations which disturbed both the money market and trade generally. Everybody would admit the difficulty of deciding upon the course proper for the House to take in the present case; the proposal having been made with such suddenness that hon. Members had not opportunity of consulting with their Colleagues. He could not help feeling, however, that the Government ought not to press for the entire postponement of discussion that evening, even if it had to be discussed at a later hour. He could not think it fair that the House of Commons should be precluded from discussing the subject until May next. But any reasonable proposal on that point would receive from his (Mr. Goschen's) side of the House the best consideration.

Mr. FAWCETT said, it was, of course, perfectly useless at that time to attempt to discuss what the right hon. Gentleman the Member for the City of London (Mr. Goschen) had described to be by far the gravest proposal that had ever been advanced by the Government with regard to the finances of India. It had been stated that it was the intention to borrow £5,000,000 in India, if it could be done, and that England was going to lend the Indian Government £2,000,000, which, taken in connection with the powers now asked for, made up a sum of no less than £17,000,000. It appeared to him absolutely impossible to over-state the extreme gravity of these facts. Without wishing, in the slightest degree, to embarrass the Government, he was compelled to deny altogether the assertion of the Under Secretary of State, that the Government had done their very best to avoid the necessity for this Loan. They had made no real and genuine effort to reduce the Expenditure, which, on the contrary, had been increased by events for which the present Administration were responsible. Again, the Under Secretary of State had said that it was impossible to reduce the Home Charges; but he (Mr. Fawcett) had always believed that if a minister could be found of sufficient courage and determination to attack the Indian military system, and not shrink from facing the authorities at the Horse Guards, it would be possible to reduce the Military Charges to such an extent as to produce an important change in the value of silver; and he challenged contradiction of that statement. He hoped the country, on reading the announcement of the Government proposal on the following day, would awaken to the gravity of the Indian financial situation; and he ventured to say that after Easter there would be no subject considered more pressing than that of the necessity for doing something to extricate India from her financial difficulties. There appeared to him little use in opposing the introduction of the Bill. He trusted that what he was about to say would be duly reported by the Press, although he feared that the Bill had been introduced at too late a period of the evening. He wished business men, both in India and in England, not to take it for granted that the Loan would be agreed to, although no opposition might be offered to the introduction of the Bill that evening. In his view, the policy of borrowing those enormous sums in India and in England, thereby increasing the Home Charges, was fraught with such peril to the future of India that he, for one, would spare no effort to prevent the Bill passing, or, at any rate, to greatly reduce the amount which the Government under the Bill would have authority to borrow. Therefore, it appeared to him important to make that statement; and he hoped it would not be assumed out-of-doors that the mere fact of the Government introducing a Bill for powers to borrow £10,000,000 was any reason for believing that the authority to do so would necessarily be conceded. Notwithstanding the large majority which supported the Government, he still clung to the hope that on a question like that before the House a discussion without Party bias was possible; and that when the real facts of the case were known and laid before the country, a feeling would be raised which the Government would not be able to overcome. He maintained that business men in this country and elsewhere would not make a correct calculation, if they assumed that the Bill would pass in the form in which it had been introduced; and that they ought not to base their calculations upon the supposition that the Indian Government was going to have authority to borrow £10,000,000. Although, of course, there would be advantages in postponing discussion of the second reading of the Bill until they had before them the whole of the facts, he could not help feeling that there was great force in the remarks of his right hon. Friend the Member for the City of London—that, upon a question involving money and speculation, the less delay which took place the better—and, therefore, it seemed to him open to the consideration of the Government whether they would not fix the second reading of the Bill at an earlier time than that contemplated by them. Knowing that the effect of the Bill being introduced would be to raise the price of silver and cause speculation, to affect the German currency, the rates of exchange, and the monetary system of almost every European State, he considered it a subject well worthy of the attention of Her Majesty's Government whether it would not be better to submit to the disadvantage of not having all the details, and proceed with the discussion of the second reading at an earlier date. He took that opportunity of giving Notice that on the second reading of the Bill he would distinctly raise the question indicated by him in the few remarks he had just made, and move a Resolution thereupon, to the effect that he believed economy in the Military and other branches of the Indian Expenditure to be practicable, and that it would be undesirable to add to the amount of the Indian Debt.

SIR GEORGE CAMPBELL considered that it was scarcely possible for the House to pass that stage of this matter without giving a certain amount of sanction to the proposal which had been just sprung upon the House. He could not consent to do so in so sudden a way. For his own part, he was of opinion that it was better to face the question of exchanges rather than postpone and avoid it. He had recently in a Committee asked a very experienced person, who informed him that the India Office received in exchange the intrinsic value of silver and something more. There was no real loss by exchange. The only difficulty was the low value of silver, but it was as likely to go lower still as to rise. He begged to move that Progress be reported.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Chairman do report Progress, and ask leave to sit again."—(*Sir George Campbell.*)

MR. E. STANHOPE hoped the House would not consent to the proposal of the hon. Member (Sir George Campbell). Having one or two words to say in reply to remarks which had been made by hon. Members who had spoken on the Bill now before the House, he would explain, in the first place, that the right hon. Gentleman the Member for the City of London (Mr. Goschen) had, unintentionally, of course, quite misunderstood him with regard to the discussion of the Bill, inasmuch as he had by no means deprecated that, but only discussion of the details of the financial proposals of the Indian Government before he could lay before the House a Statement of those details. It would, in his opinion, be hardly fair to Lord Lytton, if they were to proceed with the discussion of a mere telegraphic summary of those proposals. With regard to the time named for the second reading of the Bill, that had been fixed because there would really be no time for its discussion before Easter; and it was, besides, felt that it ought to be discussed in connection with the whole financial policy of India. The hon. Member for Hackney (Mr. Fawcett) was wrong in supposing that the Government were proposing to raise a loan of £10,000,000. That was by no means the case; and he thought he had very fully explained that they hoped to raise but a very small proportion of that sum. What they really asked for were borrowing powers, in order that they might have some control over the market when they offered their bills for sale. The right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Goschen) had also asked why the Bill was introduced at that moment? To which he replied that it was done for the purpose of settling the market. It was a well-known fact that the market had been utterly disorganized by the absolute necessity which existed for forcing the bills upon it, because they had no power to borrow; and the public knew perfectly well that, sooner or later, they must ask for those powers. The hon. Member for Kirkcaldy (Sir George Campbell) had said that it was much more honest to face the difficulty of the exchanges; and in this he thought he had been somewhat hard upon the Government, for it was no fault of theirs or of this country that they could not always sell their bills. He trusted the House would allow the Bill to be brought in.

Mr. COURTNEY said, they were told that the Resolution was proposed in order to steady the market. And it would, doubtless, have a certain effect in that direction, because it would be known that a Resolution had been submitted to the House of Commons by the Government asking power to raise £10,000,000. Unfortunately, however, a formal assent to the Resolution at that late hour would be held to mean that the House approved of the Resolution, and the step proposed to be taken. Of course, hon. Members knew that was not the case; but it would be so understood. Nothing would be reported in the morning papers except the fact that the Resolution was passed; and that would be telegraphed to every bourse in Europe, and interpreted as if Parliament had agreed to a loan of £10,000,000. And, therefore, in view of the importance of the question, he trusted that the Motion to report Progress would be proceeded with by the hon. Member for Kirkcaldy (Sir George Campbell), because then it would not be supposed that they had agreed to the Loan Resolution, which would, in consequence, be put over to some other day. It was necessary that the financial world should not be misled by supposing that the House had approved of the Government proposals to borrow this enormous sum of money in an extraordinary and un-Parliamentary manner.

Mr. RATHBONE thought it must be evident to the Government that their proposal had taken the House by surprise, and suggested that Progress be reported to-morrow, and the Bill taken after the adjournment of the debate on the Zulu War, at half-past 11 P.M., or thereabouts. The Government proposal was rather a startling one, and he did not see what harm could be done by the delay of 24 hours.

Mr. GOSCHEN said, perhaps the Chancellor of the Exchequer would consider the various proposals made by various hon. Members who had spoken on his (Mr. Goschen's) side of the House. The statement had been made by the Under Secretary of State that the Government's intention in announcing the Bill was for the purpose of giving notice in the silver market, and to those interested in the present question, of the proposed application to Parliament for increased borrowing powers, and that object had therefore been attained. He agreed with the hon. Member for Liskeard (Mr. Courtney) that the discussion should take place upon that very important measure at a time when it could be reported, so that those hon. Members who objected to the manner in which the Bill had been introduced might be accurately reported. He wished it to be distinctly understood that he (Mr. Goschen) gave no opinion on the matter; and that if he had appealed for delay, it was not with the intention of thwarting the intentions of the Government in the slightest degree, but only in order that there might be further opportunity for discussion.

Mr. DILLWYN did not quite agree with the suggestion of the hon. Member for Liverpool (Mr. Rathbone), to take the Bill after the debate on the Zulu Question, for, at half-past 11 or 12 o'clock, they would be again in the same difficulty, and no report would reach the country. The question was one of great importance, and there certainly ought to be a full report, not taken at the time when most of the reporters had left the Gallery. He trusted that the debate might be adjourned until they could have a full discussion and report; and he could see no reason why that should not be done, for the Under Secretary of State had told the House that there was no immediate hurry, and that the second reading was not to be taken for two months.

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER: Although the passing of a Resolution to bring in a Bill would be perfectly understood by Members of this House as not in any degree pledging the House to adopt the proposal, or in any way prejudicing the subject under discussion, yet I do think there is something to be said as to the impression likely to be produced outside this House by such a course. Therefore, I propose that we should agree to report Progress, and put down the Committee for to-morrow.

Question put, and *agreed to.*

Committee report Progress; to sit again *To-morrow.*

BLIND AND DEAF MUTE CHILDREN (EDUCATION) BILL—[BILL 93.]

(*Mr. Wheelhouse, Sir Andrew Lusk, Mr. Scott, Mr. Isaac, Mr. Benjamin Williams.*)

COMMITTEE.

Order for Committee read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair."—(*Mr. Wheelhouse.*)

MR. MONK objected to the Bill going into Committee after half-past 12. It was only read a second time yesterday, and there had been no time to put down any Amendments with regard to it upon the Paper. If the Bill were to be proceeded with, he certainly wished to put down some Amendments, as he thought it was a measure which would involve a material increase of taxation throughout the country. It was also desirable that they should have an expression of opinion from the President of the Local Government Board with regard to it. He thought that the principle of the Bill ought to have been discussed on the second reading; but, owing to its coming on late on Wednesday, there was no opportunity of doing so. As he considered that it was necessary that a discussion should take place on the Order for going into Committee, he begged to move the adjournment of the Debate.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Debate be now adjourned." —(*Mr Monk.*)

MR. SCLATER-BOOTH hoped that his hon. and learned Friend the Member for Leeds (Mr. Wheelhouse) would not press the Bill into Committee at that hour. He did not dispute his hon. and learned Friend's right to take it then; but he should be satisfied with the unexpected progress made on Wednesday. The Government had assented to the second reading of the measure on certain conditions and qualifications; but he desired to have an opportunity of considering whether he should put Amendments upon the Paper.

MR. ANDERSON asked whether the half-past 12 Rule applied to this Bill? It was desirable that the Bill should stand over, as there had been no time for placing upon the Paper any Amendments with respect to it?

MR. SPEAKER said, he would read to the hon. Member the half-past 12 Rule, by which he would see that it did not apply to the present case.

> "That, except for a Money Bill, no Order of the Day or Notice of Motion be taken after half-past Twelve of the clock at night, with respect to which Order or Notice of Motion a Notice of Opposition, or Amendment shall have been printed in the Notice Paper, or if such Notice of Motion shall only have been given the next previous day of sitting, and objection shall be taken when such Notice is called."

MR. WHEELHOUSE said, that for nine years he had been endeavouring to pass this Bill, but without success. For that length of time he had tried most earnestly to pass this measure for the benefit of the two classes of persons who were often not only poor, but might be without friends, and who were unable to speak for, or help themselves. Mainly, no doubt, in consequence of the half-past 12 Rule, and partly in consequence of other matters, the chance of bringing the Bill into Committee, and through Committee, had been lost to him. Now, he was met by the statement that some hon. Members wished to propose an Amendment to the Bill. The Bill was not then as it was when he first introduced it, for it had been practically laid down upon the lines which he received at the instance of the Government themselves. He would much rather have had his own Bill, could he have passed it intact as he first introduced it; but as the Government was not willing to accept the Amendments which had been placed upon it, he was not merely willing, but really glad to accept them, and he thought it hard that he should be prevented, by a proposal to put down more Amendments, from carrying the Bill through a stage when he had the opportunity.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Debate be now adjourned." —(*Mr. Monk.*)

Notice taken, that 40 Members were not present; House counted, and 40 Members not being present,

House adjourned at a quarter
before Two o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Friday, 28*th March*, 1879.

MINUTES.]—Public Bills—*Second Reading*—Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Order Confirmation (Downpatrick) * (21); Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders Confirmation (Cashel, &c.) * (22); Workmen's Compensation (7), *debate adjourned.*

Report—Medical Act, 1858, Amendment (31-37).

Royal Assent—Consolidated Fund (No. 2) [42 *Vict.* c. 7]; District Auditors [42 *Vict.* c. 6].

AFGHANISTAN—NEGOTIATIONS WITH YAKOOB KHAN.—QUESTION.

The Marquess of RIPON: I beg to ask the noble Viscount the Secretary of State for India a Question of which I have given him private Notice—namely, Whether there is any truth in the rumour, which appeared in one of the morning papers, to the effect that negotiations with Yakoob Khan have fallen through, and that Her Majesty's troops have been ordered to advance upon the City of Cabul?

Viscount CRANBROOK: I can only say that I have no intelligence of that description, and have no reason to believe it to be correct. It is not in the least in accordance with the latest information which we have received with respect to these affairs. We have heard nothing to-day at the India Office about it.

Lord STANLEY of ALDERLEY desired to remind the noble Viscount that a few nights ago, when asked a Question in regard to a Proclamation of General Roberts, he answered that there was no information on the subject; but the Proclamation was shortly after laid before the House.

Viscount CRANBROOK: The noble Lord is quite mistaken as to what I said on a former occasion. I said that we had received no official communication on the subject; but General Roberts's Proclamation, when it came home, was at once laid on the Table of the House.

WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION BILL.

(*The Earl De La Warr.*)

(NO. 7.) SECOND READING.

Order of the Day for the Second Reading, read.

Earl DE LA WARR, in moving that the Bill be now read a second time, said, that the measure was one of considerable interest to a large section of Her Majesty's subjects; therefore it would cause no surprise to hear that some 300 Petitions, signed by upwards of 300,000 persons, had already been presented to their Lordships' House in its favour. The main object of the Bill was to make employers liable for injuries to their servants caused through the neglect or want of caution on the part of those who were acting as their agents or were exercising superintendence in any way. The Bill was founded upon the Report of the Committee of the House of Commons which sat two years ago to consider this subject, and upon the recommendations of the Royal Commission on Railway Accidents. As the law stood at present, a master or employer was liable for injuries sustained by his servant when caused by his own personal negligence or want of caution, but not when caused by the negligence or want of caution of his fellow-servants. The 1st clause of the Bill dealt with this point, and rendered the master liable whenever the injury was caused by any person acting by his authority, or exercising superintendence, or by defective machinery or plant or stock of any kind. This legislation was in accordance with the spirit of the law which had always made a master or employer liable for injuries sustained by his servants through his own negligence. It surely followed that if an employer delegated his authority and superintendence to other persons he delegated also his responsibility. By many decisions it had been held that the employer was not liable for an injury to any workman caused by one of his fellow-workmen. These decisions were based upon the doctrine of "common employment." This clause did not touch that doctrine further than this—that it excluded from the class of fellow-servants or fellow-workmen those who were exercising responsible superintendence and acting with the authority of the employer. This was necessary, in consequence of the wide meaning which the English Judges had given to the term common employment. In the case of a mine, for instance, if from the fault of any of the men in charge a miner were killed or injured, the owners were by the present law free from pecuniary responsibility; so that, however culpable their agents might have been, no compensation could be obtained. The present state of the law, which in effect made no one responsible when the master had delegated his authority, was manifestly unjust, and its tendency was a premium to employers to rid themselves of all responsibility by throwing it upon other persons who were not liable to make compensation to their fellows for any injury that might be inflicted by their negligence or misconduct. It had been held by high authority that when a man engaged himself to a certain employment he engaged himself to run all the risks attending upon it. For his part, he (Earl De La Warr) could not concur in that view. Surely an *employé* did not engage himself so far as to run all the risks incident to his employment; to run the risks of accidents that were preventable, and that arose from the carelessness or negligence of those who were exercising authority and superintendence. Thousands of persons met with accidents every year from causes declared to be preventable — they were to be read every day in the newspapers — and it was to protect the workman, as far as possible, from such dangers that his Bill was intended. Indeed, it might be very fairly argued that the Bill would in some degree tend to prevent such accidents, by making the employers liable for injuries occasioned by their own negligence or that of those to whom they delegated authority. He asked their Lordships, as a matter of justice, to give it a second reading, because he considered that the law was operating unjustly, and needed to be amended.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2^{a}."—(*The Earl De La Warr.*)

The LORD CHANCELLOR said, he was glad to acknowledge the very great interest which the noble Earl had taken in this subject, and the humane motives that had actuated him in laying this measure before their Lordships. If the Government had been of opinion that it was possible at the present time adequately or conveniently to discuss the provisions of the Bill, it would have been his duty to follow the noble Earl in his observations on the operation of the existing law. Had it been necessary for him to do so, he believed he could have shown that the Bill before the House, instead of proceeding on the lines recommended by the Select Committee of the House of Commons, was really drawn on very different principles, and on a Report which had been presented to that Committee, but which the Committee refused to adopt. He could also have shown, from the noble Earl's own point of view, that the Bill would probably fail to achieve its object. He was anxious, however, to state the position of the Government. In the House of Commons last year, after the Committee had reported, the Government desired to bring in a Bill to give effect to the recommendations of the Committee; but, owing to the state of Public Business at the time, that could not be done, and the Bill had to be postponed to the present Session. The Government had this Session introduced a Bill on the subject in the other House, and it was their earnest desire to expedite its progress as much as possible; and he believed there was a strong feeling in the other House in favour of settling the question. But the House would see that, as there was already a Government Bill before Parliament on the same subject, it would be hardly convenient to determine, until the two Bills had been laid side by side and compared, in which form legislation should proceed. Possibly, when the Bill came up from the other House, and was compared with that of the noble Earl, it might be found, whichever were adopted, that there were provisions in the other of them which might be advantageously imported. He should, therefore, suggest the postponement of the discussion of this Bill till the House had the Government proposals under its consideration.

Earl DE LA WARR expressed his willingness that both the Bills should proceed *pari passu,* but asked when the Government Bill was likely to come before the House?

The LORD CHANCELLOR said, he was unable to forecast the progress of the Bill through the other House, but thought it would be best to move the adjournment of the debate to that day six weeks.

Motion *agreed to;* the further debate upon the said Motion adjourned to *Friday* the 9*th of May* next.

AGRICULTURE AND TRADE.

QUESTION. OBSERVATIONS.

THE MARQUESS OF HUNTLY rose to call attention to the depressed condition of Agriculture and Trade throughout the country; and to ask Her Majesty's Government, Whether it is intended to institute any inquiry, by a Royal Commission or Committee of the House, into the causes affecting Agriculture and Trade? The noble Marquess said, it was not to be denied that the existing state of things was very serious, and urgently demanded a remedy; but he desired to say, at the outset, that he did not intend to go into the question of Free Trade or Reciprocity. He did not, indeed, believe that any remedy for the present depression in trade and agriculture would be found in any changes in that direction; but he wished simply to put before the House the facts that he had been able to gather. No one denied that depression—very great depression—existed, though various opinions existed as to its extent, which probably varied in different parts of the country; but, taking it at the lowest estimate, he was only too confident that temporary reductions of rent by the landlords would do but little good. Some of their Lordships, as he had read, had returned to their tenants 10 per cent, some as much as 25 per cent, off their rents. But this remission was for one year, and the agricultural depression went far beyond that. No doubt, the bad harvests of recent years had much to do with the depression of agriculture —four bad or defective years in succession were enough to affect the most substantial tenants. There was a very curious fact revealed by the agricultural statistics—namely, that since 1874 there had been a great decrease in the amount of agricultural stock in this country. That was a fact which could hardly, he thought, be fairly attributed to the recurrence of bad seasons. Another thing which affected the agricultural interest was the low freights for corn. He found that corn could be carried 200 miles on the other side Chicago and delivered at Liverpool for less than 12*s*. a-quarter, freight and all charges included. This was less than the farmers in some districts could send their corn to market. So great did he believe the depression in agriculture to be, that he had made inquiries among large agents of land in several parts of the Kingdom; and he held in his hand the last copy of the *Midland Counties Herald*, which was an advertising paper, and which contained 63 advertisements of farms to be let. So great was the depression that, in some districts, it was absolutely impossible to get tenants for the land. Within 10 miles of Warwick there were many thousands of acres to let. For instance, near Stratford-on-Avon, the acreage advertised to let was 8,000. He knew that in Northamptonshire and Huntingdonshire many farms were unlet. This was a very serious matter, when it was considered that one-fourth of the population was engaged in agriculture. He had, he might add, a letter—one of a great number—which he might read if he were not anxious not to trespass unduly on the time of the House, and in that letter the writer stated that great difficulty was experienced in finding tenants for the grass land at his disposal, although there had been a reduction of 23 per cent on the rental. The writer added that he had been manager of the estate with respect to which he wrote for 24 years, and that he had never known farmers to be so short of money as at present. There were, in fact, some parishes in which the farms were wholly untenanted. He might mention the case of a farm belonging to himself, which, 20 years ago, let at 21*s*. an acre. It had been improved in every way, but five years ago the tenant had given it up, and he had let it to a tenant on a seven years' lease at 20*s*. an acre. The tenant, however, at the end of two years got tired of it, and he had let it to another tenant at the same rental, who, however, stipulated that he should erect new buildings and make other improvements. He did so; but this year, after two years' experience, the tenancy had been declined. He (the Marquess of Huntly) was aware that the last Returns showed that the value of the lands rated to the income tax had increased by nearly £2,000,000; but he would remind their Lordships that those Returns were based on Returns made in 1876, before the great depression of which he was speaking had begun; and that they included lands with buildings upon them, and in the neighbourhood of towns, in which case there had been no very considerable depreciation of value. This was what was called "accommodation land"—but this could not properly be included in agricultural land. Then, in addition to the great fall in the price of corn, it must not be forgotten that there had arisen a vast competition in the supply of meat. The importation of cattle from Canada, and of dead meat from the United States, was already immense, and appeared to be capable of unlimited increase. This could not but affect the prosperity of the agricultural classes in another direction. He did not hesitate to say that landlords would have to face these facts, and make a great reduction in their rents. It could not be to the advantage of the country that the land should be allowed to go out of cultivation; but that would be the upshot of it, and it might be that there would have to be an Encumbered Estates Court for England, as there was in Ireland, to relieve the landlords. Among the many modes of relief which had been suggested were that tenants should have some security for unexhausted improvements, and that there should be a remission of those burdens which now pressed upon agricultural property. With these suggestions he fully agreed, for he thought that every inducement ought to be given to persons to invest their capital in land. As long ago as 1846 a Committee of their Lordships' House sat to inquire into the burdens affecting real property. That Committee recommended a remission of taxation. Another Committee also sat, and in its Report said the relief of the poor was a national object towards which every description of property ought to be called on to contribute; and the Act of Elizabeth contemplated such contribution according to the ability of every inhabitant. The land paid most unfairly for the support of the poor, and the recommendation of the two Committees had never been acted upon. The taxes paid by an owner of land amounted to 16½ per cent on his income; the taxes paid by an occupier of land to 12¼ per cent; by an owner of house property to 14½ per cent; by the owner of railway and mineral property to 13½ per cent; by the owner of personal property to 8¾ per cent. These figures had been criticized, but not refuted. As to the justice or injustice of placing the public taxation upon this especial species of property, he desired to quote the opinion of the noble Earl the Prime Minister, who, in 1874, said—

> "The system of raising taxation for general purposes from one particular kind of property involves as great a violation of justice as can well be conceived."

It was not, however, to these points that he desired so especially to direct their Lordships' attention, as to the third question—the subject of local taxation. In 1871, the noble Earl the present Prime Minister, then leading the Opposition in the House of Commons, moved for a Committee of Inquiry on the incidence of Taxation. The noble Earl then said—

> "That the income of the country being £249,000,000 sterling, an assessment of one-fourth of that amount was defrayed by local taxation—which, in other words, meant the maintenance of the poor, the keeping up of the roads, and all the costs of internal administration, and asked on what principles of justice this great charge was put upon one section of the taxpayers alone."

Again, in 1850, when he was supported by Mr. Gladstone, the noble Earl said—

> "It was impossible to look at the poor rate without being struck with its inequality of incidence. It was said that it was a tax inherited with the land, and that was true; but it was inherited together with a protective system, which was not more contrary to abstract justice than was the inequality of the poor rate."

If that was the state of things then, what must it be now? To give one illustration. In a parish of 2,000 acres, in 1853, the rates amounted to £100; in 1868 they amounted to £315, and in 1878 they reached £416. In most rural parishes the rates had risen so steadily that during the past 20 years they had quadrupled. He did not ask for any special concession to agriculture; he only asked that it might be treated with equal fairness with other trades, and not oppressed by uneven taxation. There had been an extraordinary increase in the imports of food into this country—a fact which could not be overlooked. In 1858 the imports amounted to £25,000,000; in 1868 they had reached £55,000,000; and in 1878, £99,000,000; the ratio for the population per head in 1858 being 18*s.* 3*d.*; in 1868, £1 16*s.* 2*d.*; and in 1878, £2 19*s.* 7*d.* He had repeatedly heard it said that when trade got better agriculture would improve. He denied the proposition to be correctly stated—he believed it would be more accurate to say that when agriculture became prosperous trade would recover. There could be no doubt that trade throughout the country was bad—the question was how to improve it. In *The Times* that day the reports from Birmingham and Darlington showed there was increased depression in the iron trade—so that every day things were getting worse. There seemed to be a general consensus of opinion that the operatives were not assisting sufficiently the owners in this period of depression. From persons engaged in various trades he learnt that, although the depression was due to a great extent to over-production, still the limitation of the hours of labour and the operation of the trades unions had largely tended to prevent a revival of prosperity. The serious difficulty of getting men to work at the times and hours when it was really necessary was experienced in regard both to agricultural and to manufacturing employments. If left to themselves, the men would often be willing to work longer; but the trades unions were at the bottom of the short-hour system, by which it was sought to restrict the output. The strange idea seemed to have got possession of the workmen that lessened production meant increase of wages. The same baneful ideas were spread into the rural districts, and it was suggested to the labouring classes that the best way of keeping up wages was to reduce the products. Any notion more unreasonable than that could hardly be conceived. He did not know that legislation could touch that question. He only alluded to it for the sake of ventilating the subject. He believed that an inquiry into those matters might do much good, and might eventually lead to the diffusion of sounder views among the people. He did not venture to suggest to the Government where he remedy lay; but he thought the time had come when there should be some inquiry into the causes of the depression both of agriculture and of trade. Representing, as their Lordships did, the great landed interest, they had a right to ask the Government to do something towards relieving the land from the unequal burdens of taxation which it bore.

The Marquess of Huntly

Lord NORTON said, that the fact of the depression to which the noble Marquess had drawn attention was one which no one could deny; but whether the noble Marquess had suggested any remedy, or made out any case for inquiry, was another matter. For himself, he could testify from his own knowledge that in the Midland Counties the depression was most severe. He himself knew of large and well-managed properties on which many of the tenants had thrown up their farms. He knew of one case in particular, in which a considerable landowner in Warwickshire had all his farms thrown up, and the whole of his property was at this moment in his own hands. That indicated a serious state of things; and he was sure their Lordships felt the greatest sympathy with those—both farmers and owners of land—who were now suffering from the depression of agriculture, and with those who were equally suffering from depression of trade, in this country. But he thought the noble Marquess (the Marquess of Huntly) had hardly got in his mind all the *data* which must be considered together, in order to arrive at a correct judgment as to the causes of the present depression, or as to what might lead to an available remedy. In the first place, the noble Marquess had confined his statement entirely to the depression in this country, without alluding to the very material fact which ought to be taken in conjunction with it—that there was a contemporaneous depression in every country of the world. At present there was not a glimmer of light thrown across the universal darkness—except, perhaps, from the United States. It might be difficult to account for so general a depression of trade, although, perhaps, not so difficult to account for its particular existence in our own, or in certain other countries; but, at least, the universality of that depression taught them this moral—that the interests of trade and commerce, in our times, were so cosmopolitan, that one nation could not suffer without more or less seriously affecting other nations. Nor could any nation suffer natural or make artificial obstacles to its trade without injury to others as well as itself. The noble Marquess had, however, not only confined his attention to the depression of agriculture in this country, but he had not adequately taken into consideration the depression of trade in this country, which was intimately connected with it. He had, in consequence, directed his mind for a remedy mainly to the relief of agriculture from special burdens. In considering the present emergency, they ought not to turn aside their attention to that large and vexed question. It was not for their Lordships to consider in this special discussion the general principles of taxation, or whether any particular article was unduly taxed. They all knew that land was very heavily and specially taxed. Parliament was very properly developing in every way the local administration of the country; and whatever Acts of that nature were passed, whether for sanitary, educational, or other purposes, increased the burden of rates which fell on real property. Men who were not remarkably liberal of their own money for purposes of that sort, when they came as local authorities to deal with rates and public money, were often most lavish. Some school boards, in agricultural districts, had already managed to raise the local rates by 2*s.* in the pound, in addition to voluntary contributions, and to the Imperial taxation which was levied for the same purpose. There was also a lavish county expenditure; and the aggregate debt of our large towns made a very respectable figure by the side of that of the nation. During the last 10 years, while the rateable value of real property had increased 30 per cent, local burdens, resting exclusively on real property, had increased 120 per cent.

THE MARQUESS OF HUNTLY: 150 per cent.

LORD NORTON: But this was not the moment to deal with the large question of the re-adjustment of taxation between real and personal property, and to attempt to apportion it more fairly between local and national resources. The present Government had already dealt largely with that question, and had transferred the burden of some £2,000,000 sterling from local to Imperial taxation. Although it might seem that by this means considerable relief had been given to the land, he was not sure that the farmers found that they had much less to pay than they had before. He trusted that the depression of agriculture and trade under which they were now suffering was only temporary, and that they would not have to wait for the settlement of questions before seeing it pass away without the interference of Parliament. No doubt, agricultural depression had been produced primarily by a succession of three or four bad harvests, which had occasioned a loss to the country estimated by Mr. Caird at £87,000,000. There was also to be taken into account the disturbance of trade occasioned by the state of things abroad, by famines in two of our largest markets, and by the wages and labour difficulties with which they had had to contend. Other causes of depression, both in trade and in agriculture, were the enormous increase in foreign competition and the closing of foreign markets against us. Consider the immense importation of foreign corn and meat. The increase in the importation of American meat during the last 10 years was 500 per cent in quantity and 300 per cent in value, while the increase in the importation of American corn had largely exceeded in proportion the increase in our population. An unusual surplus of corn had come lately into this country from the abundant harvests they had enjoyed in America, and it undersold our home production from the lowness of the freight from that country owing to the depression in the carrying trade. Another cause of the depression of trade was the hostile tariffs which had been set up against us. There had also been over speculation in foreign investments and joint-stock undertakings, and times of depression of trade in this country, from like causes, had recurred in almost regularly decennial periods since the beginning of the present century. He was glad to see that the noble Marquess did not advocate a return to the old protective system, even as a temporary expedient, to force other countries to open their ports to our manufactures. Were we to adopt that course, instead of forcing Free Trade upon our neighbours, we should merely be stereotyping, by apparent acquiescence, the evils of Protection. It would be a suicidal policy on both sides, but especially for England. Foreign competition could not be got rid of by legislation; we must trust to scientific and economic improvements to enable us to hold our own position in commerce. It must not be supposed that America would always be able to compete with us as she was doing now in our home supply. Her own home consumption would greatly and rapidly increase, and she would not be able to send us food at so cheap a rate as she did now; for the cost of freight would increase as commercial depression passed away, and must in time balance the cost of home productions. The thing must right itself, and this crisis would pass as other crises in the present century had passed away. The agriculture of England must be progressive and prosperous in the long run, owing to the energy of the people and the increasing capital and population. The only exchangeable article in Great Britain which was incapable of increasing was the land, and it must continue to rise in value as it had done hitherto. Foreigners were, no doubt, learning to make a great many things for themselves which we had hitherto supplied to them. This must from time to time cause losses; but when any particular investment had been superseded, English energy would find out others to take its place. There was not a corner of the globe where Englishmen had not a hand in every enterprize. The question for them to consider was this—whether any good would be derived from inquiry? He did not know what was the opinion of the Government; but it seemed to him that there were serious objections to the course proposed by the noble Marquess. In the first place, the inquiry would necessarily be a very wide one—indeed, he did not see what the limit of reference would be. Then, again, it would give scope to theories of the wildest sort which had already been propounded in various quarters among the people. It would also raise large expectations which there was no probability of fulfilling. The people should be looking to their own exertions, and not to Parliament for a remedy. Nevertheless, the deepest sympathy was due to those who were suffering at the present moment, and if there was any prospect that inquiry would suggest or discover anything to alleviate the pressure of the present distress, he was sure their Lordships would be willing to agree to it. But he deprecated a Parliamentary inquiry, which might make a panic when none ought to exist.

Lord FORBES said, he should be very sorry it should go forth that the farmers were the only people who suffered. He was sorry that the debate had taken the course it had, for the burden of the discourse of the noble Marquess had been directed, not so much to the depression of trade, which was the real cause of the present distress, as to the depression of agriculture which resulted from the depression of trade. If the latter righted itself, the former would come round without legislative interference. The noble Marquess had put himself in two different attitudes. In Aberdeenshire, where he (Lord Forbes) also came from, the noble Marquess was generally considered the farmers' friend; but that night he had put himself on his property in England, and appeared as the friend of the landlords. He could not see what good result could be produced by inquiry, whether by Committee or Commission. All that was wanted was patience, and he believed that patience would be the easiest and best thing to adopt.

The Earl of BEACONSFIELD: My Lords, although the appearance of this House to-night is not one which shows that interest in the subject which the noble Marquess probably anticipated, that is not, I am sure, occasioned by any want of sympathy with the suffering classes of this country. Myself, I should have been quite prepared to leave the matter in the hands of those noble Lords who have dealt with it, had not a direct appeal been made to the Government by the noble Marquess; but I feel I should be wanting, not only in my duty, but in courtesy to the noble Marquess, if I allowed that appeal to pass unnoticed. The noble Marquess has called our attention to the depressed state of agriculture and of commerce and trade in this country; but he has not offered us any information in detail upon any head of his Motion—or rather of his inquiry—except with regard to agriculture. I am sure the noble Marquess will pardon me, if I venture to observe that I think his treatment of that subject was not characterized by novelty or by that adequate acquaintance with the proceedings which have occurred in both Houses of Parliament upon the subject upon which he chiefly dilated—namely, the peculiar burdens upon real property — which might have been expected. The noble Marquess seems to have founded his inquiry to-night in a great degree upon some speeches which I myself made—made in "another place" and in another generation. Then I thought it my duty to open a subject which had been very seldom entered into; and at a time when the agricultural interest of this country was deeply suffering, and was by no means hopeful as to the future, I endeavoured to show that some relief might be obtained by a more equitable adjustment of the public burdens. It was impossible to deny the justice of the principle upon which those Motions were made. Indeed, although I was then, as the noble Marquess has reminded us to-night, the Leader of the Opposition in another House of Parliament, on every occasion on which I brought that subject before the consideration of the House of Commons my Motions were supported by numbers which almost equalled the majorities which, for the moment, defeated them. Many of your Lordships will remember that, though the justice of the plea was undeniable, still at no time was the relief contemplated of a character or amount adequate to meet a state of affairs like the present, and to be a competent remedy for the evils to which the noble Marquess has called attention to-night. The noble Marquess should remember that the answer to my appeal to Parliament at that time made by those who resisted, not the justice, but the adequacy, of the remedy I proposed was that if a re-adjustment of local burdens did take place, the relief of the land, which then only was suffering, could not be measured by the amount of local taxation. It was shown at the time by the Chancellor of the Exchequer that, taking the sum of £85,000,000 a-year as the amount of rental upon which rates were charged 30 years ago, the amount on which the landed interest was assessed was only £40,000,000. But the noble Marquess should be, and no doubt is, aware that during those 30 years two things have happened. In the first place, there has been considerable relief afforded to the real property of the country, of which land forms a large portion; and, secondly, that the proportion in which rates, in so far as they fall upon land, is much reduced, so as to be levied now on no more than one-third of the real property of the country. If these are facts—and they are founded on official Returns—I cannot for a moment bring myself to believe that some small re-adjustment of our local taxation can bring such relief to the land as will re-animate it under the unexampled depression it now endures. Then the noble Marquess omitted to remember that there has been, in fact, a considerable amount of local taxation removed from real property during the period from which he originated his speech; and he also should have recollected the circumstances in which that reduction was made. The adjustment of our local taxation ceased to be a Party question in the House of Commons. The Gentleman who of late brought it forward was a county Member (Sir Massey Lopes), and his political connection was with the Party that was then in Opposition, and of which I was the Representative and the Leader. But it was not a Party Motion, and he carried it by a majority of 100, because it was acknowledged, on both sides of the House, not to be a Party Motion, and because those who peculiarly represented the house population of the towns perceived that they would themselves have the lion's share and principal benefit of any considerable remission of local taxation. All this must be known to the noble Marquess, and I am surprised that he did not hesitate before he recommended a remedy for agricultural distress which, on reflection, he must perceive to be utterly inadequate to give the relief which is required. No one, I think, can deny that the depression of the agricultural interest is excessive. Though I can recall several periods of suffering, none of them have ever equalled the present in its intenseness. Let us consider what may be the principal causes of this distress. My noble Friend who has addressed you (Lord Norton) has very properly touched upon the effect of the continuous bad harvests in this country. If we are to accept the figures of the highest authority upon agricultural subjects and statistics, the loss on a bad harvest such as we had in the year 1875 was no less than £26,000,000 sterling. It is, however, true that at that time the loss and suffering were not experienced or recognized as they were in the old days when the system of protection existed, because the price of the food of the people was not immediately affected by a bad harvest; and it was not till the repetition of the misfortune by two bad harvests in further succession that the diminution of the wealth of the country began to be severely felt by the people generally—not by the agriculturalists only, but by those who were interested in trade and commerce generally. The remarkable feature of the present agricultural depression is this—that the agricultural interest is suffering from a succession of bad harvests, and that these bad harvests are accompanied, for the first time, by extremely low prices. That is a remarkable circumstance that has never before occurred—a combination that has never before been encountered. In old days, when we had a bad harvest we had also the somewhat dismal compensation of higher prices. That is not the condition at present; on the contrary, the harvests are bad, and the prices are lower. That is a new feature that requires consideration. There can be no doubt that the diminution of the public wealth by the amount of £80,000,000, suffered by one class, begins to affect the general wealth of the country, and is one of the sources of the depression, not only of agriculture, but also of commerce and of trade. No candid mind could deny that this is one of the reasons for that depression. Nor is it open to doubt that foreign competition has exercised a most injurious influence on the agricultural interests of the country. The country, however, was perfectly warned that if we made a great revolution in our industrial system, and put an end to the policy of Protection, such would be one of the consequences that would accrue. I may mention that the great result of the Returns we possess is this—that the immense importations of foreign agricultural produce have been vastly in excess of what the increased demands of our population actually require; and that is why such low prices are maintained. I have here the average import of wheat in the years 1867 and 1868, and in the years 1877 and 1878. Stated in quarters, the quantity was 8,000,000 quarters in 1867 and 1868, and 13,848,000 quarters in 1877 and 1878. Now, 3,000,000 quarters would have been quite sufficient to meet the wants of our increased population; but the actual increase of 5,000,000 quarters is equal to the supply of more than one-sixth of our whole population, or nearly twice what was required by its actual increase. That is to a great degree a cause of this depression. You have, then, in the first place, continuous bad harvests, which would in any case bring depression not on the agricultural interest only, but, by the diminution of the public wealth, on trade and commerce generally; and, secondly, you have, as far as the agricultural interest is concerned, this greatly increased competition from abroad. I think there is another cause; but, as it is not peculiar to agriculture, I will leave it while I make one or two observations on a subject very slightly treated by the noble Marquess, and not so fully as I could have desired by my noble Friend who has addressed us. It has been assumed throughout this debate that there has been on the part of the trade and commerce of the country a depression not only equal to that which the agricultural interest is labouring under, but that that depression was identical and similar in its effects and causes to those by which agricultural distress has been produced. Now, so far as I can form an opinion from the documents I have seen, the case is the reverse. That there is immense depression in trade and commerce no one can deny; but instead of the depression of trade and commerce resembling at this moment that of agriculture, it is quite the contrary. Agriculture just now is producing much less than it did before—nearly 1,000,000 acres have gone out of cereal cultivation —and it is suffering from foreign competition, which even in its own home market it has unsuccessfully to encounter. That, however, is not the condition of our foreign trade. The volume of our foreign trade is not at all diminished. It is perfectly untrue, so far as I can form an opinion on the subject, that we have lost the markets of the world, or that any branch of foreign industry—generally speaking of course—is successfully competing with the English. That there may be occasionally, in the multifarious transactions of English commerce, some particular article that may find itself for a moment shut out from the markets, or that, owing to a combination of circumstances, it might meet with a successful and unexpected competitor, is one of the necessary consequences of that multifariousness. The great fact, nevertheless, remains that after a period of continued depression, the volume of production has been exactly the same. There has been, of course, less profit; but the volume of industry has been the same; the same quantity of goods has been manufactured; there are no markets from which we have been successfully shut out, and no competitors with whom we cannot satisfactorily enter into rivalry. Here is a Return which I think proves the case—it is a Return of British and Irish exports. I find that the exports in 1873 were, in round numbers, £255,000,000; while, in 1877, they were only £198,000,000—showing an apparent falling-off of £57,000,000. But if you value the products of 1877, which only produced £198,000,000, at the same rate as the products of 1873, which were valued at £255,000,000, you will find that the difference between them is less than £1,000,000. It is, therefore, clear that although the depression of trade and commerce is undeniable, that depression does not arise, as in the case of agricultural distress, from the loss of the power of production, or from severe and successful competition with foreign industry. On the contrary, during all these years of depression we have been producing an equal quantity of goods—the same volume of English manufacture has been sent into the world—only we have been obtaining for them lower and still lower prices. That, it appears to me, is an important circumstance, and one which demands our deep consideration. I doubt not the depression in our home trade is affected very much—as I freely admitted at the first—by bad harvests, totally irrespective of the principle on which our industrial system may be established, whether it be a protective one or one of free imports. It is clear that a series of bad harvests greatly diminishes the sum of national wealth, and must materially, in any circumstances, interfere with the trade of the country. It is quite possible, as we have known from our own experience, that one bad harvest, which years ago would have created discontent and great suffering recognized by every class, might be passed over in the circumstances in which we now find ourselves. But if you cannot pass over two, you certainly cannot pass over three or four; for, although the last harvest was not bad, it was garnered under such circumstances that, so far as the farmer was concerned, it was a bad harvest. I have said I admitted that the causes of agricultural depression were principally these—in the first place, the bad harvests; in the second place, foreign competition, which the country adopted, not with haste or in rashness, which it had an opportunity of rejecting, because a considerable Party in Parliament gave it that opportunity, and on the merits of which, after it was established, the country was appealed to and a Parliament elected on the issue placed before it, and yet which it did not choose to change. The second cause, I say, is to be found in this competition which you have, not precipitately, but determinedly, adopted; and there is besides another cause, which is, in my mind, not peculiar to agricultural distress, but which is equally applicable to commercial distress, and that is the effect which the production of gold has exercised, and is at this moment particularly exercising, not only on commercial transactions, but on the value of the other precious metals. I do not know that I can put the matter more clearly before your Lordships than in this way. After the repeal of the Corn Laws there was considerable suffering among all classes. Not merely in the agricultural classes, but in trade generally, there was great discontent and dissatisfaction. I do not myself believe that it was the immediate effect of the repeal of the Corn Laws; it was probably a re-action after the great stimulus, no doubt, which had been created in consequence of the extraordinary expenditure on the railway system in England. Be that as it may, very great discontent existed. Suddenly, after three or four years, there was an extraordinary revival in trade and a great elevation in prices. How did that occur? One of the most wonderful events in the history of the world happened, and that was the discovery of gold in California. In 1852, £36,000,000 of gold were poured into Europe; and when your Lordships recollect that the business of the world until that time had been carried on by an amount of gold which, I believe, never reached £6,000,000 a-year, you can at once apprehend the effect of this discovery. In one year there came £36,000,000 of gold, and in five years £150,000,000 were poured into Europe. The effect of this was that prices were raised immensely. But a marvellous thing occurred also shortly after. There was a Commission of all the great States of Europe, who took advantage of the holding of the Exhibition at Paris to meet there, with the consent of their Governments, to consider whether a uniform system of coinage could not be established in the world; and they came to a resolution that a uniform system could be established, and that advantage ought to be taken of the gold discoveries to bring about this result. Whatever may have been the exact circumstances of the case which was in the result such as I have indicated, the Government of Germany, which had £80,000,000 of silver, availed themselves of the great change of which I am speaking to substitute gold for their £80,000,000 of silver; France resolved that her bimetallic currency should, if possible, be replaced by entirely a gold currency; and the example of those two countries was followed by Holland and the smaller States of Europe; and the great process of converting silver into gold currency continued. These vast changes have been going on for 10 years; and we cannot, therefore, be surprised at the revolution which has occurred in the price of silver, when both France and Germany, the one with £60,000,000 and the other with £80,000,000 of silver, were anxious to avail themselves of the change which has occurred, and to substitute a gold currency. All this time the produce of the gold mines in Australia and California has been regularly diminishing; and the consequence is that while these large alterations of currency in favour of a gold currency have been taking place in the leading countries of Europe—notwithstanding an increase of population, which alone requires always a considerable increase of gold currency to carry on its transactions—the amount every year has diminished and is diminishing, until a state of affairs has been brought about by the gold discoveries exactly the reverse of that which they produced at first. Gold is every day appreciating in value, and as it appreciates in value the lower become prices. This, then, I think, is the third cause—not dogmatically stated, but only with that diffidence which becomes one who has to speak on an abstruse and complicated subject—which, I think, earnestly requires the consideration of your Lordships, and which may lead to consequences which may be of a very serious character. Now, my Lords, I do not wish to speak at too much length on this subject. I have noticed, on the part of the Government, a series of causes which, I think, have led to the present most unsatisfactory state of the public fortunes. The greatest sufferers at this moment, undoubtedly, are the cultivators of the soil and the farming class. They are a class who, if you look to the amount of labour they employ, if you look to their general character, their connection with local interests, and a variety of other considerations, must ever be deeply valued by those who value the order of society and, I will say, even the freedom of this country. There is no other country in which we find an identical class such as the British farmer; and, whatever may be the consequence of our legislation that is past, if it should be the disappearance or a great diminution of the influence and numbers of that class, it would be a political injury which never could be compensated for by any fiscal or financial results. I am sure your Lordships sympathize with that class. You are deeply connected with the land. You know well all shades of rural life—you have lived among those men; and I feel confident that the sympathy you express is as cordial and as profound as can animate the breast of man. But, my Lords, do not let us be afraid of telling them at this moment that, while we deeply sympathize with them, that while we will lose no opportunity that we can use of legitimately assisting them in the hard trials which they have to encounter—there is nothing, in my mind, which would be a more bitter mockery than to pretend by some small adjustment of local taxation that we can offer them a remedy for the distress which is produced by such vast, such numerous, and such complicated causes. If there is anything in the state of our system of taxation which acts unfairly to the British farmer, I cannot doubt that Parliament—that both Parties in the State—will be prepared and even eager to remedy it. We have shown that before by the series of relief that we have given him. When an hon. Gentleman in the other House, a county Member (Sir Massey Lopes), carried a Resolution that it became the duty of the Government to revise the local taxation of the country, and relieve real property—including land, of course, as one of the most important portions of real property—from unjust burdens, he was asked to define what were the burdens which he thought were so peculiar and so unjust; and it was then that he said the rates on Government property ought to be assessed as on all other property; that the care of pauper lunatics should fall on the State; that the registration of births, deaths, &c., should no longer be supplied by local taxation; that the Metropolitan Police should be supported out of the Consolidated Fund; that the police of the counties and boroughs of Great Britain—omitting Ireland, because that was already supplied—should be borne upon the Consolidated Fund; that local prisons should be equally sustained by the general Revenue of the country; and so on. That was a definition of the practical claims which were then preferred, and which were sanctioned by a majority of 100 in the House. My Lords, from every one of those items during the last five years real property has been relieved, and every one of those burdens have been assisted from the Consolidated Fund. Of these things the noble Marquess has omitted to tell us.

THE MARQUESS OF HUNTLY: I said, thanks to the Government, real property had been relieved by £2,000,000, but that other charges had been put on it.

THE EARL OF BEACONSFIELD: As to the Poor Law charges, after discussions of great length, all Parties and all Governments have come to the conclusion that to make the relief of the poor an affair of State, and to fasten it on the general income of the country, would be one of the most disastrous and pernicious measures that could be conceived. Now, my Lords, I have endeavoured to place before you some of those considerations which at this moment I think should not be absent from your minds. That the country is in a state of industrial depression seldom equalled is what Her Majesty's Government do not deny. Upon the question whether the great subjects which I have intimated may require a more public and formal examination, I am not at this moment desirous of speaking in a spirit of dogmatism. It is not impossible that, as affairs develop, the country may require that some formal investigation should be made of the causes which are affecting the price of the precious metals, and the effect which the change in the value of the precious metals has upon the industry of the country, and upon the continual fall of prices. I do not think such an inquiry need grow out of the discussion this evening. The noble Marquess has not laid any ground for it. The noble Marquess has brought forward, but only imperfectly, a case that has been submitted to Parliament before, that has been submitted to Committees, and to Commissions. The opinion of Parliament upon all these questions, and the conduct of Parliament are, I think, an answer to the inquiry of the noble Marquess. What he wants done has, in fact, been done; and what he indicates as yet possible to do would be additional injuries to those very classes whose interests he wishes to serve.

MEDICAL ACT, 1858, AMENDMENT BILL—(No. 31.)

(*The Lord President.*)

REPORT OF AMENDMENTS.

Amendments *reported* (according to Order).

Further Amendments made on the the Motion of the LORD PRESIDENT.

Clause 3 (Necessity of obtaining qualifying certificate from Medical Board, and obligatory establishment of Board), in line 3, after ("licentiate") the words ("in medicine, surgery, and midwifery") inserted.

Clause 15 (Examination rules for securing uniformity of examinations for qualification), in sub-section 3, after ("examinations") the words ("including the production of evidence of good character") inserted.

Clause 16 (Scheme for establishing Joint Medical Board for conducting medical examinations), after line 25 insert as a separate paragraph—

("Every scheme made in pursuance of this Act shall be laid before both Houses of Parliament as soon as may be after it is confirmed if Parliament be then sitting, and if not, as soon as may be after the commencement of the then next session of Parliament").

Clause 19 (General provisions as to scheme for Medical Board), line 14, after ("board ") words ("which fees shall be of the same amount in every part of the United Kingdom"), inserted.

Clause 21 (Power of medical authorities to constitute medical diplomacy), at end of clause insert—

("But if any such new medical diploma is constituted by a medical authority for the said purpose, that diploma shall be the only diploma granted by such authority for the purpose of attaching to such authority with a view to registration persons who have obtained qualifying certificates under this Act").

After Clause 31, insert the following clause:—

(Saving for right of Archbishop of Canterbury.)

"Nothing in this Act shall interfere with any right of the Archbishop of Canterbury to grant, as heretofore, the degree of doctor in medicine as an honorary distinction, so, however, that such degree be granted only to a person who is registered in the medical register, or who, having been so registered, continues to be entitled to be registered in the medical register."

Verbal and consequential Amendments made.

Bill to be read 3ª on *Monday* next; and to be *printed*, as amended. (No. 37.)

House adjourned at a quarter past Eight o'clock, to Monday next, Eleven o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Friday, 28*th March*, 1879.

MINUTES.]—New Writ Issued—*For* Longford County, *v.* Myles William O'Reilly, esquire, Assistant Commissioner of Intermediate Education in Ireland.

Select Committee—Lighting by Electricity, *appointed.*

Public Bills—*Ordered*—Convention (Ireland) Act Repeal (No. 2) *.

First Reading—Bankruptcy Law Amendment * [114]; Debtors Act, 1869, Amendment * [115].

QUESTIONS.

CHRIST'S HOSPITAL AND SCHOOL.

QUESTION.

Sir CHARLES W. DILKE asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, What steps are being taken by the Governors of Christ's Hospital to give effect to the recommendations of the Royal Commission of 1877; and whether any scheme for the management of the hospital has been prepared by the Charity Commissioners and submitted to the Governors; and, if so, whether the removal of the hospital out of London has been one of its recommendations?

Mr. ASSHETON CROSS: Sir, I am informed by the hospital authorities that great alterations have been made in the powers of the Head Master, and also as to the junior Grecians, and other matters of discipline in the school; but I am informed that no draft scheme for the management of the hospital has as yet been submitted by the Charity Commissioners to the Governors, nor are the Governors able to state whether any such scheme has been prepared by the Commissioners.

SCIENCE AND ART DEPARTMENT—AGRICULTURAL SCIENCE.

QUESTION.

Mr. PHIPPS asked the Vice President of the Council, Whether, in consideration of the difficulty of obtaining a sufficient number of properly qualified teachers to give the necessary instruction to the sons of farmers, to enable them to avail themselves of the advantages of the education in agricultural science offered by the Science and Art Department, he proposes to take any steps to make known the intention of the Department to offer to teachers a special course of instruction in agricultural science at South Kensington this summer, provided a sufficient number of candidates apply?

Lord GEORGE HAMILTON: Sir, we propose to send a circular on the subject to all the science schools and classes in the country; and if the hon. Gentleman, as Chairman of the Educational Committee of the Central Chamber of Agriculture, would co-operate with us, I have no doubt the proposed instruction and system of aid of the Department will become widely known.

INSPECTORS OF IRISH PRISONS.

QUESTION.

Mr. COGAN asked the Secretary to the Treasury, If he can state on what grounds the salaries of the Inspectors of Irish Prisons have been fixed by the Treasury at £500 per annum, rising in five years to £600, when the salaries of the Inspectors of Prisons in Scotland are £600 per annum, rising in five years to £700, and in England £700 per annum, rising in five years to £800; and, whether the duties to be discharged are the same in each part of the United Kingdom?

SIR HENRY SELWIN-IBBETSON: Sir, in answer to the Question of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Kildare County, I have to say that the Irish Government recommended the Treasury, in February, 1878, that the salaries of these Inspectors should not be less than £400 a-year each. In August of that year, on re-consideration of the question, they recommended the present salaries of £500 a-year, rising to £600; and the Treasury, naturally supposing that the Irish Government had the best opportunity of judging of the work to be done, sanctioned that amount. I would point out to the right hon. Gentleman that, with regard to the duties to be discharged, they are not the same in all parts of the country, and we must consider, not alone the nature but the quantity of the work; and if we are to judge by the number of the prisoners to be inspected, it will be found that the relative number in Ireland is much smaller. In England the average number of prisoners inspected is 2,985; in Scotland, 1,693; while the Irish Inspectors have only 1,347 prisoners to inspect. The Question, however, hardly admits of a formal explanation in reply, and I would suggest to the right hon. Gentleman that the most convenient course to be pursued would be to raise the point on the Estimates on the Irish Prison Board.

CRIMINAL LAW—THE CONVICT THEODORIDI.—QUESTION.

MR. CALLAN asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether any memorial was presented from the convict Theodoridi himself, praying for a commutation of his sentence; and, if so, what were the special grounds stated in it?

MR. ASSHETON CROSS, in reply, said that no memorial from Theodoridi had been presented to him, except through the Turkish Ambassador. One of the principal statements in it had reference to the convict's state of health, and that was untrue.

AFGHANISTAN—THE WAR—RUMOURED ADVANCE ON CABUL.

QUESTION.

MR. W. E. FORSTER: A statement has appeared in one of the public journals, respecting which I should like to put a Question to Her Majesty's Government. The statement comes from Calcutta; and it is said that orders have been issued to our troops to proceed to Cabul, and that negotiations with Yakoob Khan are at an end. I should like to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Whether he has any information on this subject?

MR. E. STANHOPE: Sir, perhaps I may be allowed to answer the Question of the right hon. Gentleman, as I made inquiry just before leaving the India Office. We have received no news whatever from the Viceroy today; and all I can say with regard to the statements in *The Standard* is that they do not at all tally with the information which has recently reached us.

EAST INDIA LOAN BILL.

QUESTION.

MR. FAWCETT, alluding to the proposal which was introduced at a late hour last night for raising a loan of £10,000,000 for India in England, wished to know from Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Whether any arrangement had been made for the resumption of the debate on that subject?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER, in reply, said, if it was thought right and convenient that a discussion on the merits of the proposal should be held at this stage, it would undoubtedly be well that some arrangement should be made for bringing it on. He would in the course of the evening communicate with hon. Gentlemen who took an interest in the question, and see what arrangement could be made.

ORDERS OF THE DAY.

—∞0∞—

SOUTH AFRICA—THE ZULU WAR—SIR BARTLE FRERE.

RESOLUTION. ADJOURNED DEBATE.

[SECOND NIGHT.]

Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Amendment proposed to Question [27th March],

"That this House, while willing to support Her Majesty's Government in all necessary measures for defending the possessions of Her Majesty in South Africa, regrets that the ultimatum which was calculated to produce immediate war should have been presented to the Zulu King without authority from the responsible advisers of the Crown, and that an offensive war should have been commenced without imperative and pressing necessity or adequate preparation; and this House further regrets that after the censure passed upon the High Commissioner by Her Majesty's Government in the Despatch of the 19th day of March 1879, the conduct of affairs in South Africa should be retained in his hands." —(*Sir Charles W. Dilke.*)

And which Amendment was,

At the end of the Question, to add the words "and that a war of invasion was undertaken with insufficient forces, notwithstanding the full information in the possession of Her Majesty's Government of the strength of the Zulu Army, and the warnings which they had received from Sir Bartle Frere and Lord Chelmsford that hostilities were unavoidable."—(*Colonel Mure.*)

Question again proposed, "That those words be there added."

Debate *resumed.*

Mr. HANBURY said, before referring to some remarks made by the right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Knatchbull-Hugessen) who addressed the House immediately before the adjournment, he wished to notice one observation, which had not yet attracted attention, in the speech of the hon. Baronet the Member for Chelsea (Sir Charles W. Dilke). In the middle of his peroration, throwing aside his voluminous notes and giving full vent to what was evidently the ruling thought in his mind, the hon. Baronet said that his Motion had been adopted into the despatch of the Government. The hon. Baronet's Resolution certainly had a somewhat checkered history. It was placed on the Paper some days—almost weeks—before the despatch of Sir Bartle Frere had arrived in this country, on which the censure of the Government was founded. They were, therefore, bound to remember the difference between the two censures. The censure passed by the Government was the calm and impartial decision of a Judge with all the facts before him; the other was like the opinion given before a Judge by the policeman or attorney only anxious for a conviction. Such a Resolution was likely to act most prejudicially on the minds of Colonial Governors, when they saw it was possible that a Motion of this kind could be placed on the Paper, and continued day after day, even before the defence of the accused could reach this country. It was all the more remarkable, because it had been taken up by a great Party and supported by the skill and experience of the hon. Baronet. The Motion, as it first stood on the Paper, seemed to him to partake of a Micawberish character—it was waiting for something to turn up. The hon. Baronet was "willing to wound, and yet afraid to strike." Something did turn up; it was the despatch of the Secretary of State. But that, although it conveyed a censure, was a judicial and a discriminating censure, whereas the Motion of the hon. Baronet was that uncompromising condemnation which seemed always ready to fall on the head of anyone who was serving his country abroad and was guided by a Conservative Administration at home. He could not help thinking that the speech of the hon. Baronet was throughout an attempt to magnify and exaggerate the faults of Sir Bartle Frere, and to ignore those remarkable merits which went far to minimize, if not to excuse, his faults. What was the great charge against the present Government? Not that they did not censure Sir Bartle Frere, but that they had not recalled him. Now, this was the very worst moment when any Governor could be recalled from South Africa. It was notoriously very bad policy to change horses at any time; but Sir Bartle Frere was the one man who, in South Africa, had been able to bring about co-operation and self-defence on the part of the White population. This had been shamefully neglected by that Government which withdrew Imperial troops without taking care to effect co-operation on the part of the Whites. The crisis in South Africa had not been occasioned by Sir Bartle Frere; it had been becoming more intense year after year. It was due entirely to the introduction of firearms and the state of the Transvaal Government. These were sufficient to account for the excitement which prevailed over all South Africa. In such a state of things, when they knew not what insurrections might be going on among the Native Tribes, they wanted a High Commissioner who, like Sir Bartle Frere, was not afraid of responsibility, and who was not a mere Under Secretary of State, a mere marionette of his Chiefs, and was at all times very much at the mercy of permanent officials. His very fault was itself a virtue in excess. If Sir Bartle Frere could have been proved to have acted against orders, even his great career and great personal influence in South Africa should not have justified him; but his offence was in no sense acting against orders; it could only be said that he acted without orders. What were the facts? Up to September, Sir Bartle Frere was not in Natal at all. The Government, therefore, naturally paid more attention to Sir Henry Bulwer. It was the Lieutenant Governor who communicated with the Colonial Office; and in the absence of telegraphic communication such a system was most likely to come to cross purposes. In September Sir Bartle Frere returned to Natal, where he found things much worse than he had supposed, and he sent home three alarming despatches at intervals of a week from each other, followed by two pressing and urgent telegrams to the Colonial Secretary. These were distinctly answered by the Home Government. Yesterday there was issued by the War Office a series of despatches which it was rather remarkable were not published before. Until these despatches were issued it was generally supposed that the answer which had been sent to Sir Bartle Frere was the despatch of the 25th of November, which hampered him with necessary conditions, and which would reach him long after the Ultimatum had been sent to Cetewayo; but, to his astonishment, he found in the military despatches a telegram from the War Office of the 25th March, which in all probability reached Sir Bartle Frere before the Ultimatum was sent, and which hampered him with no conditions at all, but which simply gave him *carte blanche* to do what he liked. If that despatch reached him before the Ultimatum was sent the censure of the Government was entirely undeserved. The House was entitled to some explanation from the Government as to whether they had any information of the time at which that despatch reached Sir Bartle Frere. Looking to the fact that he had asked for reinforcements and they had been refused, and seeing that now he had asked for them and they had been sent without hesitation, if the telegram reached him before the 11th of December the Government could not blame him in the least. He felt that it was of much more importance than any Party consideration that justice should be done to the men who were administering the affairs of our Empire. [MR. W. E. FORSTER: Would the hon. Member state where the telegram is?] He could not at the moment; but it was sent on the 25th of November. He wished to have a statement from some Cabinet Minister as to any information they had about the receipt of the telegram by Sir Bartle Frere. If it did not reach him before he sent the Ultimatum it certainly reached him two or three days after, and it was an almost complete justification of what he had done. Undoubtedly, he had gone beyond his orders, but to that the censure of the Government ought to be limited, and technically they were justified in sending it. At that point there came a great divergence of opinion between the two sides of the House. There were those who defended the policy of the Ultimatum, but said it was inopportune; and there were those who said, whether it was opportune or not, its policy was bad. In the course of his speech last night, the hon. Member for Chelsea asserted that Natal had not been invaded for 30 years; while the right hon. Member for Sandwich alleged that Cetewayo had had an Army for 20 years, but had never threatened Natal.

MR. KNATCHBULL-HUGESSEN: What I stated was that at any time during the last 10 years there had been equally as much occasion for war as now.

MR. HANBURY said, that, from the speech of the hon. Baronet the Member for Chelsea, no one would have supposed that we had annexed the Transvaal, for the only danger he anticipated was an invasion of Natal. But it was important to recollect that we had annexed the Transvaal when an invasion of it by Cetewayo was imminent; he replied to Sir Theophilus Shepstone that he was glad to hear of the annexation, because the Dutch had tried him, and he intended to fight them and drive them out. If we were called upon to defend Natal, much more, if possible, were we called to defend the Transvaal, having annexed it because it was unable to defend itself against Cetewayo. It did not appear from the Papers that the Zulu King thoroughly realized the change involved in the annexation, because he spoke only of his strong desire to continue on friendly relations with the Government of Natal, which he regarded as the English Government in contradistinction to that of the Transvaal. In two letters from the Bishop of Natal's son, it was stated that the Zulus were hostile to the Boers in the Transvaal, and would fight them but for the fear of being involved in a quarrel with the English, and that Cetewayo himself, who was wise and peaceful, had no desire to fight the English in Natal. Since our occupation of the Transvaal a part of it on the boundary of the Swazi territory had been invaded by the Zulus. Although the arbitration gave certain lands to Cetewayo, it did not give all he claimed; and from the first his people declared that they would not surrender anything without fighting. The complaint that more time was not allowed to Cetewayo was answered by a statement which entirely discredited all his peaceful professions. There was a remarkable passage attributing to him the statement that if the English did not intrench his people would offer them no opposition. He was afraid we had been misled by statements of that kind, and we now knew to our bitter cost how unwise it was to place any reliance on them. Whether Cetewayo was or was not loyal to Natal, he was not loyal to the Transvaal. He believed that personally Cetewayo had no wish to enter into war with the English race; on the contrary, he was most anxious to avoid it; but this admission was by no means a yielding of the whole case, for, as Mr. Witt told us, Cetewayo, by disregarding our wishes, had alienated the great mass of his people, who were naturally opposed to his cruel and bloodthirsty practices. There were two classes who wished for war—the young men, who wanted to wash their spears, not caring very much in whose blood; and a stronger and more important party, the Indunas, who wanted to embroil Cetewayo in war with the English, in order that they might get rid of his bloodthirsty rule. The Indunas felt that the only means of producing a revolution in the country and getting rid of Cetewayo was to embroil him with the English, and Cetewayo, knowing their object, was no doubt profuse in his declarations of loyalty. Up to 1876 he took every possible opportunity of showing his dependence upon the English Government; but when he found the Transvaal power broken down, his tone suddenly changed. He threw to the winds the promises made at his Coronation, and announced that he was the equal of the Governor of Natal, and that he meant to kill as he pleased. This change from a state of dependence to one of equality on the part of the Zulu King was a most formidable fact, and the House might be sure the next step he contemplated was the assertion of his superiority to the White man. Lord Kimberley, who was Colonial Secretary at the time of the Coronation of Cetewayo, declared that Cetewayo's Coronation promises were mere froth, and were never intended to be kept. Considering the circumstances of the case, the statement was hardly a creditable one for an ex-Secretary of State for the Colonies to make. At different periods previous to the death of Panda, Cetewayo expressed his allegiance to the English, styling himself and the Zulu people their children; but in 1870 he asked—Why should the promises of the English only be "smooth words without action?" This was the first trace of his annoyance at the policy of the Government. For a long time he was favourably disposed towards the English; but he finally lost patience with them, and for a good many of the crimes which that man had since committed the Government then in Office might fairly be held to be responsible. In 1873 Panda died, and the Zulu Government, being without a head, sent to Natal for Sir Theophilus Shepstone to crown their new King. Sir Theophilus Shepstone accordingly did go to Zululand in a public, not a private capacity. "I crossed the Tugela," said he, "as the Representative of the Government of Natal. I carried with me the dignity of the Government that sent me." Everything, in fact, went to show that even then the Zulu people regarded themselves as the "children" of the English. An incident which occurred in 1875 bore strong testimony to the same effect. The Governor of Natal wrote that by the last ship from England Her Majesty the Queen had sent for presentation to Cetewayo a handsomely-ornamented copy of the report of his installation, and that it was intended to remind him of the promises he had made to Her Majesty's Government, which promises he was to be told he would be expected to keep. What could be more evident than the dependence established between Cetewayo on the one hand and the Natal Government on the other? And yet Lord Kimberley got up in "another place" to say that Cetewayo's promises were merely idle words. Now, when they were so bound to a people as they were to the Zulus, they were obliged at all cost to take care that such promises were fulfilled. The question involved in all this was whether Sir Bartle Frere's demands upon the Zulu King were of a mere Quixotic character or not. There was no obligation upon any Colonial Governor to carry civilization into savage countries from motives of pure philanthropy; but in view of the peculiar relations existing between the Zulus and the Natal Government, it was impossible for Sir Bartle Frere to maintain a passive attitude. No doubt, there was the question whether his Ultimatum was not premature; but in justice to him it ought to be remembered that he had had some experience of summary Ultimatums. He had been commissioned by the late Government, without regard to Treaties, to present to the Ruler of Zanzibar one of the most monstrous Ultimatums ever sent to an independent Ruler. With a Treaty in one hand and a pistol in the other, he had demanded that the Sultan of Zanzibar should sign the Treaty, with a threat of at once bombarding his town if he refused. Sir Bartle Frere was hampered by his association with the very men who were now the first to condemn him. In considering the Ultimatum sent to Cetewayo, it should be borne in mind that the Zulu-loving Bishop Colenso, the calm and dispassionate Sir Henry Bulwer, Sir Theophilus Shepstone, and every man of authority in South Africa, backed up Sir Bartle Frere in the policy of that Ultimatum, while the gallant defence of Rorke's Drift showed how much it was possible for a mere handful of disciplined troops to effect against the Zulus. If Sir Bartle Frere and Lord Chelmsford had waited two or three months longer, the River Tugela, which was then swollen and could only be crossed at two or three points, would have been dry, and the invasion of Natal would have been rendered more easy. Then he also saw the importance attached to gathering in the harvest. There could be no doubt that it was necessary to defend both Natal and the Transvaal, and to place every obstacle between the Zulu King and Natal. It should be remembered, too, that Sir Bartle Frere had the troops on the spot, and that in an immense emergency he must have felt that if Cetewayo was to be fought at all he must be fought when the troops were at hand. But it had been said that Sir Bartle Frere ought to have borne in mind that another war was going on in Afghanistan. Well, with an extended Empire like ours, we must expect that these wars would occur now and then, as they had occurred under the Government of both Parties. Sir Bartle Frere did not neglect the state of affairs in Afghanistan; for he stated in one of his despatches that, from all the information he had received, he believed the war would be over so soon that the troops might proceed on their way to India. On the other hand, another consideration absolutely bound Sir Bartle Frere down to send the Ultimatum to Cetewayo. What had happened? For 16 years constant disputes had gone on between the Transvaal Government and the Zulus, who believed that Government to be strong. On one pretence or another the award on the arbitration had been kept back, and in 1869 was allowed to drop out of sight in the Colonial Office at home. Cetewayo naturally, therefore, looked upon arbitration with suspicion, and if there ever was a time when it was dangerous to make the award known to the Zulu King, it was the precise moment when Sir Bartle Frere was compelled to communicate it. It made concessions, and concessions were regarded as a sure sign of weakness, and at that time were calculated to intensify the excitement which prevailed among the Zulus. The illusion as to the strength of the Transvaal Government had disappeared, and, more important still, the chief, Secocoeni, who had defeated the Transvaal Government, had succeeded not in defeating, but in repulsing, soldiers of the English Government itself. It was at that critical moment, while the armed Natives despised the White man and were confederating among themselves, that Sir Bartle Frere was bound to present the Ultimatum with a view to balance an award of weakness. From the beginning, Cetewayo and his messengers had stated that, whatever was the result of the arbitration, they were determined to have possession of the disputed territory and much more. Well, was the Ultimatum likely to be accepted by Cetewayo? Bishop Colenso said he thought it would, and it was justified by every man of authority in South Africa as one likely to be accepted by the Zulu people themselves, who wished for the termination of the cruel rule of the King. The young men of the Army, it was true, wanted to wash their spears; but they looked forward to but one engagement, their object being to get rid of the tyrannous ordinance of the King concerning them, which would have enabled them to marry and settle down. But it was quite possible that they might have backed up the English, because the Ultimatum was framed in their interests. From first to last, these men—the most powerful in the country—stated distinctly that they were most anxious to have the promises Cetewayo made at his Coronation carried out, for that the existence of a large Army was a thing to which they thoroughly objected. There was one thing which he thought Sir Bartle Frere ought not to have raised by the Ultimatum, and that was the question as to missionaries. He knew that Cetewayo was more inflexible on that subject than on any other. He had refused to give any promise with respect to them at his Coronation, though he, no doubt, consented to tolerate them in his country. He regarded a Zulu Christianized as a Zulu spoilt. Indeed, it would seem as if he would have been a worthy member of the Birmingham League itself, for he said that, although he had a strong objection to the missionaries teaching Christianity in his country, still, they were men who knew a good deal, and that, for his part, he went in strongly for secular education. He desired to make an allusion before he closed to a very important document—namely, the terms of the appointment of Sir Bartle Frere himself. They were terms for which the present Colonial Secretary was, he believed, in no way responsible, as he was not a Member of the Cabinet at the time his Predecessor in Office drew them up. In the first place, it was said that Sir Bartle Frere was chosen to go to South Africa because of his courage, and then he was charged in these terms—

> "We do hereby require and enjoin you as such our High Commissioner in our name, and on our behalf, to take all such measures and do all such matters and things as can and may lawfully and discreetly be done to prevent any incursion into our possessions of the tribes of neighbouring States, and for maintaining our possessions in peace and safety."

What other Governments, he asked, had ever been placed in the same position? But there was a still more monstrous clause, if he might use that epithet, which ran as follows:—

> "He is to do everything in his power for promoting the good order, civilization, and moral and religious instruction of the tribes aforesaid—namely, the Zulus—with a view to placing them in some more settled form of government."

Looking at the terms of that commission, though Sir Bartle Frere must be censured, and justly censured, for taking so important a step as offensive war without giving information beforehand to the Government, it would surely not be right to say that he was not justified in taking the steps he did in the great emergency in which he found himself. It being a fact that Sir Bartle Frere was not only entitled to proclaim offensive war, but was to engage in a harum-scarum mission throughout the whole of South Africa in order to Christianize tribes that were only very distantly connected with us, any vote of censure that might be passed upon him for interfering with the Zulus must necessarily be to a great extent limited. Strong as the terms were in which the Government expressed their confidence in Sir Bartle Frere, they were, in his (Mr. Hanbury's) opinion, hardly strong enough. He hoped, however, that the Government, looking at the result of the recent Divisions in the other House, and at the strong feeling which existed on the subject in the House of Commons, even amongst some Members opposite, even if Sir Bartle Frere should act as a man of high spirit was not unlikely to act in the circumstances in which he found himself and send in his resignation of the post he held, would do everything in their power to retain in office, for the benefit of this country and of South Africa, a man whose vast experience in India, whose influence with the people of South Africa, and whose high sense of responsibility and willingness to do and dare were indisputable facts. He hoped that Sir Bartle Frere would remain in South Africa, and the Government would do what it was their duty to do if they impressed upon him how important his presence was to the Colony.

MR. LOWE: Sir, until I hear some sort of answer to the admirable speech delivered yesterday by my hon. Friend the Member for Chelsea (Sir Charles W. Dilke), I think I shall do most wisely not to attempt to tread upon ground which has been so fully and so fairly occupied by him. I shall, therefore, in the few observations I propose to address to the House, confine myself to a much humbler task—a task which has been in some degree imposed on me by the speech of the hon. Member who has just sat down—namely, of calling the attention of the House to the exact question placed before it, and to certain circumstances connected with it. The hon. Gentleman appears to me to have warmed rather on the subject since the time when he put down the Previous Question. I cannot think, after the fervid eloquence with which he concluded his speech, if he had been impressed at the time when he put down that Question as he is now, that he could possibly have cooled himself down to be content with so tame a means of meeting the question. The hon. Gentleman, in the course of his speech, has said that Sir Bartle Frere is not only not worthy of censure, but is perfectly right, and it is only just now that he has admitted that some sort of censure should be passed on the High Commissioner. I think it is very desirable indeed that we should clearly understand the history of the Motions that are before the House, as I think it will be found to be instructive. The first Motion that was put down was, in substance—

> "That this House regrets that the ultimatum, which was calculated to produce immediate war, should have been presented to the Zulu King without authority from the responsible advisers of the Crown, and that offensive war should have been commenced without imperative and pressing necessity or adequate preparation."

Well, how did the Ministry meet that Motion? They met it by the Previous Question. What did that mean? It meant, I apprehend, according to the usages of Parliament, that they were not prepared to dispute or deny all, or, indeed, any of the propositions contained in that statement; but that they did not think it opportune that the statement should be made at the present time. They were, therefore, at that time, as I understand, not prepared to deny—I suppose I must not say to admit—that the Ultimatum was calculated to produce immediate war; that it was made without authority from the Ministers of the Crown; and that there was no pressing necessity for adequate preparation. Well, Sir, that, it seems to me, was the meaning of moving the Previous Question, and, therefore, if it had gone to an issue, it would have been a very tame affair indeed, as we should, I apprehend, all have been at one on the subject. At all events, there would have been no serious difference of opinion as to the merits of the case, but merely as to the prudence of making any statement with regard to it at the present time. So far, therefore, the thing seemed to be extremely simple; but then it did not stop there, because, very shortly afterwards, Her Majesty's Ministers, not content with the Previous Question, took upon themselves to do that which the House was asked by this Motion to do, and passed themselves a most severe and cutting censure in all respects upon Sir Bartle Frere, which went far beyond that which the hon. Member for Chelsea proposed to ask the House to inflict. They took the matter out of the hands of the House, and of themselves published to the world at large, in a most elaborate manner, a censure on Sir Bartle Frere. I confess, therefore, that we are rather aggrieved by the manner in which we have been treated, because it really looks as if Her Majesty's Ministers thought they had in some sort of way acquired a right to the monopoly of abuse. It was as if they said—"You want to censure one of our men, we have got a majority, and we will not let you do it; but all the censure that you could have bestowed upon him, and a great deal more than you were disposed to bestow upon him, we will put upon him ourselves, and we do." Surely that is rather hard on the House of Commons. How is it that we have sunk so low, that the right of abuse is to be limited entirely to Her Majesty's Ministers? We have opinions as well as they, and why may not we express them? The only reason I can imagine is that contained in the words of Shakespeare—

> "That in the captain's but a choleric word,
> Which in the soldier is flat blasphemy."

What the House of Commons must not dare to say or think of may be said with impunity by Her Majesty's Ministers. So far, at any rate, I do not observe any inordinate affection on the part of Her Majesty's Ministers for Sir Bartle Frere. Certainly, they did take a step which shielded him from our attack; but he had no great reason to be obliged to them for that, because, it seems to me, they only did it to inflict a much greater wound on him themselves. I do not say that the Government were actuated by any strong or burning affection for Sir Bartle Frere, and I beg the House to take notice of this. Well, then, everything seemed to be going on in the best of all possible ways. We were all agreed. The Government had had their fling at Sir Bartle Frere, and we wanted to have ours; and really after the Government had been to the trouble to put in very good language all we wanted to say about Sir Bartle Frere, it did not so much matter if they had carried the Previous Question afterwards. And, therefore, everything seemed in the most comfortable and happy state, when some subterraneous agency—I suppose it must have been—moved my hon. Friend the Member for Chelsea to put down an addition to his Motion. Hitherto, you will observe the whole fire had been directed upon Sir Bartle Frere, and acquiesced in with the utmost complacency on the other side; but now the lines have been changed, because my hon. Friend proposed to add—

> "That this House further regrets that, after the censure passed upon the High Commissioner by Her Majesty's Government in the Despatch of the 19th day of March 1879, the conduct of affairs in South Africa should be retained in his hands."

Then there came a most remarkable change. All went smoothly as long as the censure was confined to Sir Bartle Frere; but it is a very different thing when you propose to touch Her Majesty's Government. It has been a matter of great amusement to me, since the addition of my hon. Friend, to watch the gradual approximation of the Government towards Sir Bartle Frere. That which was at one time very wrong indeed is now apparently right. That which was very cool at one time is now ripening into the strongest possible friendship. It seems to me that a common danger or a common difficulty has drawn them together, and that the tone of the Government has gradually changed, so that the feeling between them and Sir Bartle Frere has become one of the most cordial affection. We know how severe the censure was which was passed upon Sir Bartle Frere. Let anyone compare that with the speech, for instance, of the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for the Colonies last night, and observe the difference between them. The House will remember that in the letter that was written to Sir Bartle Frere censuring him there is a very strong expression indeed. He is, however, always treated now as if he was only censured by the Government for a single offence—that of going beyond his powers without consulting them. It is a mistake to suppose that this was the view taken by the Government, for the right hon. Gentleman the Colonial Secretary, writing to Sir Bartle Frere, said—

> "I have previously impressed on you that every effort should have been used to prevent war;"

which was quite a different thing from saying—"You were wrong in making war without asking our leave." The language that was used was in substance informing Sir Bartle Frere that he had violated the precept laid upon him, not merely to refrain from acting without the consent of the Government, but to refrain from doing anything by means of which he could become the engine of producing war. This has now all to be got rid of; but let us see how it is got rid of. Just let us remember how the Secretary of State for the Colonies spoke last night of this man—Sir Bartle Frere—whom they had only a short time previously condemned for having taken on himself authority which he had no right to assume, and had produced an unnecessary war. The Colonial Secretary said—

> "We cannot decide these questions now. We are to look to the future rather than to the past. But the Government retain complete confidence in this gentleman."

The Colonial Secretary says in substance that he thinks Sir Bartle Frere has been pretty nearly right, on the whole; that there was a great deal to be said for him; and that whether the Ultimatum was, or was not, right, can hardly be settled now. That is the tone taken now by the Government. It only shows what a wonderful difference was brought about in the state of things by reason of the simple fact that the hon. Baronet the Member for Chelsea made a slight addition to his Resolution. Let us consider for a moment the question as it stands now. The question, as it now stands before the House, is in substance——

[The right hon. Gentleman, who had been speaking with some difficulty, at this point abruptly resumed his seat.]

SIR ROBERT PEEL: Sir, I feel that there was a great deal of force in the remarks which my right hon. Friend the Member for the University of London has just made with reference to the Motion of the hon. Baronet the Member for Chelsea. As that Motion stood originally, everybody must, I think, have agreed as to the censure passed upon Sir Bartle Frere; but the rider which he had added has evidently made a great change in the opinions of Her Majesty's Government. I agree also in what fell from my right hon. Friend as regards the speech of the hon. Gentleman who sits below me (Mr. Hanbury). The hon. Gentleman treated this as a very frivolous matter. He said that if the Motion of the hon. Baronet had stood in its original terms, it would be easy to "pooh-pooh" it by the Previous Question. But he says—"You want now to find fault, sitting at your ease at home, with a Governor who is now at the Cape, and who has rendered important services to the country," and he went on to say that he is a Governor who holds such a monstrous commission that it is impossible to understand the censure which the Government have passed upon him. I confess I could not understand the weight of the remarks of the hon. Gentleman. But I come now to the speech of the hon. Baronet the Member for Chelsea, and I must say that during the course of this debate, I have more than once heard it asked—Who is responsible for the state of affairs in South Africa? The hon. Baronet, in his most comprehensive and lucid statement, asked that question, and said there was reason to believe that for months before the issue of the Ultimatum on the 11th of December, the Government knew of the High Commissioner's intention to engage in an offensive war. If that is the case, it is a very serious charge against the Government; and I confess, speaking honestly and without Party bias, that I do not think the assertion of the hon. Baronet can be carried out to the fullest extent. The hon. Baronet was followed in the debate by the hon. and learned Gentleman the Member for Cambridge (Mr. Marten), who, with his usual animation, answered more or less on the part of the Government. He tried to establish some legal point, which the House was unable to see. But he went on with more satisfaction to himself, and said—"Do not be led away by what you see in books. The language of Cetewayo must not be taken in a literal sense, as it was merely illustrative of Eastern allegory." I suppose most of us must have known that. Well, to use the words of the American humorist, I shall leave my hon. and learned Friend "to digest his alligator." There is, however, one remark of the hon. and learned Gentleman to which I must allude. He said of Sir Bartle Frere that, putting the Zulu War aside, he had been a most successful High Commissioner. What, putting the Zulu War out of the question! That may be all very well to the legal mind; but in our common-sense view of the question, I must say that it seems absurd. We are discussing an offensive war undertaken by this High Commissioner without authority, without adequate preparation, and without necessity; and are we to be told that, putting such a war aside, the high official in question has been most successful? It is all very well for the hon. Member for North Staffordshire to say that this is a frivolous question.

MR. HANBURY rose to Order, but as Sir Robert Peel did not give way, Mr. SPEAKER said, that the right hon. Baronet the Member for Tamworth was in possession of the House, and if the hon. Member for North Staffordshire wished to correct any statement he had made, he would, with the indulgence of House, have an opportunity at the end of the speech.

Sir ROBERT PEEL: I take it that the House drew the same inference that I did from the remark of the hon. Member—that the Motion of the hon. Baronet the Member for Chelsea (Sir Charles W. Dilke) might be easily pooh-poohed by the Previous Question. What we want to know is, who is responsible for the present state of affairs? The country asks for the information, and we in the House of Commons ask for it. We ask that those who have acted in direct violation of their duty should no longer be permitted to serve their country at the Cape. I do not mean to say that we do not know what the policy of Her Majesty's Government has been. It seems to me to have been, in familiar phrase, "as plain as a pikestaff." He who runs may read—provided he is strong enough to carry all the Blue Books which have been issued on the subject, and I hold in my hand one of the latest productions numbered 2260. In fact, if ever a superabundant supply of Papers laid bare a policy, here you have it. [*A laugh.*] You may treat the matter lightly if you please; but this is a very grave and serious matter. I do not remember before that public opinion has suddenly taken so great an interest in a question as it has in this. I never before saw the Press of the country take so extraordinary an amount of interest in a public question like this. There is one point to which I wish particularly to refer, and it is this—that I do not believe, certainly not within the last three years, any Question has been asked in the House of Commons which directly raises two more important issues than those involved in this South African business—this unfortunate affair, as Lord Chelmsford calls it. The first of those issues—and I beg the attention of the House to it—is the ready practice of our Commissioners and Residents abroad to summon troops, issue Ultimatums, and declare wars without the consent of Parliament, or even the Government of the day. We have already got enough wars on our hands, and I was alarmed lately at the Secretary of State treating very lightly a demand to send three regiments in consequence of a disturbance in Burmah. Parliament must, more than it has done in the past, exercise a control over this facile practice of issuing Ultimatums and going to war, whether on the part of the Ministers of the Crown or of their agents abroad. The second grave issue raised in this matter is connected with the military arrangements consequent upon this facile practice of issuing Ultimatums. Those arrangements irresistibly press upon our minds the conviction that the principles upon which our military system rest is thoroughly unsound, and that the maladministration of our Army is keenly felt. We pay some £16,000,000 a-year for the maintenance of a Parliamentary Army, and it is clear that there is something which is not right and straight and sound in the principles on which our military system is carried on. I believe there is no hon. Gentleman here who looks the matter fairly and honestly in the face who will not concur with me on this point. The Colonial Secretary said last night that great forbearance had been shown by the House of Commons in postponing discussion on this subject. I agree with the right hon. Baronet that, with the exception of the preliminary conversation raised by the hon. Member for Dundee (Mr. E. Jenkins), who thought it necessary, from a strong sense of public duty, as the Chancellor of the Exchequer himself admitted, to anticipate this debate, the House of Commons has exhibited great forbearance, and has given the Government ample time to prepare their case. I thought we had their case before us without waiting for more Papers; but when we look at all the Papers which have now been issued, it is obvious that the business assumes a very serious aspect. Until last night we had no Parliamentary official utterances, with the exception of those alluded to by the hon. Gentleman below me. The only satisfactory assurance we have received is that if you want to change horses you had better not undertake that process in the middle of a stream. That is one of the reasons why we should not recall the High Commissioner. The other assurance we had was not a very comforting one. It was "Boldness, boldness, always boldness! That is the policy which ought to guide the policy of our agents abroad, because it is the policy which has made Great Britain what it is." I was surprised to hear a sentiment like that fall from the lips of a Secretary of State. *De l'audace, de l'audace, et toujours de l'audace,* were the words once used by a man who little thought of the degradation and humiliation to which his country would be reduced by acting upon the maxim. Well, Sir, with the exception of what we have heard in this House, these are all the official utterances and justifications we have had respecting the policy pursued. But we can have no doubt as to this. Everyone will agree with me that never before, in all our Diplomatic and Colonial history, have two men been so thoroughly at variance with, and yet so pleasantly appreciative of, each other as the Colonial Secretary and the High Commissioner. I do not know whether the Chancellor of the Exchequer had any conversation with the hon. Baronet opposite; but it has been said by the right hon. Gentleman who spoke from the front Bench opposite that it did not appear as if the hon. Baronet did not know what the Government were going to do in their censure, and that the Government had adopted the very policy laid down by the hon. Baronet. Observe that Sir Bartle Frere is censured because he forced on a war for which there was no immediate necessity, and precipitated events which have resulted in failure. The Colonial Secretary wrote to him—

> "I fully appreciate your great experience, but I fail to discover any necessity for your conduct."

Again, the right hon. Baronet says—

> "You have omitted to follow the course which was peculiarly incumbent upon you. Your future policy is to be based on that of the Colonial Secretary, which is distinctly opposed to your own."

Yet the hon. Gentleman below me just now tried to show that Sir Bartle Frere ought not to have received censure for acting not against instructions, but without instructions. I maintain that Sir Bartle Frere acted against instructions, and that is why the country feels so strongly on this matter. The despatch of the 19th of March censures him as strongly as any man was ever censured, though I am told that with that very despatch of censure there went out private letters from official and even higher sources, urging him in the strongest terms not to resign and not to accept the censure. I want to have a denial of that from the front Bench. I believe, and I may say I know, that when the letter of censure went out, on the 19th of March, letters were sent not only by the Government, but by many persons connected with the Government, begging Sir Bartle Frere not to consider the censure, but to remain at his post and to act as he would wish to act. The despatch of censure itself ended thus:—"But I have no desire to withdraw the confidence hitherto reposed in you." It is the old "confidence trick." What a pleasant thing it is to have confidence in your officials, particularly when you know that the House of Commons and the country have no confidence in either of your officials, the High Commissioner and the Commander-in-Chief, and when, for the matter of that, the Commander-in-Chief has certainly no confidence in himself! On the 14th of March, the hon. and learned Member for Louth (Mr. Sullivan) asked the Secretary of State whether, seeing there had not been any invasion of the Colony of Natal, he would suspend further military action until an opportunity had been afforded for a peaceful adjustment of the differences with the Zulu King? This was a most righteous and charitable request to make of the Government; but how was it met? The reply was in effect—"No; we have been surprised, out-generalled, and defeated, and therefore our defeat must be avenged before anything further is done." Will the House credit it, that, on the very day Colonel Pearson crossed the Tugela River, he received a message from Cetewayo saying that he had not refused to listen to the voice of the Government, and asking the great Chief to give the Zulu nation time to reply. Colonel Pearson sent the message to Sir Henry Bulwer, and Sir Henry Bulwer, who was a wise and prudent man, said—"What am I to do with this message which I have received before an advance has been made?" Sir Bartle Frere replied—

> "These words are not more satisfactory nor more binding than the King's previous verbal and

informal messages. I therefore agree with your Excellency that the messengers should be told that, as the King did not do anything which was required of him within the time specified, the further enforcement of the demands will be intrusted to the Lieutenant-General, Lord Chelmsford."

Why, Sir Henry Bulwer had never made any suggestion of the kind, and Sir Bartle Frere had no right to attempt to throw the responsibility upon him. Then the hon. Gentleman the Member for Birmingham (Mr. Chamberlain) put a Question, whether there was any further necessity, in the interests of the Public Service, in delaying the discussion of this question? The answer to the hon. Gentleman's Question was that further Papers were on the way. Those further Papers are now in our hands, and they greatly aggravate the position of Sir Bartle Frere and of the Government. We now see by these further Papers what a state of affairs Sir Bartle Frere has brought about, and in the Transvaal and Basutoland there is the strongest opposition to the Government. In fact, all the inhabitants of those regions are excited to a degree which is hardly to be exaggerated. I now come to the last Question, which was put by the hon. Member for Dundee (Mr. E. Jenkins). He asked—"Do the Government propose to supersede Lord Chelmsford in his command?" And the answer was—"As at present advised, No." Well, since that answer was given Papers have been received, and we have had the melancholy despatch of the 9th of February from Lord Chelmsford himself. I think that despatch of Lord Chelmsford, coupled with the conduct of Sir Bartle Frere and the action of Sir Henry Bulwer, forces upon us this conclusion—that, in this South African business, there have been clearly three policies working. The first policy was the policy of the Government, the second was the policy of Sir Bartle Frere, and the third, from the 4th of January, when Sir Bartle Frere gave the entire responsibility to the Commander-in-Chief, was the military policy of Lord Chelmsford. Now, I shall speak with every fairness—the policy of the Government up to a certain date was clear and distinct. The policy of Sir Bartle Frere, whatever you may say of it in the House, had, at all events, this quality—it was bold, energetic, and determined, and it resulted in a most complete *fiasco.* The third policy was a military policy, with full responsibility of action from the 4th of January, and that policy of Lord Chelmsford, as we all know, resulted in that great disaster of Isandlana. Now, I make this assertion, and I am sure the House will agree with me, that if the policy of the Government had been really adhered to, both the *fiasco* of the High Commissioner and the disaster of the Commander-in-Chief would in all probability have been avoided. Now, let me put to them this one question—What is all this business about? There seems to be only one prudent man there—Sir Henry Bulwer; but then Sir Henry Bulwer could not stay the hand nor check the rashness which precipitated this war. No; Sir Bartle Frere had made up his mind that it should be made. He says—"For two years it had been brooding, because Cetewayo is a bloodthirsty and treacherous despot." Now, the more proximate cause of the war was the policy of Lord Carnarvon with regard to the Transvaal; but, apart from that, it has been the policy pursued by Sir Bartle Frere in dealing with Cetewayo. I was surprised to hear the Colonial Secretary say, in reply to the hon. Baronet opposite—"The hon. Baronet seemed to have forgotten the manner of man with whom he was dealing," in speaking of Sir Bartle Frere. No, Sir, we have not forgotten the manner of man we are dealing with. His services, no doubt, may have been great in the past; but when a man makes a great mistake like this—mistake? no!—when he acts in direct violation of instructions—if he is not punished for it, there is an end to government, at any rate, to Colonial government, altogether. And then we are told we do not know what manner of man we are dealing with. I will tell you what one error of judgment cost an able and illustrious officer of this country. I recollect having read how, in 1756, an illustrious officer, highly connected, although that may not be of any account, forfeited his life solely on the ground that he had committed an error of judgment. But this man (Sir Bartle Frere) not only commits an error of judgment, but acts in direct violation of all the orders and instructions he had received, whatever may be said about his monstrous commission. These troubles began, no doubt, with the annexation of the Transvaal in 1877; it began with the policy of Lord Carnarvon. Sir Theophilus Shepstone went there to observe the country, and then in 10 weeks he annexed it. That is the way to conduct your Colonial business. And so the Boers, and their boundary disputes, we have taken upon our shoulders. The hon. and learned Member for Cambridge (Mr. Marten), with his usual animation, alluded to that, and endeavoured to show us—I do not know that I shall be justified in quoting his expressions—but he spoke of the taking over of these Boers; and really the way in which Sir Bartle Frere talks of the character of the Boers, with his prejudice against Cetewayo, requires to be brought under the notice of this House. He stood up for these Boers, and said—

> "Poor people, they have left their homes in Europe to seek freedom in Africa, to govern themselves and to worship God after their own fashion."

Yes, it was after their own fashion. They have worshipped God and followed His precepts. What did Sir Theophilus Shepstone say when he went to the Transvaal in January 1872? "When I arrived at Prætoria I found slavery rampant." That was the way they worshipped God and cultivated freedom. Sir Bartle Frere goes on to talk about the Boers. This is the manner of man we are dealing with. He says they seriously believed they had the highest title to the land, because they found it in the precepts of their Bible—I wonder what Bible it was—"to exterminate the Gentiles, and take their lands and possessions." Sir Bartle Frere says he thinks they were wrong unmistakably; but, at least, they had a sincere belief in the Divine authority, and, therefore, a far higher title than the Zulu. Ever since 1846 we have lived in the Transvaal at peace with the King and people of Zululand; but when we took upon ourselves this unfortunate business in the Transvaal all that was changed. Now, it is evident, as I have said before, that Sir Bartle Frere had an animus agaist Cetewayo. Over and over again, Sir Henry Bulwer and Sir Theophilus Shepstone assured him of the character and of the past services of this savage. Sir Henry Bulwer, in 1874, says—

> "The Zulus are separated from our territory of Natal for more than 100 miles by only a stream of water; both banks are inhabited to the water's edge by the subjects of the two Governments, and our intercourse with them in the nature of things has been frequent; it has been so since the establishment of Natal 30 years ago, but it has been effectual in maintaining peace and goodwill between our Government and the Zulus."

In 1876, Sir Henry Bulwer writes—

> "I believe that Cetewayo would do nothing which could lessen the good opinion which his conduct has received since he ascended the Zulu Throne;"

and he describes the relations between the English and the Zulus as having been always friendly. When you find these opinions expressed in direct contradiction to the sentiments and animus shown by the High Commissioner, I really think he is open to very grave censure for the way he has acted in this matter. But in an important despatch which he writes to the Colonial Secretary are these words—

> "One of the few grounds on which we can expect the willing submission of the Transvaal population is that we are able to give them real security against the Zulus. It may possibly occur to others that a settlement of the Zulu question may be deferred to a more convenient season; but I cannot think that this can safely be done. We must forcibly coerce the Zulus, in order to secure the allegience of the Transvaal."

Why, what a policy is that? "We must forcibly coerce the Zulus, in order to secure the allegience of the Transvaal." And this was at a time when the award was being made. The award was made in June 1878. Sir Henry Bulwer begged over and over again, in order to allay excitement in the savage mind, that the award might be speedily made known; yet it was the 7th of December before the High Commissioner did communicate it. And he communicated with it an Ultimatum, not in his own name, but in the name of the Soverign of this country. Let me allude to that Ultimatum. It is one of the most monstrous documents that ever disgraced the archives of the Colonial Office. In the first place, the three sons of Sirayo and the brother of Sirayo were to be given up. Why? Because two loose women had crossed the Frontier, and the sons of Sirayo had crossed to bring them back. It was admitted that the boundary line of Zululand and Natal was not of a very well-defined character, and that such disregard of the Frontier boundary frequently took place on both sides. The

High Commissioner goes on to say that the promises made by the King at his Coronation Oath had not been observed. Administrative reform, I suppose. "All the young men," he said, "are taken as soldiers." What is this but the law of conscription? It occurs in France, Germany, and Russia, and I believe it would be a good thing if it occurred in this country. "They cannot marry when they desire to do so," says Sir Bartle Frere. I do not suppose our soldiers can marry when they desire to do so. "There is no real need," says Sir Bartle Frere, "for the Army at all, and therefore the Army must be disbanded." Fancy saying this. Let us take France. What advantage is there in France keeping up 800,000 men? Germany might say it is not necessary, and the French Army must be disbanded. And yet that is Sir Bartle Frere's representation in the name of the great Queen to the King of the Zulus. And then he goes on to say that "every man, when he comes to man's estate, must be free to marry." I never recollect such a bonus on improvident marriages as that. "No one is to be punished unless he is tried and found guilty." The idea of this regulation! Why, these regulations do not exist in Russia. "The promises made by the King at his Coronation Oath must be kept." We know that the Government of the day, when they were made, never supposed they would be kept. "Men are to be left to live in their homes in peace and to be allowed to marry." These are to be the duties of the Deputy who is to reside in Zululand. I cannot conceive a more pleasant duty than in going about and making good marriages. But fancy the responsibility of this Deputy when there was a divorce case in the Matrimonial Causes Court. Even the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Greenwich (Mr. Gladstone) would have his difficulties upon that point. These are the terms of the Ultimatum sent by the High Commissioner to the Zulu King, and an answer must be sent in 30 days. Scruples about a Coronation Oath! The Colonial Secretary told us last night that this war may be costly in men and money; but it will be the turning-point in the history of South Africa. What! an unnecessary war, begun without authority, to be the turning-point in the history of South Africa? That is not the policy we wish to see advocated in this House. The Colonial Secretary told us it would be costly; more blood and money must be sacrificed—money from the pockets of the taxpayers of this country, who are already suffering, heavily burdened with two or three wars on their shoulders, because the Zulu King neglected his Coronation Oath. Money will be spent and blood shed, and there will be a vacant chair in the home of many a gallant fellow who has gone to the war because the Zulu King has not kept his Coronation Oath. The lives of thousands of savages—brave and gallant savages—will be sacrificed on the plea of Sir Bartle Frere that the Zulu King has not kept his Coronation Oath. Why, he is not the first King who has had scruples about his Coronation Oath. I well recollect, and have often heard from the distinguished men of that time, and you may read in Lord Malmesbury's Diary, of the unmanly and imbecile conduct of George IV., as regards his scruples about his Coronation Oath. There were Lord Eldon on one side, and the Duke of Wellington and Sir Robert Peel on the other, pulling him one way and then another, he blubbering over Curaçao, without which he could not be brought to the scratch. Lord Eldon told him—"If you pass this measure"—it was the measure respecting Catholic emancipation—"it will be in violation of your Coronation Oath, and the sun of Great Britain will set for ever;" but Lord Eldon did not make war on the Duke of Wellington and Sir Robert Peel because George IV. did not keep his Coronation Oath. This lamentable history must impress on us the necessity of Parliament having a vigilant control over High Commissioners involving this country in a costly war, although we are told it will be the turning-point in the history of South Africa; and on the face of the Papers before us, it is a war as unnecessary and unjust as any that ever occurred in our history. The hon. Member below me (Mr. Hanbury) said that Sir Bartle Frere did not act against authority, he only acted without authority; but the Government, all through the piece, till a recent date, impressed on the High Commissioner the absolute necessity of observing caution and forbearance, abstaining from any hostile aggression. A peaceful solution of the difficulty was, above all things, urged upon him. Reinforcements were sent out, but for defensive purposes only, not for invasion or conquest. Nothing could be more honest or straightforward than the despatch of the Colonial Secretary. Why, these despatches of the Colonial Secretary are admirable for their good sense and judgment; if the Government had consented to act upon these, and to reject the unsound policy of the General and of the Commander-in-Chief, all would have been well. These two despatches of the dates referred to conclusively prove to my mind, and to the mind of most of the country, that the intention of the Government at home clearly was that Sir Bartle Frere should act only on the defensive, and certainly was that he should not undertake any offensive operations. But Sir Bartle Frere would not listen to it. He sends word to the Government by telegram that the 30 days he had allowed for a reply to be sent to the Ultimatum had elapsed, and that he had consequently placed the further prosecution of all demands in the hands of the Lieutenant-General. In other words, "I have given him all the responsibility." I have shown that the Government, in answer to the hon. and learned Member for Louth (Mr. Sullivan), had said that they intended to avenge the defeat before doing anything to bring about peace. Yet, actually before the troops had crossed the Tugela, they had received from the King of Zululand an intimation of his desire to try to come to terms. And this war is going on. There is a notification issued by the High Commissioner, saying that the British Government have no quarrel with the Zulu people; that it is not fighting against them. Every despatch which we have received during the progress of the war contains the information that our troops had "lifted" so many head of cattle, or killed so many people; that the people ran away, and that their villages were burnt. Is that what you call not making war upon the Zulu people? What is the meaning of "lifting" cattle belonging to the Zulu people, if our quarrel is confined to the Zulu King, and that, too, because he has failed to keep his Coronation Oath? On the 4th of January the whole responsibility devolved upon Lord Chelmsford; and this is the most painful part of the business. Lord Chelmsford accepted the responsibility, although he knew his own weakness. I have heard it stated that it is no business of Parliament to discuss the conduct of military commanders; but the conduct of the military commander is directly involved in this Motion, and in the policy pursued since January 4. As it is said that we must not discuss the policy of military commanders here, I have looked back, and I find that Fox, Burke, and the Duke of Wellington did not think so; and the right hon. Member for Cambridge University (Mr. Walpole) would not say so. On the 11th of March I saw with regret a letter in *The Times*, in which it was stated that the hasty and inconsiderate conclusions of the public did not represent the judgment of well-informed military minds. I dare say the military mind thinks differently from what are called the hasty and inconsiderate conclusions of the public; but the hasty and inconsiderate conclusions of the public carried the day at the commencement of the Crimean War in the midst of all the incompetency that then prevailed; and, unless the Government and the authorities at the Horse Guards think well, the hasty and inconsiderate conclusions of the public may effect a very permanent change in the arrangements which are now being made, although they may be adverse to the conclusions of what are called well-informed military minds. It was said here the other night by a military Member, or rather insinuated, that it was not the business of the House to discuss military matters; but he wrote a letter to a newspaper, in which he said—

> "Of course, I did not mean that; but I meant that occasions for it might arise when a nation had become wearied with undoubted proofs of incompetence."

Then, he said, it was necessary. I think the nation has become pretty well convinced in this business of South Africa by undoubted proofs of incompetence. But the House of Commons has always asserted its right. Mr. Burke did not refrain from condemning in the strongest terms the action of General Burgoyne. Mr. Fox made a Motion in 1778, which was resisted by the War Minister of the day—a most incompetent man, indeed, but not the only incompetent War Minister this country has seen. Lord George Germain was the War Minister then, and how did he answer Mr. Fox when he said he would have the conduct of General Burgoyne fully discussed on the floor of the House? He used much the same language that is used in these days; he said that military men were the most proper judges, and he did not see the propriety of Parliamentary interference. And then the Duke of Wellington, in the House of Lords, when a predecessor of Sir Bartle Frere (Sir Harry Smith) was recalled from the Cape, did not hesitate to criticize the conduct of that distinguished officer and comrade, and to say that it had been unjustifiable, and had led to the frittering away of his Forces. What stronger censure can you have? I recollect during the Crimean War what discussions we had in this House. The right hon. Member for the University of Cambridge (Mr. Walpole) said that the character of the Commander-in-Chief required that a Parliamentary Inquiry should take place. Mr. Henley condemned the Government; and, of course, no one was more severe than Mr. Layard. What did Mr. Sidney Herbert say as War Minister of the Government of the day? He did not shirk discussion, as the well-informed military minds of the present day would. I have always thought that Lord Raglan was unjustly treated in the earlier part of the campaign; and that the errors were not his fault, but the fault of the Administration, was proved over and over again. What did Mr. Sidney Herbert say? He admitted with sorrow that the Army under Lord Raglan had been reduced to a stage which produced deep anxiety in the mind of every Englishman. Therefore, I think it may be permitted to me to refer to the circumstances connected with the acceptance of responsibility by the Commander-in-Chief after the 4th of January. I recollect reading the other day on the monument of Havelock, the bravest and most heroic of soldiers, that when he led his brave companions in arms—only one-sixth more of British troops than will shortly be in the Cape fighting against these savages—against 100,000 Sepoys, he said—"Soldiers, your sufferings, your privations, your valour, will never be forgotten by a grateful country." We might say the same for the gallant fellows who fell in that miserable affair at Isandlana—53 officers and nearly 1,400 men—through the gross incompetence of a General upon whose head rests the blood of these men. ["No, no!"] Upon whose head it rests, until he has been tried by court martial and acquitted. As many officers fell in that battle as fell in the great battle of Inkermann. Hon. Members say "No!" I say "Yes!" I have it that 53 officers fell in that fatal battle at Isandlana, and no more fell at Inkermann. But even if that was not the case, was there not blood enough to make us think of the way in which those gallant fellows fought for the honour and dignity of the country? But what can be said of the conduct of the Commander-in-Chief? What can be said in his defence? I intend to say in Parliament what I hear in every quarter out-of-doors. The Commander-in-Chief told the Government, on November 11, that it was not in its power to appreciate the gravity of the military situation. Lord Chelmsford knew what it was. A pamphlet has been sent me from the Cape, compiled by direction of the Commander-in-Chief, in which he tells his Army the strength of the Zulu Force; he says that it consists of from 40,000 to 50,000 men, well equipped for warfare. He consents to accept the responsibility, and he advances into this country with 200 Cavalry, without taking precautions to ascertain whether the enemy may be at close quarters. He divides his Force —admitting it is insufficient—into three columns, widely separated, and in this way this competent commander advances to maintain the honour of his country. I grieve to say that the despatch in which he describes the disaster at Rorke's Drift is about the most melancholy one ever written. He talks about the men not remaining face to face with the enemy. Why, they were surrounded by the enemy! The impression civilians must have from reading the despatch is that the troops, in the opinion of Lord Chelmsford, showed cowardice and ran away. Making every allowance for Lord Chelmsford, he must have been sadly wanting in the feelings of common justice when he penned such a despatch. Lord Chelmsford blames Colonel Durnford for not having fortified the camp. Why, he was there 48 hours himself with the whole of his ammunition for the campaign, and during all those 48 hours he never made the slightest attempt to do what he says Colonel Durnford should have done in four hours. The other day I asked a distinguished General his opinion about Lord Chelmsford's conduct, and his answer was—"It is to me perfectly incomprehensible. He seems to have left the camp with all his ammunition, and to have gone fiddling about looking for a parade ground, with a hostile army of 30,000 men on his flank." After the disaster we find him riding and flying for his life. And here is one of the most painful circumstances of the whole affair—Lord Chelmsford arrives at the desolated camp at nightfall and leaves before daybreak. So far as the Papers go, he does not seem to have made the slightest search to see whether any of those poor brave, gallant fellows might not be lying in the field dying, if not, perhaps, quite dead.

MR. COURTNEY: I rise to Order. The right hon. Gentleman is discussing the military conduct of this war, and I can find no words in the Motion to justify him in so doing.

MR. SPEAKER: Among the allegations contained in the Resolution of the hon. Baronet the Member for Chelsea, there is one to the effect that the war was begun without adequate preparation, and the Amendment of the hon. and gallant Gentleman the Member for Renfrewshire (Colonel Mure) certainly refers to the conduct of the war. The observations of the right hon. Baronet therefore, are not, strictly speaking, out of Order.

SIR ROBERT PEEL: People in this country are not surprised that the spirits of Lord Chelmsford are depressed at the disaster. I have seen comments on the disaster, and I have seen how his military conduct has been attacked. He is not the first General by a great many who has been out-generalled, out-manœuvred, surprised, and defeated; but I venture to say he is the first General who has ever been surprised with compliments on the bloody results of a defeat. General Burgoyne went to crumble up the Americans; but when he was defeated and recalled, was he received with compliments by George III.? Why, George III., when he demanded an audience, refused to receive him. That was the way incompetent Generals were dealt with in former days. *Nous avons changé tout cela.* And here I cannot help alluding to the remarkable divergence in the statements made by the Secretary of State for War in this House, and by the Prime Minister in "another place," in reference to the message of confidence sent to Lord Chelmsford. The Secretary of State for War said it was sent on his own responsibility, without consultation with his Colleagues. The Prime Minister distinctly said it was sent with the concurrence of the entire Cabinet, and that it was not unconstitutional in any way. I never said it was unconstitutional; but I do say it is a wholly unprecedented thing that the statements of two Cabinet Ministers should be in absolute contradiction with each other. I shall leave it to hon. Members to reconcile these statements. Well, the conclusion I come to on the whole matter is this—Taking the case as it stands in the Blue Books, I see no ground for believing that we are engaged in a just or necessary war. All through these Papers I am painfully impressed with the conviction that the worst construction has always been put upon Cetewayo's acts by the High Commissioner, contrary to the obvious opinion of Sir Henry Bulwer, and guided, I fear, to a very great extent by the vacillating judgment of Sir Theophilus Shepstone, particularly as regards the boundary question between the Transvaal and Zululand. Now, I admit that the political and the military situation is very serious. I suppose everyone will admit the necessity of upholding our power in Africa. At all events, everyone, I suppose, will think that any dismemberment of our possessions in South Africa would not commend itself to public opinion in this country. But remarkable words were used by Lord Grey in 1853. "I think it would have been far better for this country," said Lord Grey, "if the British territory in South Africa were confined to Cape Town and Simon's Bay." Be that as it may, we have now increased duties and responsibilities to discharge. Our commerce and our civilization spread all over the world. Yes, it is no unworthy desire to wish to see fresh channels of communication open to the wealth and enterprize of this country, so that under the genial influence of civilization and the active enterprize of commerce we may be enabled not merely to enlarge the resources of our own Empire, but at the same time, under God's blessing, confer a real benefaction on mankind. Those are works which carry in their train the blessings of peace and order, and it is the adoption of such a policy that would, in my mind, tend to the civilization of the Natives of Africa and the prosperity of our Colonists. But in dealing with savage and dangerous nations, we should never forget that keen sense of justice and right which should ever guide our action, and which, in the present instance, it appears to me, has been strangely overlooked. I make every allowance for the actions of those who may not unnaturally have been swayed by local influences, and who may not unreasonably have thought that those on the spot were better able to judge of the real issue at stake than persons at a distance. Nevertheless, I cannot conscientiously, upon the face of these Papers, acquit the High Commissioner and the Commander-in-Chief of rashness in precipitating, in direct and flagrant violation of instructions received from home, the events which led to the great military disaster of Isandlana—a disaster which has so considerably weakened our prestige, at all events, for the moment, in an important Colony of the British Empire, and which has so deeply moved in all its courses the public feeling in this country.

Sir CHARLES RUSSELL appealed to the House for indulgence for a short time while he defended an old comrade and an absent man. He meant Lord Chelmsford. He promised the right hon. Baronet that he would meet the question as fairly as he had himself met it, and he would be more moderate in his language and more considerate of those who were unable to defend themselves. The first charge brought by the right hon. Baronet against Lord Chelmsford was that on the 4th of January he took over from Sir Bartle Frere the responsibilities of the position, or, in plain language, that he obeyed the orders of his superior. With regard to the plan of the campaign, the right hon. Baronet had criticized that with great severity; but, unfortunately, he was not possessed of what he was pleased to call "a well-informed military mind." The plan of that campaign was submitted to competent military authorities in this country, and was approved. The difficulties which Lord Chelmsford had to face were not of his own creating. After he had crossed the Tugela and got to the camp at Isandlana, he remained there making some reconnaissances, and with practically his whole Force. He did not, therefore, think it necessary to intrench the camp, and he (Sir Charles Russell) ventured to challenge the right hon. Baronet, who had spoken of that as a single instance, to point to a single case where a General moving with his whole Force had ever in Cape warfare intrenched his camp. He would go to the length of saying that even small detached parties did nothing of the kind. That was well known in Cape warfare, and he defied the right hon. Baronet to show one instance in which a laager defended by British troops had ever been taken. Well, Lord Chelmsford, hearing that the enemy was somewhere to the North-East, went with a large Force in search of him, and some time after he left he became engaged with a Force, and was occupied four hours in driving back that Force. When he left the camp, he sent a written order to Colonel Durnford to come up and take the command of the camp. The witnesses differed as to whether the order directed him to "strengthen" the camp; but he wrote by his military secretary to Colonel Pulleine to give the camp over to Colonel Durnford, and to "defend the camp." Lord Chelmsford had left before daylight. Now, as he should have to cast some reflection upon those who were dead and gone, and who had nobly died in discharge of what they conceived to be their duty, he trusted the House would not think he was in the least degree dealing to the memory of those gallant men so cruel and unjust a blow as that which the right hon. Baronet had dealt to the living. But the House would agree with him that, however much they might respect the memory of the dead, they were not entitled to give them that respect at the cruel expense of the living. His gallant friend, Lord Chelmsford, after he had left the camp before daylight — he spoke from memory, and without his notes, for he little dreamt that in a discussion of a Motion in which all mention of Lord Chelmsford's name had been left out a discussion of this sort would take place. He was not, therefore, prepared by reference to his marked Blue Book to give chapter and verse for everything he said; but he assured the House that he would state nothing that he could not prove. After Lord Chelmsford left the camp, Colonel

Pulleine had notice that the enemy was accumulating in force on heights about four miles off. He assembled his Force and put them to the east side of the camp, keeping them under orders for some time, when they were sent to their parades. At 10.30 Colonel Durnford arrived and took the command of the camp. It was abundantly evident that some discussion took place between Colonel Durnford and Colonel Pulleine. Colonel Durnford said he had seen some of the enemy on his left flank, and he asked for a couple of English companies with which he would go out and look for them. "No," said Colonel Pulleine, "I dare not do so, for my orders are to defend the camp," and that, Colonel Durnford's *aide-de-camp* said, was repeated over and over again. Ultimately, as if the poor fellow had a strange presentiment, Colonel Durnford said to Colonel Pulleine, "If I get into difficulties will you come to my rescue?" They had the testimony of one survivor of the rocket battery which accompanied him that Colonel Durnford attacked the enemy, with the result they all too well knew. Had the troops remained in camp and a laager been formed, which could have been done in half-an-hour or an hour—had the orders received been obeyed and the camp defended—the defence would have been complete and perfect. But it was said that the General sent back Captain Alan Gardner with an order to intrench the camp. He did so, but that was when he had found another camping-ground, which he determined to leave to Colonel Glyn, and in sending back for ammunition and provisions he added—"Intrench your camp." And why? As long as he had his mounted force at the camp he was sufficiently strong; but when he sent the order the force was divided. Let them now look to what occurred at Rorke's Drift. There they had an hour's notice that the enemy were about to attack, and that the camp was to be defended. Did Lieutenant Chard say—"Give me some men, and I will go out to meet the enemy?" He did not; but he and Lieutenant Bromhead set about throwing up defences, and they succeeded in repelling what was in proportion a larger Force than that which made the attack at Isandlana. Thus it was clear that where the men obeyed and clearly understood the General's orders, the defence was complete. Another point on which the right hon. Baronet made an attack on his (Sir Charles Russell's) absent friend was as to an alleged want of feeling which he showed when he left the camp at Isandlana before daylight on the morning after the disaster. But why did he go before daylight? He did so for two reasons—first, because he felt obliged to hasten to the assistance of the little garrison at Rorke's Drift; and, secondly, because he very properly wished to spare his men the horrible sight of the mutilated corpses of their comrades; for he need hardly remind the House that in African warfare it was notorious that the Zulus never left a wounded man living on the field. Where the wounded were not carried off for more brutal purposes, they were killed on the spot. If, indeed, Lord Chelmsford had incurred the risk of further loss, he would have deserved some small portion of the blame which the right hon. Baronet imputed to him. Let him remind the House of Lord Chelmsford's career. He had served the country for 35 years; he was present in the Crimea and attained the medal and clasp. His high courage was known to him and to everyone else who saw Lord Chelmsford, and they would give him credit for great capacity. Then, again, he served in the Indian Mutiny and attained the medal, and as Assistant Adjutant General he accompanied the Abyssinian Expedition and was present at the taking of Magdala; and in one of his despatches Lord Napier of Magdala said he desired to speak "specifically of his great ability and great energy." Was the man who had thus served his country, and who one day met with a disaster for which, in his conscience, he believed—and he said it on his honour as a gentleman—Lord Chelmsford was utterly irresponsible, to have his career in life cut short because charges such as they had heard, and which were incapable of being sustained, were, in his absence, made against him? If so, they were going to take a course which would not only be a grave injustice to the General himself, but also to the Forces that served under him. He did not quite understand the allusion of the right hon. Baronet to the case of Admiral Byng? Did he understand him to mean that they were to have such another murder?

Sir ROBERT PEEL was understood to explain that he had no wish to refer to the practices of by-gone days, further than to show what was then the consequence of an error of judgment such as Sir Bartle Frere had committed.

Sir CHARLES RUSSELL said, it might be some consolation to the friends of Lord Chelmsford that, if a military execution was to take place, it would be on Sir Bartle Frere. The right hon. Baronet talked a great deal about what popular opinion did in regard to the Crimea; but the real state of things was exactly the reverse of what had been represented. It was only when the officers of the Army had clamoured till they were tired, and had pointed out the shortcomings, that the people of England awoke to the necessities of the case. He must say that, when it was remembered that a grave responsibility was cast upon Lord Chelmsford, a clearer and more distinct charge should be brought forward than the accusation that the blood of the brave men who lost their lives rested on his head. He coupled that strong—he would go further, and say that outrageous—language with the suggestion that Lord Chelmsford should be tried by court-martial. Why did not the right hon. Baronet move for such a trial openly and boldly in the House? Why did he not take some step to secure the military inquiry which he suggested should be held? He would undertake to say that if Lord Chelmsford only received that fair play which he was happy to say the noble and gallant Lord was receiving at the hands of Her Majesty's Government, the day would come when those who clamoured against him would appear as those now appeared in the eyes of this generation who clamoured against the illustrious Duke of Wellington and demanded his recall at the outset of his career in the Peninsula, and who, had they been listened to, might have prevented those great and glorious results which the country derived afterwards through the exercise of his magnificent genius. Lord Chelmsford was the last man who would wish him to draw a comparison between himself and such a man as the Duke of Wellington; but there were some points in which small things might be compared to great. It was true that Lord Chelmsford had been sustained in what must have been to him a terrible trial by that which was touching to every man—namely, the confidence expressed in him and his brave soldiers by his Queen. He apologized to the House for the length at which he had detained it; but he could not sit still and hear an absent colleague severely censured without rising to claim for him what the House was always so ready to accord—fair and honest play.

Mr. EVELYN ASHLEY said, that if anything could have induced him to vote with the Government, it would have been the amusing, irrelevant, specious, and altogether unfair speech of the right hon. Baronet the Member for Tamworth (Sir Robert Peel). At the same time, when he heard the Resolution of the hon. Baronet the Member for Chelsea (Sir Charles W. Dilke), he felt it impossible to vote for it. But, on the other hand, he found it impossible to vote for the Government, because, though the Resolution dealt hardly with Sir Bartle Frere, yet he thought the treatment of the Government had been infinitely worse, because censuring him without recalling him made his position most difficult, while they were not in a position to have the right of censuring him at all. The speech of the right hon. Baronet the Member for Tamworth, he thought, was most unfair, as in it no allowances were made for the difficulties of Sir Bartle Frere's position, and it contained assertions to the effect that the High Commissioner had acted in direct violation of the instructions he had received—assertions that were founded upon the despatch of the 21st of November, which the right hon. Baronet must well know did not reach Sir Bartle Frere until after he had issued the Ultimatum. He would prove that the High Commissioner received no instructions whatever before the issuing of the Ultimatum, and had every reason to believe, by the language and tone of Her Majesty's Government, that he, as High Commissioner, was authorized to settle the existing difficulties to the best of his judgment and ability. He held that when Sir Bartle Frere arrived at the Cape it was absolutely necessary either that he should fight the Zulus or the Boers, or retreat from the Transvaal. If he (Mr. Ashley) had been High Commissioner, he should undoubtedly have adopted the third course, and advised Her Majesty's Government to give back the Sovereignty of the Transvaal, as in 1854 had been done in the case of the Orange Free State. It was an ill-advised annexation, founded upon wrong information. But Sir Bartle Frere may well have doubted whether the home authorities would have consented so soon to stultify an act which had been loudly proclaimed as a deed of wise statesmanship. The whole tenor of Sir Bartle Frere's communications pointed to offensive measures, and the Government tacitly acquiesced in leaving the discretion to him. By the middle of September the Government had in their possession the plans for the hostile invasion of Zululand, and the very words of Lord Chelmsford stating that it was in contemplation. Now, what language would they expect a Government to use wishing to curb and check a high official who had expressed strong views, and to lead him to understand that the responsibility of declaring war would be his responsibility, and not theirs? The language of such a Government would be civil, but it would be language not to be mistaken. It was all the more incumbent upon the Government to do that, when they were using Sir Bartle Frere's name as a name to conjure with in respect to a similar expedition in Afghanistan to overcome the great mass of Indian authorities on the other side. What was Sir Bartle Frere to think with respect to an invasion of the Zulu country, when he was quoted as an authority with respect to the invasion of Afghanistan, which was on all fours with the one he was projecting? He had received nothing but two wretched despatches referring to anything like a check on his movements, and he must have thought that the Government were not inclined to take the responsibility off his shoulders, that they were too much engaged with other matters to form a policy for themselves, and that they wished him to form a policy. If Sir Bartle Frere had been successful, they would have heard nothing in the way of censure—they would have heard nothing but praise. One of the despatches in question was a telegram, dated October 5, in which the Colonial Secretary only said he still hoped there was a good chance of avoiding war; and the other was a despatch, dated October 17, in which the Government refused the reinforcements, which were afterwards sent out. In the latter despatch, Sir Bartle Frere was merely told the Government had a confident hope that, by meeting the Zulus in a spirit of forbearance and reasonable compromise, it would be possible to avert war. There was no suggestion then that Sir Bartle Frere should not take the responsibility on his shoulders. When the Government received information of the delivery of the Ultimatum they did not condemn it; for in a despatch, dated January 23, they merely said that the communications previously received had not entirely prepared them for the course he had thought it necessary to take. The policy of Sir Bartle Frere had been ratified by the Government keeping him in office. [The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER: No.] It meant that they sanctioned the policy, but condemned what they now styled the hasty and indecorous way in which he had urged it on. The despatch of January 23 said—

> "In making these observations, I do not desire to question the advisableness of the policy which you have thought it necessary to adopt in difficult and complicated affairs, and I sincerely trust the policy you have adopted may prove successful."

From that date to the 19th March there was not a trace of any animadversion having been passed on Sir Bartle Frere; but after the arrival of the news of a military disaster, the Government had thought that they must do something to satisfy the public and to divert attention from themselves. He quite agreed with the remarks which had been made as to the inexpediency of leaving these grave issues to the arbitrament of pro-Consuls abroad; but the proper way of checking such laxity of administration was by a Resolution directed against the Government which permitted it, and not against the Governor, who only exercised to the best of his ability the discretion which had been left to him. He condemned the policy of which Sir Bartle Frere had been the willing instrument; but the responsibility did not lie with the agent, but with the principal. To sum up, Sir Bartle Frere had, in his office as High Commissioner, received very scant justice at the hands of the Government, and it was not likely that zealous and conscientious men would be found to fill similar offices in the future unless a different line of conduct was adopted towards them.

Colonel CHAPLIN said, that, having spent some years of his life in Natal and Zululand, he wished to say a few words upon the Motion now before the House. In the original draft of it, the hon. Baronet the Member for Chelsea had carefully confined himself to an expression of regret that the Ultimatum had been sent without the sanction of the Government, and so far he (Colonel Chaplin) was not disposed to disagree with him; but it should be borne in mind that there was something underlying it which conveyed a censure upon Sir Bartle Frere, which was in no wise merited. Again, the hon. Baronet fell into the mistake, than which nothing was more foolish and absurd, of contrasting the conduct of civilized nations with that of barbarous tribes. From his experience of the States of South Africa —and he had a vivid recollection of it— there existed there a feeling of great uneasiness among the White population of what might be their fate should anything be put into the heads of the Blacks that the Whites were not of a race vastly superior to themselves. The growth of any such opinion as that was the greatest and gravest danger against which they had to guard. This was a point which the hon. Baronet the Member for Chelsea had entirely overlooked. The great fear entertained by Sir Bartle Frere and the European population was that there might be a rising of the Natal Kaffirs in conjunction with all the Native Tribes surrounding the Colony. And what the consequence of such a rising would be in a country where the Blacks were to the White population in the proportion of about 13 to 1, he need not dwell upon. It had been proved by the Blue Books that Cetewayo had been endeavouring to excite the Black population for years, and the result of a general rising on their part would be the complete massacre of the White inhabitants, men, women, and children, and the annihilation of the Colony. And if that happened, what would be the fate of the other Colonies? The feeling of uneasiness to which he had already alluded so far from abating, had of late years largely and gravely increased, the chief cause of which was the continually increasing power of Cetewayo. He denied that, as stated by the hon. Member for Chelsea (Sir Charles W. Dilke), the Zulu military system was, for over 20 years, just as well prepared for war as it was now. When he was in Natal, 10 or 12 years ago, the Zulu Army was not nearly so formidable; but as the strength of his Army increased, the conduct of Cetewayo had been growing more overbearing and insolent. During the last 12 months the feeling of uneasiness at his conduct had been increasing so much along the whole line of Frontier that some of the settlers had absolutely fled from their homes. Such a state of things could be tolerated no longer if we desired to keep our Colonial Empire. Soon after Sir Bartle Frere arrived in the Colony, he wrote home to say he found "the state of affairs more critical than even he expected." These were significant words; and hon. Members who had no experience of savage races could only appreciate the situation which Sir Bartle Frere described by being suddenly transported from that House to Natal. It had not been denied that Sir Bartle Frere was a man of great experience and ability, and had won a deserved reputation by his previous services to his country. Being on the spot, he must be far more able to judge of the necessities of the case than people at home. Having faith in the ability of Sir Bartle Frere, and also in his perfect honesty of purpose, he felt bound to offer his stringent opposition to the Motion of the hon. Baronet. With reference to the military position, he agreed with the hon. and gallant General the Member for East Aberdeenshire (Sir Alexander Gordon) that a regiment of Cavalry would have been of the greatest use in the operations against the Zulus; and he was surprised, when the first appeal for reinforcements was made, that the Government had declined to send out any Cavalry. He thought, however, that the Liberal Government, which had disbanded the Cape Mounted Rifles, shared in the responsibility; and he believed that, at the present time, there could be no more efficient regiment for service in South Africa than that corps. In cases like the disaster at Isandlana the tendency was to find a scapegoat, and the one selected on this occasion, he regretted to say, was Lord Chelmsford. It was painful to approach this subject, for they must criticize the acts of the dead as well as those of the living. It was natural to throw all the blame on the General commanding, and in almost every instance it was right to do so if his orders were obeyed. Now, the hon. and gallant Member for East Aberdeenshire said that on the night of the 21st of January the Zulu Army was two miles from the camp at Isandlana. He could not tell where the hon. and gallant Member got his information from; but having carefully studied the Blue Books without finding any information as to the whereabouts of the main body of the Zulu Army, he came to the conclusion that it was much nearer 20 miles distant on that night. Anyone who had seen the Zulus on the path knew well the enormous distances they could travel without intermission. The first intimation of large bodies of Zulus was at half-past 7. Colonel Durnford arrived at half-past 10. The distinct orders left by the General were that Colonel Pulleine should "defend the camp;" and had those orders been obeyed, and not distinctly disobeyed, the disaster, which they all deplored, would never have occurred.

MR. W. H. JAMES said, the position of Natal differed from that of every other Colony. The House remembered how the subject of Confederation was discussed last year. The question with which they had to deal was not either who was to blame for the disaster nor how it was to be retrieved, but how they were for the future to deal with the Black races in South Africa, who, instead of dying out as the Whites advanced, as was the case in Canada and Australia, increased in numbers *pari passu* with the Whites. He should not have troubled the House had it not been for his Motion a year ago, when he proposed that the subject of our Native policy in South Africa should be investigated by a Royal Commission, not with the object of weakening Sir Bartle Frere's powers, but rather strengthening them. The conduct of the high officials in South Africa had been made the subject of strong animadversion. The right hon. Baronet the Member for Tamworth (Sir Robert Peel) had made a severe attack on Lord Chelmsford. As an Englishman, he must say it was a great mistake, whenever any great disaster occurred, to insist on having a victim. He did not know Lord Chelmsford; but after the explanations which had been made by the hon. and gallant Baronet the Member for Westminster (Sir Charles Russell), he should be the last man in the world to lay blame on Lord Chelmsford in the sense in which the right. hon. Baronet the Member for Tamworth had spoken. If it was possible for the men whose bones lay bleaching on the ground which was the scene of the late disaster in South Africa to speak again, they would be the last, he was convinced, to join in the blame which had been so unsparingly visited upon Lord Chelmsford. The position of Sir Bartle Frere was a very painful one. It was painful to find a man of the remarkable character and philanthrophic services of Sir Bartle Frere blamed for the war. He did not think he only was responsible. The blame, in his opinion, was rather due to the Government at home. The Government had paid too little attention to what was going on in South Africa a year ago. They must have known that the annexation of the Transvaal must inevitably kindle the most hostile feelings in the minds of Cetewayo and his warriors. He feared very much that missionary influence was at the bottom of these wars in South Africa, though all the missionary societies repudiated the idea of spreading Christianity at the point of the bayonet among savage nations. He certainly had no faith in the Christianity which was forced on a people by such means. They had already enough to do, and as they enlarged the mission field they would encourage not merely a civilizing and Christianizing influence, but promote the spread of a dangerous and mercenary spirit, place the lives of the Colonists in jeopardy, and endanger the Native races. It would be well in the future, if, instead of avenging disasters, we recognized the service rendered by men who prevented them by averting the misunderstandings out of which they arose—a service which had been effectively rendered, in relation to other tribes, by Mr. Percy Nightingale, who had recently returned to this country. If we had had peace in the Colony for 20 years, it had been largely owing to the wise and sagacious conduct of Sir Philip Wodehouse and Sir Henry Barkly. So long ago as 1842, an agreement was come to with the Zulus as to their boundaries, and the manner in which they had abided by the arrangement then made showed that they did not act aggressively. All this difficulty had arisen out of the annexation of the Transvaal, and the high-handed conduct we had since pursued. The encroachment of the Boers upon the Zulus had been the subject of the strongest animadversions by Sir Theophilus Shepstone, and Cetewayo had complained to us that we had not fulfilled our engagements to him to restrain the Boers. The oft-quoted declaration of Cetewayo, that he was governor and would kill, was mentioned in a despatch, accompanied by an inclosure, which came from Mr. Osborne, the magistrate at Newcastle, from which it appeared probable that excessive rum-drinking was mainly to blame for this outburst of threatening language. He hoped that when this unfortunate affair was settled and peace was restored, we should do at the Cape as we had done at New Zealand, where Maori wars ceased with the withdrawal of the Imperial troops. He was afraid this war was only another instance of the oppression of that spirit of independence which was the true heritage of peoples; and though, perhaps, it was not now possible to arrest it, he trusted that our statesmen and generals, recollecting that the Creator had made of one blood all the nations of the earth, would so conduct their mission into Zululand as to make it one, not of cruelty, but of mercy.

Sir HENRY HOLLAND said, that he need hardly express the regret which he felt in differing from those with whom he ordinarily acted, and for whose judgment he had an unfeigned respect. He regretted, also, to have to advocate that a harder measure should be dealt out to a Governor of tried ability, who was not present to defend himself. But the subject was one of such grave importance in the present and in the future that it was raised above the level of a Party question; and as to Sir Bartle Frere, he had so fully stated his defence, in many ably-written despatches, carried up to a very recent date, that one felt that all that could be said by him had been said. After the most anxious and careful perusal of the Papers presented to Parliament, he felt bound to express his concurrence in the terms of the Resolutions which had been brought before the House, except as to the words "without adequate preparation," which were apparently intended to convey a censure to the Government for not having sufficiently met the case and supplied Lord Chelmsford with troops. He entirely denied that any censure ought to be applied to Her Majesty's Government upon that ground, inasmuch as it appeared to him that they had done everything asked of them. They had been asked for troops sufficient to defend the Colony, and they sent out all that were asked for by the two officers at the Cape. They could not anticipate an act which plunged them into war, and, therefore, he could not help believing that the hon. and gallant Member for Renfrewshire (Colonel Mure) had really misconceived their case, and misunderstood their views. It was perfectly clear that the Government did not intend any offensive attack upon the Zulus. There was one point that might fairly be urged against Sir Bartle Frere in connection with the adequacy of his preparations, which was very important, as showing his determination for war. It would be well to call the attention of the House to the fact that he had pressed for troops; and on November 4, he received a telegram stating in substance that additional officers had been sent, but that no more troops would be sent. On October 17, 1878, the Colonial Secretary wrote him a despatch, expressing a confident hope that war might be averted, and added, "that the Forces at your disposal should suffice to meet any other emergency;" and that despatch Sir Bartle Frere should have received about November 20. The telegraphic despatch was received by him on 4th November last, at which date, therefore, he knew that no more troops would be sent; and on the 5th of that month he wrote, urging again that more troops should be sent. It appeared that in the meantime the Government at home had received further despatches, and had determined that more troops should be sent. Accordingly, in the despatch of 21st November, the Secretary of State for the Colonies announced that further troops would be sent. That despatch, however, did not reach Sir Bartle Frere until he had placed his Ultimatum in the hands of Cetewayo's officers on the 16th December last. He had acted, therefore, apparently, without having what was in his own judgment an adequate Force. The view which he (Sir Henry Holland) desired to submit to the House, and which he believed was clearly supported by the Papers, was briefly that, whether we looked to the past or to the future; to what had been done, or to what there remained to do; Sir Bartle Frere should have been recalled. First, as to the past; the Papers showed that he had sent his Ultimatum to the Zulu King without the sanction of Her Majesty's Government, without their having had sufficient time to consider the terms or the mode or time of delivering it. And, by that course, he had forced the hands of the Government, assumed the Prerogative of the Crown, and declared war upon his own responsibility, and against the wishes of the Government. He (Sir Henry Holland) held—and here he parted company with Her Majesty's Government—that for that act alone he should have been recalled. Wherever it was possible, he was fully prepared to admit that it was not only loyal but expedient for a Government to uphold their servants. He held that if a Governor in time of difficulty assumed a policy approved of by the Government at home, he should be upheld, though he might have committed errors of judgment in giving effect to that policy. So, again, a Governor should be upheld who, in like difficulties, had taken a course within his powers, but not altogether approved of by the Home Government. He would go further, and say that if, in the face of some terrible and immediate emergency, threatening danger to life and property, a Governor felt himself called upon to assume an authority beyond his powers, his policy should be approved, and he should not be recalled. The present case fell under the third head. It was not that Sir Bartle Frere had committed errors in carrying out a course within his powers; it was not that he had taken a course within his powers, but disapproved by Her Majesty's Government; but that he had adopted a policy beyond his powers. He had assumed the Prerogative of the Crown, and declared war without the authority of Government, without the existence of that terrible and immediate emergency which could alone have justified him in following that course. The onus was, therefore, upon him to prove the existence of such an emergency, and it was all the more necessary for him to do so in the present case as he had acted against the wishes of Her Majesty's Government, who sent out troops to defend the Colony, but not to attack Cetewayo. The Ultimatum which he sent to the Zulu King could only be justified by his clearly showing that there did exist an emergency of the kind referred to, and if he failed to show that, he failed to justify his conduct. Before the last Government despatch of the 19th of March was published, it was not known whether Her Majesty's Government were prepared to censure Sir Bartle Frere or to uphold what he had done; and those who supported the Resolution were therefore prepared to show that there was no such emergency. All doubt, however, upon this point had now been removed by the Government declaring that to be their view, and the opponents of Sir Bartle Frere were to that extent relieved from the necessity of proving that part of their case. However much the Government attempted now to explain away the censure passed upon Sir Bartle Frere in that despatch, it was clear that they agreed that he had taken a course against their views and without their authority. That being the case, after so grave an error as that committed by Sir Bartle Frere in declaring war without authority—a proceeding which was unprecedented in our Colonial history—he maintained that Sir Bartle Frere should have been recalled if there was any desire and intention to retain a proper and necessary check upon the action of our Colonial Governors. So much for the past. As to the future, his recall was in his (Sir Henry Holland's) judgment no less necessary, for the war yet remained to be ended, and the terms of peace negotiated. Her Majesty's Government had declared their confidence that Sir Bartle Frere "would conduct our difficulties in South Africa to a successful issue." The Colonial Secretary had made an able defence of the general policy of Sir Bartle Frere, and of what he had done in the Colony. He (Sir Henry Holland) did not propose now to discuss that policy; but he confessed that he looked with some hesitation upon it, and thought that perhaps it might be defined as a policy of annexation to please the Dutch malcontents in the Transvaal. On the other hand, he was not disposed to dispute the good work done by Sir Bartle Frere during the earlier part of his rule in South Africa. The present difficulty, however, with which Sir Bartle Frere had to deal was the conduct of the war, how to end it, and the terms of peace to be arranged. He thought that the Papers before the House furnished proof that Sir Bartle Frere was not the proper person to end the war, or to make peace; for he believed it might be shown that Sir Bartle Frere had misconceived his position as Colonial Governor, and that he had put forward grounds in defence of his conduct which were in no way sufficient, even upon his own showing, and highly-coloured as they were in his despatches. Those grounds would, in themselves, have amply justified a reference to the Home Government; they would have justified him in urging upon that Government the expediency of allowing him power to make conditions with the Zulu King, and to enforce the performance of such conditions, if necessary, by war. But he had put them forward as reasons for the course which he had taken, of declaring war at once upon his own responsibility. The Papers also showed that Sir Bartle Frere had grievously erred in the manner of making and sending the Ultimatum; and that he had acted with precipitancy and unstatesmanlike rashness. He had misconceived his position in this—that he appeared to think that all that was necessary to justify his action was to show, in the first place, that Cetewayo was a cruel despot, and that he had broken through certain promises made at his Coronation. Secondly, that raids had been committed on British territory, for which no reparation had been made. Thirdly, that settlers on parts of the disputed territory had been warned off and obliged to leave their farms. Fourthly, that the military organization of Zululand was a standing menace to the Transvaal and the Colony of Natal. But for the purpose of his argument, all that might be admitted. Admit, if necessary, that redress would have to be obtained; that some change would, sooner or later, have to be enforced on the Zulu Government; or assume, with Sir Henry Bulwer, that—

> "The relations of the Zulu Government with us could no longer, with safety, be left as they were."

Yet all those grounds were only sufficient to justify Sir Bartle Frere in appealing to the Home Government, and would not, in any way, justify Sir Bartle Frere in the immediate action which he had taken. They did not show that invasion was imminent, and that it was not possible to consult the Government before declaring war. That, however, Sir Bartle Frere failed to see, although the Government at home clearly admitted it. He would go further, and say that the examination of the Papers showed that not only was there no emergency which would justify the action taken by Sir Bartle Frere, but that, with tact and judgment, the war might have been avoided, at all events, for some time to come. Sir Bartle Frere had, according to the Papers laid before Parliament, done but scant justice to the Zulus and their King; he had not endeavoured to place himself in their position and to understand their wishes; while he had over-coloured and given undue effect to certain acts and words which were in themselves reprehensible, and, perhaps, required compensation and apology, but did not threaten immediate danger to Natal, nor justify the steps taken by him. In the last despatch from the Governor, of February 12, he had used the very remarkable words, "the die for peace or for war has been cast more than two years ago." Now, he (Sir Henry Holland) wished the House to consider whether that was really the case. Down to November, 1876, Cetewayo and the Zulus were on friendly and intimate terms with the Natal Government. Sir Henry Bulwer, on November 28, 1875, expressed his pleasure "at the satisfactory relations that have always existed between this Colony and the Zulus." In April, 1876, Sir Henry Bulwer was sensible that—

> "Cetewayo has always paid much attention to the wishes of this Government with regard to his relations with the Government of the Transvaal, and His Excellency has not failed to bring this circumstance under the due notice of Her Majesty's Government."

Such expressions would be found in several of Sir Henry Bulwer's despatches. In August, 1876, when the "recent conduct of the Government of the Transvaal had served to exasperate a restless and warlike feeling," Cetewayo sent a message that—

> "He had never taken steps without reporting them to the Natal Government, nor had he any wish to do anything not approved by that

Government. He asked leave now, as he had done before, to wash his assegais," [otherwise attack some other tribe].

On that occasion he was advised to keep quiet, and he remained so. And that happened over and over again. In September, 1876, he desired to take action and attack the Swazies, and, in compliance with the advice of Sir Henry Bulwer, he again refrained. It might readily be admitted that too much stress ought not to be laid upon the words and acts of Cetewayo, for he feared our power—he knew we did not want to annex—and he desired our alliance; he had attempted, to a certain extent, to play us off against the aggressive Boers; but still he was friendly in language and acts; and sufficient weight was not given by Sir Bartle Frere to that fact. In September, 1876, Sir Henry Bulwer remonstrated against the killing of a considerable number of young men and women—an act both brutal and cruel in itself, and also one which was in violation of the laws proclaimed at his Coronation by Sir Theophilus Shepstone. And here it might be convenient to make some observations as to what took place upon that occasion, for it seemed to him that Sir Bartle Frere relied too much upon the non-performance by Cetewayo of these laws; and he had been surprised to hear the Colonial Secretary say last evening that the Government were of opinion that we were bound to secure the fulfilment of those promises. On the contrary, he held it to be manifestly improper that any stress should have been laid in the Ultimatum upon the non-observance of those laws. Sir Bartle Frere, however, acted as if the Natal Government were bound to enforce them. But, in the first place, it was not correct to say, as he said in one of his despatches, that Cetewayo was made King in 1873 by the influence of the British Government, for in 1861 Sir Theophilus Shepstone had, by personal influence, induced Panda to nominate Cetewayo as his successor. He had been practically ruling for some years, and he would have succeeded Panda in due course, though Sir Theophilus Shepstone had not been present in 1873. No doubt, it was very much to the advantage of Cetewayo that Sir Theophilus Shepstone should be present at his installation, and assist in the ceremony, as Representative of a friendly and paternal Government—most important for him as regarded his position with the Zulus, and still more so as regarded his position with the Boers—but his presence was not necessary. Again, Sir Bartle Frere was wrong in stating that the making of those laws was a condition imposed upon the King by Sir Theophilus Shepstone, or, "a price required by the British Government in return for its countenance and support." Looking back at the share taken by him at the installation of Cetewayo, it appeared that the only condition made by him was that no Zulus should be killed at the time of the Coronation, and that no blood should be spilt while he remained in the country. There was, moreover, with respect to these laws which were made in Sir Theophilus Shepstone's presence, a rather curious point to be observed. Sir Theophilus Shepstone tells us in his account of the proceedings, that he, by Zulu law, represented Chaka, and was a Chief in the place of Cetewayo's father. In this capacity of Chief he had naturally great influence among the people, and at the Coronation, and just before the proclamation of these laws, he asked them publicly whether he did not stand before them in the place of Cetewayo's father, and as representative of the Zulu nation? So that, upon his own showing, he proclaimed the laws in question, not so much as the representative of the Natal Government, as the friend of the Zulu Chiefs. Again, he had no power or authority whatever to bind the Natal Government to the enforcement of those laws, nor was it then supposed that he had done so. Upon that point he (Sir Henry Holland) had the direct authority of Sir Henry Barkly, then Governor of the Cape Colony and High Commissioner, who had permitted him to state positively that it was never for a moment supposed that the Natal Government was bound to see to the performance of those laws. And that view was clearly confirmed by the despatch of Sir Benjamin Pine, then Lieutenant Governor of Natal, who, when sending, in 1875, an account of the proceedings of Sir Theophilus Shepstone, wrote—

> "He has succeeded in inducing the King to alter some of the fundamental laws of his Kingdom in such a manner as to check cruelty. It is, indeed, likely that the new laws may not be strictly adhered to; but their promulgation will, doubtless, work ultimate good."

Sir Benjamin Pine contemplated, therefore, the non-observance of the laws; but he never hinted that there was any obligation or right which bound the Natal Government to enforce their observance. It appeared to him (Sir Henry Holland) that the Secretary of State for the Colonies was right in his despatch of December 31, 1878, when he said—

> "The power of imposing obligations upon the Zulus, in matters relating to their internal government—which Sir Theophilus Shepstone, somewhat unexpectedly, found to be attributed to him at Cetewayo's Coronation—was rather a concession on the part of the Zulus to his personal influence than a recognition by them of the authority of the Natal Government."

In truth, therefore, the Natal Government had a strong moral right to remonstrate, but no right to interfere by arms to enforce the observance of the laws. And the fact of Cetewayo's non-observance of these Coronation laws was no proof of hostility to the Natal Government. To return to the summary of events. In November, 1876, in answer to Sir Henry Bulwer's remonstrances for killing the young men and women, came the hostile message so much relied upon by Sir Bartle Frere, and dwelt upon in the course of the debate. No doubt, in this message Cetewayo says—

> "He will kill—that it is the custom of his nation; that his people will not listen to him unless he kills; that he shall not agree to any rules or laws from Natal, though wishing to be friendly with the English; that the Governor of Natal and he are equal—he is Governor of Natal, and I am Governor here."

And he complains that the English will not allow him to fight. No doubt, also, Sir Henry Bulwer reports that at this time he "evinced a great desire for war." But, in the first place, the men he wished to fight were the Amaswazi, or the Boers, and not the English; and again, if too much stress should not be laid upon his words of friendship, too much should not be laid upon this message, whether it was, as the hon. Member for Gateshead (Mr. James) had pointed out, attributable to the influence of rum, or to a sudden outburst of temper. This was only fair to the Zulu King, and for the following reasons: — First, because, in fact, he did not carry out his threats to wash his spears, but again yielded to the counsel of the Lieutenant Governor. Secondly, because his statement of independence was strictly correct, Panda having been formally recognized as an independent Sovereign by the Natal Government when Natal became a British Colony. This had been frequently admitted by Sir Theophilus Shepstone, and especially in a carefully-prepared memorandum of June 25, 1876, in which the history of the disputed territory and of the Zulus is clearly stated. It was perfectly impossible to understand how, in the face of the reiterated statements of Sir Theophilus Shepstone that Panda was declared an independent Sovereign, it could be said that the Zulu King was in any way dependent on the Government of Natal. And he (Sir Henry Holland) must here call the attention of the House to the great difference between the views taken by Mr. Shepstone, Native Secretary of Natal, who, by his great tact and ability, kept the Natives quiet and contented for so many years, and attained such just influence over them, and those of Sir Theophilus Shepstone, Administrator of the Transvaal. The difference was most marked, and he (Sir Henry Holland) appealed from the judgments and statements of Sir Theophilus Shepstone of the Transvaal to those of Mr. Shepstone the Natal Secretary of Native Affairs. And the more hon. Members looked into the Papers, the more they would see how much he had been influenced by the change of position. Another reason why the hostile message of Cetewayo, in November, 1876, should not be dwelt upon too much was—and this was very important—that since that message had been given he had resumed a distinctly friendly attitude towards the Natal Government, though not so friendly an attitude as he held before. Sir Bartle Frere was always recurring to that message, and, indeed, attached far too much importance to it from the first. But he (Sir Henry Holland) begged the House to note what had been the conduct of Cetewayo since it was delivered in 1876. In January, 1877, Sir Henry Bulwer reports that Cetewayo had sent "a tolerably satisfactory" reply to the message respecting certain Zulus crossing the boundary and carrying off a Zulu girl; and the messenger reported that Cetewayo was kind and the country quiet. Again, in March, 1877, though he was displaying great hostility to the Boers, he handed over to the Government of Natal a Zulu accused of murdering a White man in Zululand. That was done of his own accord and free-will, and not upon any demand made by the Natal Government. The Transvaal was annexed on 12th April, 1877, and it was important to observe Cetewayo's reply to the announcement of the annexation. He says—

> "I thank my father for his message. I intended to fight the Dutch and drive them over the Vaal. It was to fight the Dutch I called my armies together; now I will send them back again."

And he did, accordingly, disband his Army. Was it fair, or just, then, in Sir Bartle Frere to say that "the die for war or peace was cast in 1876?" No doubt, subsequently, Cetewayo became restless and uneasy at the change of position, and began to distrust his old friend Sir Theophilus Shepstone and the English in the Transvaal. The position was so clearly recognized and stated by Sir Henry Bulwer, that he would venture to trouble the House with an extract from one of his despatches to Sir Bartle Frere—

> "Then followed the annexation of the Transvaal, an act the immediate bearing of which they were unable at first to comprehend, but which they soon perceived had essentially altered the position. . . . It was an act that filled them with surprise and disappointment, followed up by a feeling of disquietude on their own account, for a report got abroad that the annexation of the Transvaal would be followed by the annexation of the Zulu country. Moreover, the redress which they had so long, and it must be admitted so patiently waited for, of their alleged grievances against the Transvaal Boers seemed further off and more hopeless than ever. . . . It is this matter which has been uppermost in the Zulu mind ever since the annexation; and their fear has been that the English, to whom they had for years been bringing their grievances against the aggressions of the Transvaal, should now turn round and confirm these aggressions in their own favour."

This fully accounted for the threatening attitude adopted, in October, 1877, toward the messengers sent to Cetewayo, who had by that time begun to distrust the English. No doubt, in November, 1877, matters were critical. The Indunas and Cetewayo were more bitter in language against the Boers and Sir Theophilus Shepstone about the disputed territory. But this was not to be wondered at, as no steps had been taken to re-assure them. However, in December, 1877, Sir Theophilus Shepstone did not, as he says in one despatch, anticipate any overt attack. And now he (Sir Henry Holland) came to a very important part of the case——namely, the effect produced upon Cetewayo by the offer of arbitration made to him in December 1877, and accepted by him, as Sir Henry Bulwer reports, "in a proper spirit." It appeared that this offer had produced a great alteration in the King's mind, for the messengers who delivered it reported that "it seemed as if it had lifted a weight from his heart;" and he said—"The words you have brought me are good words." That offer seemed to have "entirely changed his tone and temper," as was reported by other messengers sent early in 1878, who said—"It was Cetewayo, but Cetewayo born again." He was apologetic and courteous. These were not, then, mere suggestions of the men who brought Cetewayo's reply to the offer of arbitration; for the messengers, Sir Theophilus Shepstone, and Mr. Dunn, all agreed in the fact of the change which had taken place in Cetewayo's tone and manner, and attributed it to the fact that he had received Sir Henry Bulwer's message of peace. Again, in May, 1878, he expressed satisfaction at the way in which the inquiry as to the disputed boundary had been conducted; he pressed for a speedy settlement, as the Zulus wished to re-occupy the lands they never parted with, and he said he saw he was the child of the Natal Government, and that their desire was to do him justice. Now, how could Sir Bartle Frere speak of the die of war as having been cast two years ago, when it was clear that in May, 1878, Cetewayo was again assuming his former friendly tone, and had again admitted that the Government of Natal was a paternal Government? The statement, in his opinion, was perfectly monstrous. Now, doubtless, about that time, there were parties of armed Zulus warning off settlers on the disputed territory south of the Pongolo; but those movements were also fully explained by Sir Henry Bulwer in his despatch of August 12, 1878, in which he says—

> "There has been, I think, a good deal of misconception and exaggeration in the matter. What action of the Zulus has been taken since the Commission sat has, I believe, been taken with the object of preventing the subjects of the Transvaal returning to their farms in that portion of the disputed territory from which they retired in December last when a collision seemed inevit-

> able. After the Commission had concluded its inquiry at Rorke's Drift, some of the Transvaal subjects made an attempt to return to the lands which they had formerly occupied in this portion of the country; and this was a disturbance of the *status quo* which irritated the Zulus, who, looking upon it as an attempt on the part of the Transvaal people to re-establish themselves in the country, determined to resist it and to maintain the assertion of their own claim."

That was just the case; the Zulus were not at all desirous that the farmers should prejudge the award before the Commissioners had sent in their Report. Why were the Dutch farmers to go and settle on the land in dispute? It was most important to Cetewayo not to allow them to settle there, and thus attempt to establish any rights. Sir Henry Bulwer continued—

> "We must not forget, if the action of the Zulus has of late been of an aggressive character, that it is aggression by those who hold themselves to be the aggrieved, and that it has been in vindication of Zulu rights suffering injury from alleged Transvaal aggression."

Surely they might set the calm and well considered judgment of Sir Henry Bulwer thoughout the case against the highly-coloured and exaggerated statements and views of Sir Bartle Frere. In July, 1877, there was the raid—as it is called—by Sirayo's sons upon British territory, and the carrying off of two Native women, upon the character of which raid, and the importance to be attached to it, he (Sir Henry Holland) would make some comments later on. Again, in October, 1877, two more outrages were reported. First, the seizure and detention, for two or three hours, of Messrs. Smith and Dighton; and, secondly, the proceedings in the territory north of the Pongolo, to both of which he would refer hereafter. No doubt, again, about that time, Cetewayo was collecting his troops. What was the reason for this? In his despatch of October 6, Sir Bartle Frere admitted that the movement of troops in Natal caused great anxiety to Cetewayo; and in this he was confirmed by Sir Henry Bulwer, who, several times, deprecated that movement as likely to cause Cetewayo to suspect the honesty and justice of our proceedings. This was also confirmed by Mr. Dunn, who had lived in Zululand, and knew every thought and turn in Cetewayo's mind; by Sir Theophilus Shepstone; and by one important witness, the Induna Uhamu, who, in November, 1878, when sending a friendly message to the English, desired the messenger to say—

> "That Cetewayo had not called his people together to commence war, but only to put everything in order to be prepared to resist the Government Forces when they came to invade his country, because he is afraid, seeing so many troops approaching his country from all sides."

Now, if Cetewayo had said that, it might have been urged that it was all nonsense, and an attempt to throw dust in our eyes. But it was made known to Sir Bartle Frere, in November, 1878, by a powerful Chief disaffected to Cetewayo and friendly to the English. That brought us down to the month of November, when Sir Bartle Frere had made up his mind to send the Ultimatum—in other words, to go to war. Now, if the summary, which he had laid before the House, was correct—and he was satisfied that the closer the examination of the Papers the more would its correctness appear—it showed that Sir Bartle Frere had laid far too much stress on the single message of November, 1876, and had not given sufficient consideration to the acts and conduct of Cetewayo since that date; that there was no danger of immediate invasion; that Sir Bartle Frere had over-coloured the state of things; and that he had far too hastily assumed that there was no chance of coming to terms with the Zulus. And the grounds which he had put forward in defence of his action failed him when fairly considered. He would just state the different grounds put forward by Sir Bartle Frere for sending the Ultimatum. Take first the raid on British territory by Sirayo's sons. No doubt, it was a serious outrage; but it had not been previously sanctioned by Cetewayo; it was not in the nature of an organized attack; it was not likely to be repeated, and it was not in any way an act of hostility to the English; a semi-apology had been given, and compensation had been sent. True, it was only £50; but that sum probably appeared to a Zulu King to be a more substantial sum than it did to the Natal Government. And, lastly, it could in all probability have been peaceably settled, had not the demand for a settlement been coupled with a demand for the extinction of the Zulu Government. Now, the point with regard to the threats to the farmers had already been disposed of, as he had pointed out, by the explanation of Sir

Henry Bulwer. There was exaggeration and misconception as to these proceedings. The Zulus feared that the Boers were prejudging the award, and they took action to maintain their rights. The claim, afterwards made by Sir Bartle Frere—that the occupation rights of these settlers should be allowed by the Zulus—afforded, in truth, strong ground of justification for these proceedings. Take, again, the state of things in the territory north of the Pongolo. That was also explained by Sir Henry Bulwer, in Blue Book 2242, page 88, where he said—

> "Then, across the Pongolo, there is another question arising out of the conflicting claims between the late Government of the Republic and the Zulus as to the relations in which they respectively stood towards the Amaswazi; and, whatever the merits on either side may be, it is certain that the claim of the Zulus dates many years back, whilst those of the Transvaal Government are comparatively recent. . . . With regard to this matter also, it is not a question now first raised by the Zulus; it is one the existence of which was recognized by Her Majesty's Government before the annexation."

The proceedings involved no threat or danger to Natal, and were no proof of hostility to the British Government. As to the attack on Messrs. Smith and Dighton, he was astonished to find Sir Bartle Frere attaching any importance to it. Both Sir Henry Bulwer and the right hon. Gentleman the Colonial Secretary agreed in thinking it a very slight matter; and he would, therefore, not condescend to notice it any further. But it was urged by Sir Bartle Frere that Cetewayo was getting up a combination of Natives against the White men. Of that there certainly appeared to be no direct evidence, and he thought Sir Bartle Frere had lent too ready credence to reports. Sir Henry Bulwer, as late as June, 1878, disputed the fact, and in his despatch of 12th June he said—

> "So far as I can offer an opinion to your Excellency upon this point, I would say that hitherto there has been nothing to show that what has taken place in different parts of the country are portions of any general combination movement or understanding among the Natives. . . . To some extent, whatever is passing in one part of the country, and with one tribe, will affect other tribes in other parts, perhaps unsettling or exciting them, perhaps only interesting them. But there has been nothing as yet to show that what has taken place up to this has arisen from or has been a part of any general combination or movement."

There could be but little doubt that Sir Bartle Frere, in his heated imagination, had conjured up that combination of Cetewayo and the Native troops against the Whites. Lastly, there was the fact of the collection of armed Zulus not far from the Frontier; and that, in truth, appeared to be the only ground for fearing invasion or direct danger to the Colony of Natal. But first, Sir Henry Bulwer, in a despatch of September 30, 1878, said—

> "The maintenance of a standing and well-organized Army is according to the custom of the Zulu nation, which in all its traditions and instincts is warlike, and does not in itself prove that there is any set purpose of aggression in the mind of the King."

He goes on to admit, as we all must admit, that this consideration did not remove the cause of danger that a large standing Army in a savage nation must always be to its neighbours. And, secondly, it was clear, as he (Sir Henry Holland) had before pointed out, that the regiments were collected for the purpose of defence, not for attack. Cetewayo and his Chiefs firmly believed that they were to be attacked by the English. It was then not only natural, but laudable, that they should unite to defend their country. On such a question as this, the same standard applied to Zulus as to Englishmen. They loved their country as much as we did ours. Should we not have rallied round our Sovereign to defend our Borders if threatened? Let us be just to the bravery and patriotism of the Zulus, although they were opposed to us. It could not be doubted that Cetewayo and his Chiefs feared invasion. Why, therefore, should they not have collected their Forces? Had they not done so they would have been unworthy the name of patriots. Moreover, was there not good reason to hope that, if the award had been sent alone, Cetewayo would have disbanded the troops? He did so in 1877 after the Transvaal was annexed, and when he was thus freed from the fear of the Dutch; and he (Sir Henry Holland) thought it more than probable that he would have immediately disbanded his Forces when he was freed from the fear of any attack on the part of the English, and when he saw that they desired to act justly by him. We had seen the effect produced on him by the mere offer of arbitration—would not the actual award, and the handing back to him of territory wrongfully taken from him, have pacified him? Sir Bartle Frere admitted in one of his despatches that Sir Henry Bulwer, and many persons of experience in Natal, hoped that such a proof of our desire to do impartial justice would satisfy the Zulus. Again, Sir Bartle Frere dwelt far too much on the bloodthirstiness of Cetewayo, and his desire to "wash his spears." But, first, it was not against us that he desired to wash them. As the hon. Baronet the Member for Chelsea (Sir Charles W. Dilke) pointed out, if Cetewayo wanted to wash his spears in our blood, he would hardly have asked our permission to do so. And, further, if he was so intent upon attacking us, why did he not do so during the Transkei War, or on some other of the "favourable opportunities" to which Sir Bartle Frere refers in one despatch, and when the Colony was denuded of troops? Sir Bartle Frere had a most extraordinary way of accounting for that fact. He said it was owing to the "half-heartedness of a suspicious barbarian despot." But if Cetewayo was half-hearted in 1877, and if he feared to attack then, when the Colony was denuded of troops, why should he have become whole-hearted in 1878, when the Colony swarmed with troops? Was he more whole-hearted because, as clearly shown by the Papers, his Chiefs had become more disaffected? Suspicious he was at the end of 1877; but would not his suspicions have been put to rest if he had been dealt with fairly, and if he had seen that we desired to do justice, and not to attack either his land or himself? He (Sir Henry Holland) contended that there was nothing to justify the precipitate action of Sir Bartle Frere. It was possible that war might have been avoided altogether by tact and judgment, and it would seem that Her Majesty's Government were of that opinion; but whether it could or could not was not the question before the House—which was whether Sir Bartle Frere was justified in forcing an immediate war upon the Zulus, and also whether our confidence in him must not be shaken when we considered the grounds he had put forward for such immediate action? There existed also other reasons why, in his (Sir Henry Holland's) judgment, confidence in him must be shaken, and he desired to point them out to the House as briefly as possible.

He asked the House, in the first place, to consider the impolicy and unfairness of coupling the Ultimatum with the award. What was our position in 1878? The Transvaal had been annexed, and as it had been said, and as it would be said during the debate, that that annexation had led to the mischief, and as he (Sir Henry Holland) had supported the annexation, he begged to be allowed to interpose a few words on that point. We annexed the Transvaal because, in spite of repeated remonstrances, the Boers persisted in aggressions on the Zulus, which led to collisions of a serious nature; and as the Boers were at that time utterly bankrupt and insolvent, and had been beaten in action by the Natives, there was every danger of the latter feeling that they were getting the better of the White man. If this feeling spread, there was great danger to the peace of Natal. But, having annexed the Transvaal, our first duty was to hand back any land which had been improperly taken; and if Sir Bartle Frere had done this in a friendly and just manner, the annexation of the Transvaal would have been a step towards peace and safety. He had failed to do that; but for his conduct those who advocated the annexation were not responsible. Well, the offer of arbitration had been thankfully received by Cetewayo in December, 1877. In October and November, 1878, the King and his Chiefs were in great alarm of invasion, and troubled at not hearing anything of the award and final settlement of the question of disputed territory. The Zulus were doubtless disturbed by the "law's delay," for, unlike us, they were not accustomed to it, and they believed we had held out to them false hopes. It was clear that there existed about that time an important party amongst the Zulu Chiefs who, together with a great number of the people, were disaffected towards Cetewayo, and our first object should have been to endeavour to secure those people upon our side. Had we presented the award and allowed it to be fully understood by them that we intended to do justice, we should have secured them. It was only necessary to convince them of our justice, and that we neither intended to attack them nor encroach upon their territory. The award should have been sent, as Sir Henry Bulwer advised, with a friendly explanation; time should have been given for the Chiefs and people to understand the purport of it; it should have been allowed to sink into their hearts. It might have pacified Cetewayo, looking to his past conduct; but it certainly would have enlisted the Chiefs and many of the people on our side. But that chance had been thrown away by Sir Bartle Frere, most improperly and unjustly. He offered, with one hand, to give up land wrongfully taken, and with the other he presented conditions requiring the extinction of the existing Zulu Government. So that the message of peace was coupled with a message of war; and Sir Bartle Frere, instead of pacifying the Zulus, had brought about what Sir Henry Bulwer prophesied—that, if attacked, the Zulus would, in defence of Zulu soil, rally round their King to a man. Sir Henry Bulwer wrote strongly against coupling the award with the Ultimatum. It was true that finally, when he saw his superior officer determined on war, he expressed concurrence in the necessity of imposing some terms on Cetewayo and in the general terms of an ultimatum; but his despatch was guarded in several passages by such phrases as "it is considered," "it is said," and he did not anywhere, that he (Sir Henry Holland) could find, express any belief that it was necessary or urgent to send in such conditions, or, indeed, any conditions, without first consulting Her Majesty's Government at home. Again, Sir Theophilus Shepstone, as late as November, 1878, while agreeing to the terms of the Ultimatum, declined to offer any opinion as to the form which the communication should take, or the time at which it should be delivered. Sir Bartle Frere, in his despatch of December, 1878, admits that there was a considerable party in Natal and at the Cape

> "Strong in numbers and intellectual powers, strongly opposed to coercion being employed in order to enforce compliance with our terms on Cetewayo."

So much for the impolicy of coupling the Ultimatum with the award. But further, this mode of proceeding was unfair to the Zulu King. It was right to make demand for reparation for the outrage committed by Sirayo on British soil; and 20 days were given to make reparation for this and for the other outrages. But how could Sir Bartle Frere expect reparation to be made when, at the same time, the King was called upon, within 10 days more, to assent to the extinction of the system of Zulu Government? It was noteworthy, also, in connection with the question of time, to observe that Sir Bartle Frere only extended the time at Sir Henry Bulwer's suggestion. It would hardly be believed that a Colonial Governor could call upon the King of a neighbouring country to assent in 15 days to the destruction of the existing system of his Government and to the disbanding of his Army. The 15 days were extended to 20 for the outrages, and to 30 for the extinction of the King's Government. The House would do well to mark the undue proportion of time allotted for the replies. Only 10 days more granted for re-modelling the Constitution of the country beyond the 20 granted in respect of those trifling outrages! He must beg the House, in the second place, to consider the conduct of Sir Bartle Frere with reference to the award itself. He had, from the first, done his best to whittle down the award—from the first he cavilled at the Report of the Commissioners. He found fault with the reception of some evidence, and with the rejection of other evidence and documents. The hon. and learned Member for Cambridge (Mr. Marten) had defended this conduct of Sir Bartle Frere; but he forgot to observe that the First Commissioner was not a military man, who however skilled in defining a boundary would not be skilled in legal technicalities, but an experienced barrister—the Attorney General of the Colony of Natal. However, Sir Bartle Frere argued against his decision with as much vehemence, if not with so much knowledge of the law, as the hon. and learned Gentleman the Member for Cambridge. Again, Sir Bartle Frere took up another extraordinary position with regard to the award. He proposed to hand over the Sovereignty of the land to the Zulus, but to deprive them of the occupation. He insisted on Cetewayo acknowledging the rights of the farmers who had settled on the land when it was wrongfully held by the Transvaal Government. He treated the question—and he (Sir Henry Holland) was astonished to hear the hon. and learned Member for Cambridge do the same—as if it were a question of cession of territory; as if the rights of the farmers had been acquired from persons legally entitled to grant such rights. Sir Bartle Frere spoke of the Sovereignty of the Transvaal; but the Transvaal Government never had any Sovereignty there. They were simply wrong-doers. If the farmers had any claims at all, they were against the Imperial Government or the Government of the Transvaal. But Sir Bartle Frere assumed that they had rights against the Zulus. Was there ever a more monstrous proposition than that practically advanced by the Governor? It amounted to this—"A man comes and, despite my protests, squats upon a field which has been temporarily taken from me by a wrong-doer. The law decides that the field is mine and always was mine, and yet I am called upon to admit the right of the squatter to continue his occupation." Those facts, and many others with which he could not venture to trouble the House, whose indulgence he had already tried too long, showed, to his mind, a determination on the part of Sir Bartle Frere to force on a war and to subdue Cetewayo. What had influenced him in that course? It was very important to inquire into this, as showing what would be likely to influence him if he remained in the Colony. He believed the state of the case to be as follows—First, that Sir Bartle Frere had a strong desire to secure the object—a very proper object—for which he was sent out as Governor—namely, the Confederation of the States of South Africa. He knew full well that this could not be secured until the Native questions were settled. The Cape Colonists would never consent to confederate with Natal till the Zulus were subjugated: And, secondly, he had a keen desire to propitiate the Dutch malcontents in the Transvaal and to put an end to our troubles there. Many passages in his despatches showed how deeply this influenced him. In support of this view, it was sufficient to cite from one despatch of November 5, 1878—

> "But even if there were any hopes of real peace by deferring a settlement with the Zulus, it is quite impossible to hope for a solution of our difficulties in the Transvaal, till the people of that country are assured that we have some better reason for abstaining from coercing the Zulus than a sense of our inferiority and weakness."

This feeling accounted for his determination to protect the occupation of the Dutch settlers in the disputed territory to which he (Sir Henry Holland) had already referred, and for the gallant but illegal defence of the farmers, whose views he had adopted in all his dealings with the Zulu people. Thirdly, he seemed to have given a too ready credence to the stories of the Norwegian missionaries, who had said to him that—

> "Nothing less than the disarming of the Zulus—the breaking up of their military organization, and the appointment of a Resident, will, in our opinion, settle the Zulu question satisfactorily."

That was the first mention to be found in the Papers of those definite points; and it was very curious to note that from that time the phrases "disarmament of the Zulus," "breaking up their military organization," and "appointment of Residents" were constantly employed by Sir Bartle Frere, who seemed to have yielded a little too much to the language as well as to the opinions of the missionaries. It was admitted by the Government that Sir Bartle Frere had exceeded his powers and plunged the country into war without authority and with undue precipitation. Nevertheless, they still retained him in the position of Governor. He (Sir Henry Holland) saw in that concession to Sir Bartle Frere difficulty in the future and danger in the present. Difficulty in the future, because a precedent had been created which it would be hard to get over. For how could any Governor be recalled, if we allowed to remain in office a man whose conduct had been such as to deserve the severest censure ever passed on a Colonial Governor? No graver offence could be committed by a Governor than that committed by Sir Bartle Frere, in assuming the Prerogative of the Crown and declaring war without authority. Therefore, he asked, how could a Governor at a future time be recalled for a less offence, though his proceedings were injurious to the interests of the Colony over which he presided, and were opposed to the policy of the Home Government? And he (Sir Henry Holland) saw danger in the present, because, if he read the Papers aright, Sir Bartle Frere had failed to show that calm and dispassionate judgment which alone could carry us through these troubled waters, On the contrary, he had shown a partizanship, a haste and determination to go to war, which certainly did not qualify him to be the negotiator of peace. Moreover, his influence in the Colony must be materially diminished by the heavy censure passed upon him by the Government, despite all the excuses put forward by them on his behalf. How could the Colonists and others place confidence in one whom the Government had tied down so carefully—whose judgment they evidently mistrusted, though they gave him a chance to regain his position? One could not help reading between the lines of the last despatches of the Secretary of State for the Colonies, and seeing that, although the Government expressed confidence that Sir Bartle Frere would not hit anyone else, they took good care to tie his hands. To conclude, he (Sir Henry Holland) deeply regretted the course taken by Her Majesty's Government. This country prided herself, and justly, upon her Colonies spread all over the world, and upon her government of those Colonies. She prided herself, and he thought justly, upon her treatment and management of the vast number of Natives within her possessions, and upon her relations with Native Tribes outside those possessions. That proud position she had attained by dealing out evenhanded justice to all alike, of whatever colour, of whatever creed. If she failed to do this, if she swerved from the path she had marked out for herself, she must so far forfeit her proud position and diminish her influence and power of doing good. We must, therefore, view with jealousy any proceeding which tended to cast a doubt upon her honesty of purpose and love of justice. We must view with jealousy any attempt to palliate and soften down, even out of regard to the individual, any high-handed and arbitrary act of injustice, such as he (Sir Henry Holland) believed to have been committed by Sir Bartle Frere. For these reasons, he should have desired to see Sir Bartle Frere recalled. He had now only to thank the House for their kind indulgence, and again to express his regret at having to oppose Her Majesty's Government in that important case. But it was because it was one of such grave importance, both now and for the future, and because his personal conviction in the matter, whether right or wrong, was so clear, that he felt bound to lay aside all Party feeling, and to support the Resolutions.

LORD COLIN CAMPBELL*: Sir, what I have heard to-night has altered my opinion, which I formed during the debate last night—an opinion, too, which I think might be formed from a careful perusal of the Papers which have been presented to Parliament—namely, that Her Majesty's Government and the supporters of Her Majesty's Government are not prepared to exhaust in argument and debate all the reasons which they might allege in support of the course which they have seen fit to take in not recalling Sir Bartle Frere. Her Majesty's Government and the supporters of Her Majesty's Government are driven, in opposing the Resolution, to act at once on the offensive and the defensive in relation to Sir Bartle Frere. They are driven to act on the offensive, in so far as they vindicate the censure which has been passed upon him; and to act on the defensive, in so far as they defend what Her Majesty's Government have done in not following up that censure to the logical conclusion which is desired by those who sit on this side of the House. But Her Majesty's Government and the supporters of Her Majesty's Government are driven to assume even a more singular position, in so far as they are obliged to defend a policy on which but very lately they announced their intention to reserve their opinion. We have had some reasons from Her Majesty's Government why they do not recall Sir Bartle Frere. We have been reminded—we were reminded last night, by the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for the Colonies (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach)—that he is an eminent and distinguished public servant, that his career in India has been marked by conspicuous ability and devotion to the Public Service, and we have been reminded that his administration of the Cape Colony has been a most able administration; and I think the impression left upon the House was that Her Majesty's Government can find no one so well fitted to carry on the work which has been commenced in South Africa, and which, whatever may be thought of it, must be brought to some definite conclusion. But I venture to think that there is cogent and material reason why Her Majesty's Government have not recalled Sir Bartle Frere which has not been mentioned. We have heard a great deal about justice in this debate. The word "justice," and the expression "justice to Sir Bartle Frere" have frequently escaped the lips of hon. Members opposite. But has full justice been done to Sir Bartle Frere by Her Majesty's Government? I venture to say that Her Majesty's Government are not in a position to recall Sir Bartle Frere, and for this reason—that by doing so they would be committing an act of great injustice, not because the act would be of itself one of great injustice—I am far from thinking that; but because it would be an act of injustice when committed by Her Majesty's Government. Sir, Her Majesty's Government are responsible for the fact that this war has been commenced, and they cannot escape from that responsibility by casting on the shoulders of a subordinate the whole burden of the blame which in justice they should share. Ever since last autumn—the early part of last autumn—they have received warning after warning that great events and great difficulties were impending in South Africa. But they grasped or grappled with a situation of growing difficulty, and they allowed the country to drift, and at last to be precipitated, into a position and into a war which it is neither in the power of Parliament nor Her Majesty's Government to arrest or to control. But, nevertheless, it is a war which, if they had exercised due vigilance, if they had exercised due caution, they might have arrested weeks and even months before that despatch of the 23rd of January was written, which affirms that Her Majesty's Government, on the 11th of December, were not entirely prepared for the information which they had received. The right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State told us last night that they had received no information from Sir Bartle Frere previous to the 11th of December which would warrant them in believing that he contemplated an aggressive policy. I beg respectfully, and with all due deference to the right hon. Gentleman, to demur to that statement. On November 1 they received—Her Majesty's Government received—from Sir Bartle Frere a despatch in which there is an express and distinct allusion to a proposed Ultimatum. The High Commissioner informed the right hon. Gentleman that in the event of adequate reparation not being made for the violation of British territory, which he held had arisen out of the abduction of the refugee women by Sirayo's sons, it would be necessary—these, I believe, are the words of the High Commissioner—"to send to Cetewayo an Ultimatum which would put an end to pacific relations with our neighbours." Surely this was an intimation deserving of some speedy and special notice; but what did Her Majesty's Government do? They waited for three weeks before answering that despatch, and when they did answer it they took no notice whatever of his alarming proposal. The High Commissioner was informed that it was the intention of Her Majesty's Government to reinforce the Army in South Africa; and yet, while fully aware that the High Commissioner intended to take a step which could result in nothing else but war, which was but the preliminary and forerunner of war, and the prelude not to a defensive but to an offensive war, they contented themselves with informing the High Commissioner that it was not their intention to furnish him with the means of conquest and invasion—an expression which was utterly inadequate to place a veto upon a course designed not for conquest and invasion, but to exact swiftly and surely reparation for an offence, and bring matters quickly to an issue. Well, what followed? Twenty-three days after they received that telegram from the High Commissioner, which was referred to by the hon. Baronet the Member for Chelsea (Sir Charles W. Dilke), and which informed Her Majesty's Government that diplomacy and patience had absolute limits, six days after they received Lord Chelmsford's October memorandum, and Sir Bartle Frere's despatch of the 28th of October—both containing a distinct allusion to the possibility of the immediate commencement of operations. General Thesiger, in his October memorandum, C. 2220, p. 353, says—

> "Feeling the necessity of a personal inspection of the country and of the roads lying in the vicinity of the Zulu Border, and of judging for myself of the best means of defending it against Zulu attack, or of directing our own columns in the case of an invasion of Zululand becoming necessary, I proceed via Greytown," &c.

In Sir Bartle Frere's despatch of the 28th of October, p. 357, he says—

> "The Lieutenant Governor will probably follow this up with a reply to the message about the abduction and murder of the two refugee women, and he will remind Cetewayo of His Excellency's request that the matter should be referred to the Great Council, and ask whether this has been done."

And then he goes on to say—

> "It is possible that by these means hostilities may for a short time be delayed; but a final peaceful solution seems to be more hopeless than ever."

In paragraph 14 of the same page he says—

> "The unusual drought continues to present a serious impediment to the movement of even very small parties of men, and is, for the moment, a practical obstacle to offensive operations; but a few showers, long since expected at this season, may any day remove this obstacle."

Nevertheless, we have it on the authority of this despatch that Her Majesty's Government were not entirely prepared. But why did not Her Majesty's Government act? The case was urgent. The information of the 11th of December was one of the most alarming character. There was not an hour to lose if they wished to avert hostilities. Sir Bartle Frere's despatches deprecated delay. It was evident also that the commencement of hostilities did not depend upon the arrival of the reinforcements. Lord Chelmsford, in his memorandum to the Secretary of State for War, says, page 18—

> "Her Majesty's Forces are at this moment (including, I believe, those of the Transvaal) in the position intended by me to resist attack or to make a further advance if ordered."

On page 19 he says—

> "A defensive plan, however, cannot be considered as satisfactory unless there is the possibility of taking the offensive at the right moment. This I am doing my best to prepare for; and, so soon as my Native Contingent is mobilized, I shall be ready, so far as my limited means will allow, to enter Zululand, should such a measure become necessary."

It was evident that they would only arrive in time to find hostilities commenced. Why did not Her Majesty's Government telegraph? I ventured to put a Question to the right hon. Gentleman yesterday, and he told the House that he was not in position to reply by telegraph to the telegram received on the 23rd. But he could have replied by telegram on the 12th of December to the despatches received on the 11th. I have taken pains to ascertain the fact that it was possible to have sent a telegram to Sir Bartle Frere, which would have been in his hands on the 5th of January—one day before Colonel Wood's column crossed the Blood River, and six days before the General himself crossed the Frontier. But what was the course taken by Her Majesty's Government? They waited until the 18th of December, and on that day they sent a despatch—and it is remarkable that it was the first despatch which seems to have raised in the mind of the High Commissioner the faintest suspicion that he was acting without authority—which only reached Sir Bartle Frere the day before the fatal 22nd of January, and when it was too late to stop the columns. When I remember these facts, when I remember that Her Majesty's Government allowed precious weeks to be lost, and even months; when I remember that decisive language was never used, and that even in the despatch of the 18th December the threatened invasion was no more directly and unequivocally forbidden than it was directly and expressly sanctioned, I cannot record my vote in favour of the Resolution without expressing at the same time my opinion that in this case Her Majesty's Government have not shown that vigilance or used that caution which the case demanded, and that in censuring Sir Bartle Frere they have endeavoured to put entirely upon his shoulders the burden and the blame which they should have shared. Sir, in this instance, neither Sir Bartle Frere nor Her Majesty's Government have followed a precedent which they should have followed and remembered; and if I may be permitted to do so, I will bring it to the recollection of the House. In 1863 we were involved in a war with Ashantee. That war presents some analogy with the present; but as regards their origin at least there are some important differences, and not the least important difference is this—that the war of 1863 arose not because the Governor of the Gold Coast had seen fit to present an Ultimatum to the King of Ashantee, but, on the contrary, because the King of Ashantee thought the time had come when it was necessary to send an Ultimatum to the Governor of the

Gold Coast—that is to say, he demanded that certain of his subjects who had fled from what he was pleased to call justice should be given up to him. And what was the conduct of the Governor? He incurred that responsibility which a Governor must always be ready to incur. He vindicated the honour of the British flag, and refused to surrender those who had once set foot on British soil. His action was sanctioned and approved by the Home Government; yet it involved the Colony in tremendous danger, for we had at that time but a few hundred British soldiers on the Gold Coast, and these, with some thousand indifferently armed and ill-organized Native levies, were all that he had to depend upon in order to defend the Protectorate. But what followed? Remaining always on the defensive, as, indeed, he was bound to do, ever uncertain as to the movements and intentions of the enemy, the Governor was at length obliged to face the difficult question whether the circumstances did not warrant him in carrying the war into the enemy's country. I beg to remind the House how he carried the resolution he arrived at into effect. He applied to the Home Government for assistance; but he did more—he told them exactly what he intended to do with the troops when he had got them. And what was the reply of the Home Government? It will be found in a letter addressed by the direction of the Duke of Newcastle from the Colonial to the War Office. The principle of all military proceedings on the West Coast of Africa should be that of defence and not of aggression. It is upon this principle alone that the Governors are authorized to make war, and no invasion of neighbouring territories can be

> "sanctioned unless it can be shown that it is really a defensive measure, safer, less costly in blood and money, and more likely to be decisive in its results, than waiting for an attack which is being prepared, and which no peaceful measure can ward off without loss of that dignity and position which are essential to our security."

Sir, had such decisive language been used in the present instance, we would not now be involved in war, and Her Majesty's Government would have had no occasion to censure Sir Bartle Frere. With the permission of the House, I will return for one moment to the despatch of the 23rd of January. That despatch was written in answer to despatches received on the 11th of December, and also in answer to despatches on the 2nd, 10th, and 15th of January. Her Majesty's Government were consequently in possession of full information. They had had ample time to form and pronounce an opinion, and consequently Her Majesty's Government did pronounce an opinion. They expressed in that despatch no censure. They find "powerful arguments" in support of a policy the propriety of which they did not question. But what is the language of the despatch of the 19th of March? When that despatch was written, Her Majesty's Government had received full details of the disaster at Isandlana. It was not written in a moment of triumph, but of humiliation; it was not inspired by the spirit which attends success, but it was dictated under an overwhelming and overpowering sense of failure and national dishonour. Two months had elapsed since the Government were in possession of all the facts and all the arguments. Yet now, for the first time, they express censure, and they reserve their opinion of the policy of Sir Bartle Frere. The hon. Baronet the Member for Chelsea has pointed out that there arises a strong presumption from these facts—the presumption, namely, that Her Majesty's Government had gone within an ace of approving the policy of the High Commissioner, but had left themselves an opening for escape of which they availed themselves after they had received news of the disaster, and after the Resolution of the hon. Baronet had been placed upon the Paper. The right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for the Colonies said yesterday that the censure which was expressed in the despatch of the 19th of March was grounded solely upon the fact that the High Commissioner had sent an Ultimatum to Cetewayo without the advice of the responsible Advisers of the Crown. But Her Majesty's Government were in possession of that information when the despatch of the 23rd of January was written, and therefore censure should have been expressed in that despatch. Sir, I think there is no one—at least, amongst those who sit on this side of the House—who can entertain the shadow of a doubt that if, on the 7th of February last, instead of hearing that we had suffered a great and terrible defeat, we had heard that that gallant band of men who fought at Isandlana had beaten back the hordes by which they were surrounded, and if we had received intelligence that success had attended our arms in every quarter of the invaded territory, this despatch of the 19th of March would never have been written; but that henceforth it would have been open to Governors and High Commissioners intrusted with great and responsible commands to act upon the dangerous application of the maxim—dangerous, that is to say, when the lives of hundreds of men are at stake—dangerous when the fate of a Colony depends upon the issue—

> "He either fears his fate too much
> Or his desert is small,
> Who dares not put it to the touch
> To win or lose it all."

Sir, holding these views regarding the conduct of Her Majesty's Government and the character of these despatches—believing that Her Majesty's Government are in part responsible for the fact that an Ultimatum was sent to Cetewayo—it has appeared to me doubtful how far I could consistently support a Resolution which did not directly convey a Vote of Censure upon Her Majesty's Government. Sir Bartle Frere has been censured by the Government because he sent an Ultimatum to Cetewayo without the approval of the responsible Advisers of the Crown. Now, if there were exceptional reasons to justify the despatch of the Ultimatum, it might, of course, in those circumstances, be possible in some measure to excuse his conduct. But no one in this House can for a moment accept as evidence the arguments which Sir Bartle Frere has offered in his defence. He appeals to the authority of his commission from the Crown, and he defends himself by an appeal to that *suprema lex*, the law of self-preservation. As Her Majesty's High Commissioner, he had authority to repel an invasion, but he had no permission to invade. Neither can his conduct be upheld on the ground of self-preservation. If there were dangers to the Colony before the disaster of Isandlana, how greatly must not the danger have been increased after that terrible reverse. The position taken up by Sir Bartle Frere had not been justified by the event. It is because I think it of vital importance that Parliament should guard more carefully than the Government have guarded that Prerogative of the Crown which relates to the declaring war and making peace, and because it is essential that an emphatic protest should be made against the establishment of a precedent which would render the country never safe or secure from the danger of sudden and distant wars, that I shall vote for the Resolution of the hon. Baronet the Member for Chelsea.

COLONEL STANLEY: Sir, I do not think it is incumbent on me, or that it would be convenient to the House, that I should refer in detail to the points of Colonial policy which have influenced the action of the Government in the course of the proceedings which have formed the subject of this debate. It is all the more necessary for me to do so, after the full explanation which has been made by my right hon. Friend the Secretary of State for the Colonies. He has shown, it seems to me conclusively, the reasons why the House would not be justified in accepting the Resolution before us. But, although I do not propose to traverse the ground he occupied, it will be my duty, before passing to that which is my province in dealing with the Resolution of the hon. Baronet and the Amendment of the hon. and gallant Member for Renfrewshire, to touch upon one or two points, in order to correct some mis-statements which have been, of course, unintentionally, made. The hon. Baronet made a statement to the effect that Sir Bartle Frere had found the Colony in a state of peace, and that it became, under his High Commissionership, in a state of war. But it is hardly necessary to refer to the Papers to show that that view of the case is erroneous, and that, so far from South Africa being in a state of peace, there was an apprehension of grave danger in many directions. In 1876, Sir Henry Barkly reports that there were troubles in Griqualand West, and again, in the same year, he reports the commencement of troubles in the Transvaal with Secocœni, and he at that time suspected there was an understanding between that Chief and Cetewayo. In July, again, of that year, Sir Henry Barkly reports the commencement of the war between Secocoeni and the Transvaal, and he reports that danger threatened Griqualand West, and that it may become necessary for our Government to intervene. In the same month he reports that there was a rumour that

Cetewayo was endeavouring to bring about a combination of the Tribes, and that there was even then an understanding between the Zulus and the Basutos. Again, in September, Sir Henry Bulwer reports that Cetewayo was preparing war, and sounding his way towards effecting a Native rising against the White men. I do not wish to cite the authorities at length; but I cannot help referring to them in contravention of what has been stated by the hon. Baronet the Member for Chelsea, that Sir Bartle Frere succeeded to a Colony in a state of peace and left it in a state of war. I now pass on to the military Papers, which is the portion of the case with which I am specially connected; and I may here say I have placed upon the Table all those which have reference to the present war. I think that the first mention, so far as military considerations are concerned, of those circumstances to which I need allude is contained in Despatch No. 2, in which Lord Chelmsford, writing from Pietermaritzburg on August 23, speaks of various movements of troops; but this has reference merely to the disturbed state of Secocoeni's country; and Lord Chelmsford adds that he is unable to say that active operations against the Zulus were necessary, the general impression in the Colony appearing to be in favour of that opinion. The next of the military Papers is dated September 14, and in it the High Commissioner states that he has received a despatch from Lord Chelmsford, in which he points out that his views as to military requirements in the event of hostilities with the Zulus were that he should have a certain number of special-duty officers and the support of two regiments of Infantry, and that the presence of Cavalry would be of immense importance. That is the first point to which I desire to call attention; but, inasmuch as the hon. and gallant Member for Renfrewshire (Colonel Mure) has alleged that the war was undertaken with insufficient Forces, and has laid some stress on the want of cavalry, it is as well that I should refer to the Correspondence that has passed with regard to those subjects. I have carefully examined the sketch which General Thesiger at that time had framed with a view to possible hostilities, and I carefully examined every Paper, however indirectly bearing upon this question, and I am utterly unable to find that any reference was made to the necessity of having more Cavalry sent out. I should like to refer to a statement of Colonel Pearson which appears in one of the most recent Blue Books, in which, after he has had experience of the campaign, he points out with great force the reasons why he does not think that Cavalry should accompany his column. He says, as regards the composition of the Force, mounted men would be of immense value, yet, considering the large amount of forage that would have to be conveyed and the consequent increase in the amount of transport that would be required, it would be better that it should not form part of the column. Then, attention has been drawn to the memorandum commencing "In the event of the invasion of Zululand being decided upon." All I can say in reference to the memorandum is that, the Frontier being at that time in a somewhat disturbed state, the General Officer proceeded to the Frontier to examine the lines of defence, and, as he has said more than once, he undoubtedly felt it to be his duty to consider the possibility of defensive operations being turned into offensive ones. There is no question that, had he omitted to do so, he would have been guilty of a positive act of neglect, and he would, in the event of war breaking out, have found himself in the position of the French when, at the outbreak of the Franco-German War, they had maps of the enemy's country, but none of their own. The paper he prepared, however, was nothing more than a military sketch, setting forth the number of troops that would be required in the event of hostilities, and the manner in which they could best be utilized. I will pass over the Correspondence in which Lord Chelmsford points to the difficulties he found himself in with regard to transport, and will come to the time when, the Frontier becoming more and more disturbed, we were originally pressed by the Government at the Cape to send out further re-inforcements. We have been blamed for sending out inadequate reinforcements, and on this point I should wish to refer to the despatch which was received by us on the 1st of November, in which Lord Chelmsford expresses what he thought were the real requirements for the military defence of the Colony. It is true that before that time we had received information from the Government at the Cape that reinforcements might be desirable; but we had not thought it consistent with our duty to send them, because we were anxious to avoid doing any act that could in the remotest degree be regarded as indicating that we were desirous of plunging the country into war. On the 18th of October I forwarded a telegram to General Thesiger, informing him that it was not our intention at that time to send out more troops, but that we would send out the special-service officers, in order to remedy the defects in the transport; and, although not placing any actual restriction upon him, we requested him to keep down the expense of the transport as much as possible. A further application for more troops was replied to by my right hon. Friend the Secretary of State for the Colonies on the 21st of November, and by myself on the 25th of November. At that time my right hon. Friend and myself were in possession of further information that led us to believe that not only for offensive operations, but for the actual defence of the Colony, it would be necessary to send out additional troops. To show how groundless are the complaints which have been made as to the inadequacy of the additional Forces sent out, I will cite a passage from the memorandum which Lord Chelmsford sent to us, and will show how the requirements set forth in that memorandum were complied with. On the 29th of September Lord Chelmsford writes that the possibility of resisting a sudden raid in Natal appeared to him to be almost hopeless, and that he was afraid that this fact must be well known to the Zulus, and that the danger then to Natal appeared very great, through the encroachments and claims which had been made by Cetewayo. Now I call attention to this memorandum, because I think it shows conclusively the reason for which forces were sent out by Her Majesty's Government. It shows that, however tardily, in the opinion of some persons, they fully complied with Lord Chelmsford's request. Lord Chelmsford, in the conclusion of the memorandum, says he considers that for defensive purposes alone the Natal and Transvaal Colonies require three battalions of Infantry, in addition to what they have already got. The requirements of Lord Chelmsford were met by Her Majesty's Government in the reinforcements they sent out on the 6th of November.

COLONEL MURE: The Secretary of State for War would leave it to be inferred that the whole of the regiments were sent from England. Two battalions only were sent from England, and the third was taken from the Cape Colony, that Colony being denuded of all excepting Colonial levies.

COLONEL STANLEY: I am quite willing to make the matter more clear; but if the hon. and gallant Member will read the despatch, he will see that this is how Lord Chelmsford suggested the troops should be sent. The hon. and gallant Member for Renfrewshire (Colonel Mure) says we hesitated to send out a further reinforcement of troops, because we were then wholly occupied by the Afghan War. I do not know that we were fully occupied with that war, though while it was going on I think I should have been unworthy of the position I hold, if my attention had not been directed to the reinforcements which might be required there. I do not wish to shelter myself even under the supposition that because Lord Chelmsford did not ask for more troops, therefore we did not give him more. Lord Chelmsford was an able soldier, who had served in India, who could see what was going on in other places, and what demands were likely to be made upon our troops by these contingencies of war. He, therefore, as a chivalrous Commander, asked for as little aid as he could. On the 25th of November, 1,940 of Infantry, and 240 Engineers were sent to the Cape, which we considered a strong reinforcement. It was the duty of the Secretary of State to impress upon Sir Bartle Frere and Lord Chelmsford that, in supplying these reinforcements, it was the desire of Her Majesty's Government not to furnish troops for a campaign of invasion, but for the protection of the lives and property of the Colony. That, I think, explains clearly the position of affairs up to that date. Meantime, the state of the Frontier was gradually getting worse. Outrages had occurred, and the presence of the Zulu Army upon the Frontier was becoming more and more in the opinion, I believe, of almost all men, a standing menace to the prosperity and to the peace of the Colony. The mobilization of Cetewayo's Army was continually taking place under the pretext of hunting parties; but the men bore their shields, and there is evidence over and over again that the attitude under which the Zulu troops were mustered really meant war. I confess I find it difficult to reconcile the argument of last night, that we were blameable for not sending out sufficient reinforcements, with the statement that the Zulu Army was no menace whatever to our Frontier. As a matter of fact, we have sent out troops to the full number that we were asked for. The hon. and gallant Member for Renfrewshire said that despatch after despatch came from Lord Chelmsford, but they were never attended to; and he said, further, that absolutely no answer was made to the requisition from Lord Chelmsford until we were awoke by the disaster of Isandlana. With regard to that I shall have a few words to say presently; but where there is no telegraphic communication there is always a risk of error, of being at cross-purposes. It has been said that the Forces were considered as insufficient. I do not at this moment intend to go into that; but I will quote the words of Sir Bartle Frere in one of his latest despatches. He says that although a larger Force would lessen the chance of successful opposition, there was no reason to suppose that the Force at their disposal was too small for the task attempted; and then he gives the opinions of those who were most intimately acquainted with the Zulus and Zululand, the effect of it being that the military power of the Zulus was over-estimated, and that after an action or two the military system of the Zulus would collapse. There is always the possibility in these things of taking too sanguine a view. It is perfectly possible that even those best acquainted with the country, those upon whose opinion we have the best reason to rely, traders and others, might have formed in their ordinary dealings with the Zulus an insufficient estimate of the warlike character of that nation. What we have seen shows them to be a people of courage, remarkable not only among Black races, but among any race. Their agility, their fearlessness of death, and the manner in which, as one despatch points out, they advanced over their dead, mowed down, show that they are a military force worthy of opposition to our own troops. At the same time, the Force sent out was held by those most conversant with it to be sufficient for the operations in the field; and I must point also to this fact—that although one disaster has occurred, the recollection of which it will be difficult to efface from our military annals, that is the one and sole occasion on which, under any circumstances, our troops have been worsted. In all other actions the Zulus have retired even before a comparatively small Force. Some stress was laid upon the fact that the officers and men did not speak the same language; but in this connection, I hope the House will allow me to refer to a few words in the despatch in *The Gazette*, which will be in the hands of hon. Members to-morrow. In this despatch Lord Chelmsford refers to officers specially under Colonel Wood, and shows that the fact that they could not speak Zulu did not destroy their efficiency. It is clear, therefore, that this difficulty is disposed of; and I may refer to my gallant Friend, Lord Giffard, who won his Victoria Cross at the head of Natives who followed him in all directions, although they hardly knew a word of the command. Then there is another important factor which I must refer to in the composition of our Forces. I hope I may not be supposed to be trenching upon that feeling to which an hon. Gentleman on the other side lately contributed a classical name, when I refer to that feeling—the feeling which leads one to believe in the power of the White race. Even in the gloomiest times, that has been the bright side to which we could always turn with honour and with satisfaction. I will cite three cases which have come to my knowledge within the last few days. They seem to exemplify particularly that courage on which even small numbers may rely, and which has often made up for disparity of numbers. A short time ago I saw an account, not meant exclusively for my own eye, describing how a paymaster in charge of certain remittances passed through a hostile country from one column to another, escorted only by two Natives. Nevertheless, he proceeded without doubt and without demur, not hesitating in the slightest degree in his duty, although it was obvious that from the first his life was exposed to many risks. There came an alarm, and the two Natives thought discretion was the better part of valour. I am given to understand that, notwithstanding this, the paymaster went on alone; and although his journey was one of many miles, and he had to swim across two rivers and to pass through a bush which was infested with hostile troops, he persevered in his duty and carried on the supplies to the column. I will take another case, the facts of which can be vouched for by more than one person. In the fatal disaster at Isandlana two pathetic sights were seen. A blue-jacket, the servant of Lieutenant Milne, of the Navy, who was fighting against any odds, got his back to a waggon and kept off his opponents, laughing the whole time as if he were making a joke of the matter. I am sorry to say that that gallant man met with the common fate. In another case I heard of similar bravery being shown by a drummer-boy. In the action he was overpowered, and his last act was to thrust his sword into the face of one of his opponents. I do not wish to enter into these subjects in order to excite emotion; but these are no unimportant factors on which Lord Chelmsford could rely when he felt that men such as he commanded were good against odds which at other times might be overpowering. Now, Sir, I come to that which is to me a most painful and unpleasant duty, but which is no less on that account a duty to be discharged. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Tamworth (Sir Robert Peel), in the course of his speech to-night, entered first into a discussion of the general policy of the Government; then he proceeded to challenge the military policy of the Government, although the latter policy might have been discussed at a more fitting opportunity on the Motion of the hon. Member for Dundee (Mr. E. Jenkins). However, the right hon. Gentleman has thought it his duty to enter to-night upon a criticism, of which I do not complain in regard to its effect upon the Government, though I think it scarcely found an echo in the feelings of this House. But when he spoke of our military system as being unsound, I felt that if the right hon. Gentleman chooses to formulate a Motion on the subject at any future time, I should be glad to meet him upon that ground. He spoke of the position and the military policy; but he went on to denounce at a time like this the General Officer in command of the Forces, and all the officers in language such as I have seldom heard in this House, and which appeared to me to be more worthy of a meeting of the Commune than of the British House of Commons. The right hon. Gentleman cried for vengeance and military execution, whether on Sir Bartle Frere or Lord Chelmsford, and demanded such a hecatomb of victims as would hardly be equalled or surpassed even by those of which we have heard in connection with Cetewayo. But when he went on to say, with regard to this disaster at Isandula, that the blood of the men who died there was on the head of the General in command, I heard those expressions with surprise—I had almost used a stronger word—and I must ask the leave of the House for a few moments to touch upon that point, which otherwise I should not have approached. It is true, Sir, that my hon. and gallant Friend the Member for Westminster (Sir Charles Russell), than whom no man in this House is better qualified to speak of such matters, did not allow a moment to elapse after the fame of a brother-officer had been thus impugned, but gave an emphatic denial to the assertion, and protested against it. I believe my hon. and gallant Friend conclusively showed, in the opinion of the House, that the disaster was in no way attributable to Lord Chelmsford in the manner in which the right hon. Gentleman had endeavoured to fix it. I do not know whether it is necessary for me to turn to details which have been before the world. We have not hesitated, even in the darkest hour, to place the fullest information before the public, and to let them see exactly what has passed, whether it was good or whether it was evil. I have therefore but little to add, except that, though I speak with a feeling of natural reserve upon the subject, I am bound to go one step further than my noble Friend, Lord Chelmsford, and to say that, though the Court of Inquiry pronounced no opinion, and that he himself did not think it necessary to pronounce any opinion, nevertheless the circumstances were pretty clear that it was, to use the mildest term, owing to a neglect of his orders that the unfortunate disaster occurred. I wish to refer for a moment to the opinion given before the Court of Inquiry by the military secretary of Lord Chelmsford, who had been the means of sending the orders to the camp. He states that it never for one moment occurred to him that the Force left at the camp could have been insufficient for the purpose of defence. Some stress has been laid upon the fact that the camp had not been intrenched and the waggons not drawn up in laager; and though, for obvious reasons, we shall never know the whole truth as to the cause of the disaster, still I think it is perfectly evident that, whatever may be said, it was not to be expected that the course suggested should be followed by a Force in process of moving, and which, from the very rapidity of the attack, was prevented from assuming a proper position of defence. I pass on to another point, on which I am bound to defend my noble Friend, Lord Chelmsford. He was accused of having, after this disaster, after his return from the camp—and the accusation was spoken in no measured terms—of neglect of duty in having left the camp before daylight not sure whether his men were alive or dead. I am sorry to say that the fact shows that Lord Chelmsford knew only too well the customs of Zulu warfare; for it is an undoubted fact, established by the evidence of a deserter, as well as by corroborative testimony, that none were spared, and that there were no wounded left on the ground. Therefore, it was Lord Chelmsford's duty, as has been pointed out, to pass on to the defence of Rorke's Drift, and we know that he just arrived in time, and in no slight degree contributed to the ultimate defence of that post. The right hon. Gentleman went on to say that Lord Chelmsford was the first General whom he had ever heard of as being complimented upon a bloody defeat. I need hardly point out to the House what an abuse of language that is. I did not expect that such an attack would have been made, and I hope that, as in "another place," hon. Gentlemen would have been content to attack the policy of the Government, and would have left the personal question out of sight. Therefore, I have not with me the telegram to which reference has been made, and which I must, therefore, quote from recollection. But I remember it well enough to say that it contained no compliments upon a bloody defeat; but contained only an expression, if I may so, a womanly expression of sympathy with those who were in sorrow and suffering and of confidence in the bravery of officers and men. Something has been attempted to be made of a discrepancy of language between myself and my noble Friend in "another place" in an explanation given. Whether my noble Friend stated that the telegram was sent with the knowledge or with the concurrence of the Government I do not know; but I have never disavowed the sending of the telegram, and in similar circumstances I would send it again. The right hon. Gentleman has not thought it unfitting at this moment, when so much depends upon the feeling of confidence between the officers and men, and between the officers and the General in Command—he has not thought it unworthy of himself to abuse the great powers of his oratory to discredit, I would have almost said to blacken, Lord Chelmsford in the eyes of the world. He has spoken of Lord Chelmsford in terms to which I have already referred, and he has spoken of him in connection with the late despatch as a General who had no confidence in himself; but I venture to say, with regard to that despatch, that the right hon. Baronet has endeavoured to attribute to the words a meaning wholly foreign to them. It is very easy for us here to frame our words with care; but allowance must be made for one who had undergone such a strain of anxiety and such sorrow in seeing so many friends swept away from his side, and who was not only exposed to considerable hardships, but in great vicissitudes, and, therefore, had scarcely much leisure to write. Though I admit that it might bear the interpretation put upon it, yet I read that despatch of the 9th of February in a wholly different light. Lord Chelmsford lays before me his opinion that he thinks it desirable, in the view of further contingencies, to send out an officer of rank to South Africa without delay. He points out, further, that Sir Bartle Frere concurs in the recommendation that the officer should be competent to succeed him in the office as High Commissioner. I read that, not as has been attempted to be represented, as the statement of a man wanting confidence in himself, and therefore likely to lose the confidence of others; but I look upon it as the calm and dispassionate utterance of a brave man, knowing that he was running daily risks, not afraid of looking death in the face, and anxious only to place before us the contingencies he thought might possibly occur, and thus give the earliest warning in order that provision might be made. The House is fully aware of the provision that has been made to meet these requirements. I have defended Lord Chelmsford, but I have not gone into details as I otherwise might have attempted to do; but I have felt it incumbent upon me, both from my present position and from other causes, to endeavour to vindicate, as far as possible, the character of an officer whose reputation I believe has thus been unduly aspersed. I have endeavoured to give my contradiction to that aspersion. It is not only because I can speak of a friendship of over 25 years' duration—a friendship I was never more proud of than at the present moment; not only because I can refer to Lord Chelmsford's brilliant services in the Crimea, in India, in Abyssinia, in almost every part of the world where of late years active service was to be found; not only because in all those duties which he has discharged he has earned the love, respect, and esteem of those with whom he has been brought in contact; it is not only because the representations of officers who have been his superiors have invariably been in his favour; it is not only because those officers who have served with him, and whose opinions are valued in the country, have considered that if an officer were to be selected for the command in South Africa, Lord Chelmsford would still be the man to select; it is not only for these reasons, but because I feel, in face of the aspersions which have been made, the paramount importance that the imputations cast on the Commander-in-Chief of the Army in the Field should not go unanswered in the House of Commons, that I give them this positive denial. None of the accounts I have received from South Africa have expressed any lack of confidence in him by the Army in the Field; on the contrary, all the accounts I have received from South Africa incline me to believe that confidence in him has been in no way shaken. I have no right to state private letters or impressions; but this I can say—that I have seen and heard nothing which would in the slightest degree bear out the aspersions which persons in this country have thought it their duty to make, and I believe that Lord Chelmsford at the present time as fully possesses the confidence of those under his command as at any previous time. Now, Sir, I only wish to touch for one moment on the matters referred to by my hon. Friend the Member for Midhurst (Sir Henry Holland). I wish to do so merely because, upon the matter of policy, he has quoted the opinion of Sir Henry Bulwer as an authority against the policy of sending the Ultimatum to Cetewayo. In the despatch of December 12, and the inclosure therein sent by Sir Henry Bulwer, he says—

> "I have read and considered with attention the Minute of His Excellency the High Commissioner dated the 13th instant, regarding the terms to be proposed to the Zulu King after the delivery of the award in the matter of the disputed boundary question in common with certain others in dispute or in question between us and the Zulus, and more particularly in connection with the future relations between the British Government and the Zulu King and people, and with the future condition of government in the Zulu country. I beg leave to express my concurrence generally in the conclusions of the High Commissioner and in the terms which His Excellency proposes to lay down."

Sir Henry Bulwer continues, in paragraph 9—

> "The course of events during the last two years has so altered the position of British authority in South Africa, it has so multiplied our responsibility, and the political and the military situations have become such, that the relations of the Zulu Government with us and the condition of the Zulu country can no longer with safety be left as they are. It has now become a matter of positive necessity to do something. I fully concur in the views of His Excellency the High Commissioner, that we have the right and that we are bound to interfere in the government of the Zulu country, both for the safety of the British countries in the neighbourhood and for the safety of the Zulu people themselves."

In paragraph 24, he says—

> "The terms here mentioned are terms which I think the British Government has a right to make, and, if they are rejected, a right to insist upon. In respect of the mode of conveying these terms, they should, I think, be set forth as conditions deemed by the British Government absolutely necessary in consequence of the state of affairs in the Zulu country, and as such laid before the King and the Councillors and the whole nation for their due consideration. The proposals, however, are new, and aiming, as they do, at the root of the whole Zulu system of Government and being, as they are, for the good of the people, they are of an importance which deserves that they should be only known to and considered by the nation, and a period of 15

days from the date of the delivery of the communications to the Zulu Representatives at the Lower Tugela Drift will hardly be a sufficient time for this purpose."

As a matter of fact, the time was doubled. My hon. Friend the Member for Midhurst used an extraordinary argument, for he said that Sir Henry Bulwer, upon whose opinion he so much relied, had probably been overruled by Sir Bartle Frere. In those Minutes I find no evidence of his being overruled; and I think it a poor compliment to pay to the ability, or even to the conscience, of Sir Henry Bulwer, to say that in a matter of this description he allowed himself to be overruled. If the argument is to have weight, it much diminishes the authority with which Sir Henry Bulwer should be quoted on other matters. I have endeavoured to prove, though very briefly, upon the question of policy, that the state of affairs in connection with Cetewayo, which has been described as a state of peace, did not exist, and that, even in the opinion of Sir Henry Bulwer, it had become such as to render interference necessary. I have endeavoured to prove that the Forces we sent out were sufficient, in the opinion of competent persons, for the military operations which were contemplated, and that I should be willing to enter into the subject at some more fitting opportunity, such as the hon. Member for Dundee (Mr. E. Jenkins) proposes. I think I have sufficiently proved for the purpose of this debate that Her Majesty's Government have nothing to reproach themselves with, or to be reproached by others. With regard to the last point raised — namely, the comments upon what the Government thought fit to write to Sir Bartle Frere—the right hon. Member for the University of London (Mr. Lowe) has made merry over what he thought was a change of front on the part of the Government. He said that they were at first content to move the Previous Question, but that they had now taken other ground, and altered their form of reply. The answer to that is plain; the form in which the Motion stands in the Paper is one which the Government can only meet with a prompt and decided negative, and that is the course they have taken on this occasion. We certainly will not dispute with hon. Gentlemen opposite for what the right hon. Gentleman would call the monopoly of abuse. We are quite sure that there is no fear of its falling into disuse in their hands in respect of our Parliamentary proceedings. With regard to the observations concerning a subterranean agency, by which the change might have been made, I confess, for my own part, that, being only an observer, I am unable to trace any of the subterranean agency of which the right hon. Gentleman spoke, unless it be a private meeting between my hon. Friend (Sir Henry Holland) and the hon. Baronet the Member for Chelsea, which, I suppose, may have taken place in a room not far from this. Whether that was subterranean agency or not I do not know; but I do deny, with regard to the position of the Government, that there has been, so far as I am aware, any change whatever. It is said that the Government have changed their tone with regard to Sir Bartle Frere, and the noble Lord the Member for Argyllshire (Lord Colin Campbell) contrasted the language of my noble Friend in January with the language of the despatch in March. The answer to that is plain, for my right hon. Friend at the time of the receipt of Sir Bartle Frere's despatch in January was not in possession of the further information for which in December he had written to Sir Bartle Frere. That information arrived in this country between the two dates, and it was in consequence of the facts which Sir Bartle Frere had to urge in explanation of his conduct that the despatch of my right hon. Friend in March was written. It has been said that we are inconsistent in the terms in which we have expressed our views with regard to the conduct of Sir Bartle Frere in the Ultimatum. Whatever language may have been used, Her Majesty's Government endeavoured to indicate the lines upon which his policy was to be governed. We felt it to be our duty plainly to indicate the points upon which we disagreed with Sir Bartle Frere, and the lines within which we thought his policy ought to be. At the same time, we felt that the whole of his past career, those great services which he has rendered, not to one, but to many Administrations —which he has rendered in many circumstances and in various parts of the world—we felt that these were also to be taken into consideration; and we felt that for an officer of such experience, and who had rendered such distinguished services in the past, that we ought to do the utmost in our power to endeavour to retain him, for the sake of securing to the country his services in the future, and that we should not look back on what had occurred, but should look forward with confidence to retain Sir Bartle Frere's services for the future government of South Africa. We thought it desirable, at the same time, to indicate for his guidance, considering the very extensive powers which he enjoys—to indicate clearly to him what lines Her Majesty's Government thought his policy should pursue. We have pointed out everything that ought to be done, and everything which we think ought not to be done; and it is with firm confidence that, guided by the policy thus indicated, and the views which Her Majesty's Government have made clear to him, he will, with an exhibition of the public spirit which has characterized all his former acts, be contented to render to the Government and the country in the future as great services in South Africa as he has already rendered in other parts of the world, that we look forward to the future.

MR. ERNEST NOEL wished to bring the attention of the House back for a few moments to one point that did not seem to have been much touched upon in the course of the debate, and that was that the Government were placed in the position of either having censured Sir Bartle Frere unfairly, or that they were bound to inform the House whether they considered Sir Bartle Frere acted properly in sending the Ultimatum. The country had a right—and the House, as representing the country, had a right—to ask that question, the answer to which had never yet been given to the House; and he asked the Government to state whether such an Ultimatum was rightly sent to Cetewayo? Upon that would depend the question whether the Government were justified or not in the censure passed upon Sir Bartle Frere? Apparently they were agreed at the first that Sir Bartle Frere had done wrong, for it was a justifiable inference that as the Government had been strangely silent upon the point they did not agree with the policy of the Ultimatum. The House had a right to ask the Government one of two questions upon this matter. He hoped, before that debate was closed, the right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the House would tell them whether the Government thought it was right, just, and fair of an English officer to send to an independent Sovereign this message—that he was to give up that which for 15 years he had possessed, and which was the basis of his power; that he was to give up his Army within 30 days—he had almost said within 20 days—of receiving the notice, or there should be war? Was it fair or unfair to make such a demand upon an independent Sovereign, however brutal or savage he might be; and it must be remembered that the Governor of Natal had acknowledged the independence of the Zulu King? He thought the Government was bound to say whether they considered the High Commissioner was justified in sending to that independent Sovereign this message —that if within 20 days he did not reverse the whole of his policy, and give up that upon which his power was based, war should be declared? And more than that, did the Government think that, with that demand made to this independent Sovereign, it was right that there should be also demands that he should guarantee that the missionaries should be protected in his land? The right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for the Colonies had told the House that he thought that was a mistake; but did the right hon. Gentleman remember that that was part of the Ultimatum, and that upon non-compliance with it war was threatened? How could they subject the Sovereign to whom the Ultimatum was addressed to this demand? It was a part of the ultimatum, and war was to be the result of its not being complied with. The right hon. Gentleman forgot to explain to the House that, if Cetewayo had given up the sons of Sirayo, he must have agreed, at the same time, to all other parts of the Ultimatum; for if he had complied with this, how would it have been possible for him to have refused compliance with the other demands of the Ultimatum? All the demands were bound up together, and non-compliance with one of them was war. He thought, also, the Government ought to give some indication of their opinion as to whether Sir Bartle Frere was right in thus binding up together all those demands as an Ultimatum; and, for his part, he would venture to say that it was most unjust. The right hon. Gentleman the Secretary for the Colonies had, he thought, in some measure allowed that it was unjust to bind them together, and that if they were not complied with within 30 days there should be war. If the Government was prepared to say that the Army of Cetewayo was a danger so pressing and immediate that Sir Bartle Frere was justified in forcing on war, then he could not understand how it was that so severe a censure had been passed upon him. He ventured to think that there had been a number of points left out of this discussion regarding Sir Bartle Frere. He had known Sir Bartle Frere for many years, and he had the highest respect for him; but, from the despatches recently published, he was forced to come to the conclusion that Sir Bartle Frere was carried away with the idea that Cetewayo was so great a danger to the Colony that he must be destroyed. Owing to that, he was not prepared to deal fairly with that savage Chief — that was clear from the way in which he wrote upon this subject. In many ways he had shown how utterly unable he was to use ordinary fairness as between man and man in conducting the negotiations. He would only allude to one passage he had written concerning Cetewayo. He complained that the Zulu King made raids before the publication of the award; whereas, as a matter of fact, the raids to which he referred were made, not by Cetewayo, but by a Chieftain from whose territory Cetewayo was separated by 50 or 60 miles. That was the way in which Sir Bartle Frere treated Cetewayo, and it was clear that Sir Bartle Frere was utterly unable to distinguish in his own mind what was fair and just in our dealings with this South African Chief. If the Government were prepared to say that the Ultimatum was right and honest, and that they supported Sir Bartle Frere in it, they ought to tell the House so, and to tell the country so. It was not fair to treat the country as they did, and it seemed to him that it was not fair to Sir Bartle Frere himself that the Government should decline to say plainly whether they considered the Ultimatum was right in itself and sent at the proper time. If the dangers of the Colony were at the moment so great that Sir Bartle Frere was justified in making war, he did not think that he ought to have been censured for the Ultimatum. If the Government thought the Ultimatum right, they should say so; but if they did not think it right, it was equally their duty to state it plainly, and to recall Sir Bartle Frere.

Mr. ONSLOW thought the hon. Gentleman who had just spoken was ignorant of the fact that the reason of the censure was that the Government did not approve of the Ultimatum, for he called upon Her Majesty's Government to say whether or not they disapproved of the Ultimatum. It could not be said that Her Majesty's Government had at all deceived the public, or Sir Bartle Frere, in the censure which they had passed upon him. They had a distinct right to say that they did not approve of the Ultimatum; and he, for one, as a genuine supporter of Her Majesty's Government, would not have voted with them on the present occasion had they not done so. The noble Lord the Member for Argyllshire (Lord Colin Campbell) had accused the Government of throwing upon the shoulders of Sir Bartle Frere the blame which ought to rest upon their own. If that were the opinion of hon. Gentlemen who sat upon the Government side of the House, there were many on this occasion who would have voted against Her Majesty's Government. The noble Lord had accused Her Majesty's Government of political cowardice. Although, on many occasions, hon. Members on this side of the House were prepared to support the Government, yet, if these charges could have been supported, he, for one, would not have done so. He was prepared, on that occasion, to vote with the Government, although with some reluctance, because he thought that they were no way responsible either for the war or the issue of the Ultimatum, and that they should be supported now that the war in Zululand was on their hands. He believed that the war was due wholly and solely to Sir Bartle Frere. As the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for the Colonies had said in his speech, which had been so much commented upon, he had no idea at the time of the despatch that Sir Bartle Frere intended to issue the Ultimatum which had resulted in this disastrous war. Mention had been made in the course of the debate, and very strong remarks had been made, such as he had never before heard since he had had the honour of having a seat in that House, with regard to the conduct of this war. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Tamworth (Sir Robert Peel) had used language with regard to Lord Chelmsford such as he trusted no one on the Government Benches would ever use. The hon. and gallant Baronet the Member for Westminster (Sir Charles Russell) had conclusively shown that Lord Chelmsford was in no way to blame for the disaster which had occurred. Knowing Lord Chelmsford as he did, he should be very unwilling to say anything in disparaging terms of him, and he firmly believed that no blame in respect of the disaster was owing to him. He wished that subject had been kept out of the debate. But it was impossible, if they went into details, to avoid speaking in praise of those who so nobly shed their blood in defence of their country at their posts at Isandlana, but who, he was bound to say in common with many others, that day committed a grave and fatal mistake. He thought it much to be deprecated that the conduct of the General in the field should be put in the question, and that so many scribblers in the newspapers, and anonymous writers, should attack him. It was not fair to the General in the field that he should be vilely slandered in the public journals by anonymous scribblers, and it was a most monstrous thing that newspapers which supported Her Majesty's Government should have admitted such letters as they had read. If he might use the expression, he thought it was a disgrace to the Press that had done so much on behalf of the country, that these letters should have been allowed to appear. After the discussion which they had had in that House, he hoped that both hon. Members, and the general public outside, would see that Lord Chelmsford had not been to blame for this great disaster that had fallen on the British nation. The hon. Baronet the Member for Chelsea, in the very able speech which he had delivered, spoke most strongly against Sir Bartle Frere; and, for his part, although he was well acquainted with the great services and abilities of Sir Bartle Frere, he was not one of those who eulogized him. The hon. Baronet had brought forward his Motion merely on one issue—namely, that a Vote of Censure should be passed on Her Majesty's Government for not recalling Sir Bartle Frere; but the speech of his hon. Friend, and the speeches of the right hon. Baronet the Member for Tamworth (Sir Robert Peel), and of the right hon. Member for the University of London (Mr. Lowe) had not been confined to the terms of the Motion; but they had abused the Government for their whole conduct before the war. It was only fair and just to the House and to the Government that they should have brought forward some Resolution condemning the whole of the policy of the Government, if their real intention was to attack that policy, rather than they should have raised an issue only concerning Sir Bartle Frere. Why was that not done? Because they were afraid of their own supporters, who, they thought, would not follow them in that course. If that were the case, he deprecated that unfair way of condemning Her Majesty's Government by a Resolution, which, while it did not raise the issue, yet enabled hon. Gentlemen to make accusations with regard to the policy of the Government. No one had used stronger language than the hon. and gallant Member for Renfrewshire (Colonel Mure), who had accused Her Majesty's Government of not sending out sufficient troops. He could only say this—that it had not been shown that Her Majesty's Government had not sent out what everyone considered to be sufficient Forces for the occasion. If Her Majesty's Government intended to make an aggressive war, they were wrong in not sending out a greater Force; but considering that, by their instructions to Sir Bartle Frere, the troops were to act only on the defensive, Lord Chelmsford had been sent sufficient Forces. He defied the hon. Baronet to say that, in these circumstances, Her Majesty's Government had any such an idea as the undertaking a war of aggression. The hon. Member for Chelsea (Sir Charles W. Dilke) had glorified Cetewayo in terms which he thought were hardly just, or hardly appropriate. He had tried to prove that Cetewayo was injured, that he was an angel, or something more. That had been the policy of the Opposition ever since he had been in the House. The Opposition had tried to make out in the case of Afghanistan much the same thing as they now tried to prove in the case of the Zulu King. It was a curious form of political warfare which made the Opposition glorify the enemies of the country. From the whole policy of the Opposition, it appeared to him that they were doing everything and saying everything in favour of the enemies of the country, and ridiculing Her Majesty's Government, infinitely preferring the enemies of the country. In analogy to the Afghan Committee, he thought they should have had a Zulu Committee. He was glad that no such Committee had been formed, and that right hon. Gentlemen had taken to heart the serious lesson which they were taught by the failure of the Afghan Committee, and had not organized a similar affair with regard to the Zulus. He did not pretend that what Sir Bartle Frere had done in this instance, or in former years, was altogether what he approved. But still he could not help thinking that the hon. Baronet the Member for Chelsea had overstated his case. He could not agree to such utter condemnation of Sir Bartle Frere. Sir Bartle Frere, no doubt, had acted contrary to the spirit of our Constitution when he issued the Ultimatum, and, in his opinion, no Governor of a Colony—not even the Viceroy of India—should ever, on his sole authority, be allowed to declare war. The Viceroy of India, who held the most responsible office under the Crown, might, in former days, when there was no telegraph and only a service of sailing-ships round the Cape, on certain occasions have the right to declare war; but, in modern days of telegrams and steam communication, he most strongly protested against any Governor, under any circumstances, declaring war against a people having no less than 40,000 well-trained and well-disciplined warriors, without waiting for instructions. And he might here mention that, according to reports, well authenticated, this estimate was far below the mark. He approved, therefore, of the action Her Majesty's Government had taken in censuring Sir Bartle Frere. As everyone knew, Sir Bartle Frere had always displayed great zeal towards missionaries; and he could not help thinking that a great deal of this war was owing to his superabundant zeal towards that body. He did not wish to say one word against missionaries, whom he had seen, in India and elsewhere, earnestly endeavouring to carry out their duty; but they should not be under the impression that the country was prepared to spend blood and treasure in assisting them, wherever they might go. He was afraid that Sir Bartle Frere had so strong an idea that the missionaries should be supported that he had undertaken too much on their behalf. He did hope that the result of this matter would show the missionaries that, however much their zeal might be appreciated, the country was not prepared to defend them in whatever barbarous country they might choose to put themselves. With the extended Frontiers of this Empire in India and all parts of the world, it must always be expected that we should be in trouble with some tribe or nation. Whenever it did arise, it would be the duty of those on the spot not to declare war without the sanction of the Government of the day, but only to use sufficient force to prevent an invasion of our territories. With regard to what had taken place in Burmah, he approved of the course taken by Lord Lytton, who, on this occasion, had neither declared war nor intended to do so; but had only taken measures to protect British subjects and British territory in that country. On our extended Frontiers we must expect, at any time, to find ourselves in difficulties with some Border Tribe. Much had been said of the Ultimatum issued by Sir Bartle Frere. For his part, he must confess that he did not approve of it; nor could he help thinking that if Her Majesty's Government had seen it they would not have allowed it to go into Cetewayo's hands. He did not wish to go into details; but there was no doubt that Sir Bartle Frere had not on this, as on other occasions, waited for instructions before proceeding. He recollected that when Sir Bartle Frere was in Bombay there was great speculation in that country in consequence of the American War. An enormous amount of cotton was sent to this country, and an enormous amount of speculation took place in India. Sir Bartle Frere, if he did not encourage speculation, did nothing whatever to stop it. He knew what a responsible position Sir Bartle Frere occupied in Bombay; but no one left his Province in such a grievous state of financial ruin as he did. For his part, he did not look upon Sir Bartle Frere as one of the most able of Administrators. Supposing Sir Bartle Frere to resign—and it was quite possible that he might do so after receiving this censure—he wished to point out to the Government that they ought to look out as soon as possible for a successor to him, and that they ought to coach that gentleman in the affairs connected with Zululand and South Africa. That was not a matter which could be learned in a few days; and he did hope that, in view of this contingency, Her Majesty's Government would find out some suitable successor to one whom he could not think had been any great success. With regard to what had been said by hon. Gentlemen opposite as to why Sir Bartle Frere had not been recalled, he would state his belief that so great was their stake at the Cape, and so great were their interests in South Africa, that it was not politic to recall him at the present time. He believed that Sir Bartle Frere had, to a great extent, ingratiated himself into the feelings and sentiments of the Colonists at Cape Town; and it was for this reason that Her Majesty's Government, looking at the grave considerations involved, had come to the conclusion that it would not be wise to recall Sir Bartle Frere on the present occasion. They had warned him that they would never sanction such conduct as he had indulged in, and he hoped that the censure would have a practical effect upon him, and that he would not think himself, in future, superior to the Government, but would obey the commands of his superiors at home. In conclusion, he could only say that, looking to the policy which the Opposition had adopted ever since he had had the honour of a seat in that House, it seemed to him to have been a policy of recall. Hon. Gentlemen had wished to recall Sir Henry Elliott, Sir Austen Layard, and Lord Lytton, and now clamoured for the recall of the Governor of another of the Colonies. With all sincerity he said it, that this was the best case that they had ever had against Her Majesty's Government since 1874; for, in his opinion, there was a great deal to be said in favour of the recall of Sir Bartle Frere. But, putting all things together, and looking at the danger to the Colony from the possibility of the rising of tribes considered friendly, he could not help thinking that Her Majesty's Government had exercised a wise discretion in leaving Sir Bartle Frere the option of remaining at his post or returning, as he pleased.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Debate be now adjourned."—(*Mr. Courtney.*)

Motion *agreed to.*

Debate *further adjourned* till *Monday* next.

MOTIONS.

CONVENTION (IRELAND) ACT REPEAL (NO. 2) BILL.

On Motion of Sir JOSEPH M'KENNA, Bill to repeal the Convention (Ireland) Act, passed in the Irish Parliament in the thirty-third year of the reign of His late Majesty King George the Third, and to amend and declare the Law in certain cases in respect to Assemblies and Public Meetings, *ordered* to be brought in by Sir JOSEPH M'KENNA, Mr. PATRICK SMYTH, and Mr. O'SHAUGHNESSY.

LIGHTING BY ELECTRICITY.

Select Committee *appointed*, "to consider whether it is desirable to authorise Municipal Corporations or other local authorities to adopt any schemes for Lighting by Electricity; and to consider how far, and under what conditions, if at all, Gas or other Public Companies should be authorised to supply Light by Electricity."—(*Viscount Sandon.*)

And on April 3, Committee *nominated* as follows:—Lord LINDSAY, Mr. SPENCER STANHOPE, Mr. BRUCE, Earl PERCY, Mr. ALFRED GATHORNE-HARDY, Mr. HARDCASTLE, Mr. HEYGATE, Mr. LYON PLAYFAIR, Sir UGHTRED KAY-SHUTTLEWORTH, Mr. ADAM, Mr. MITCHELL HENRY, Mr. CHRISTOPHER TALBOT, and Mr. ARTHUR MOORE:—Power to send for persons, papers, and records; Five to be the quorum.

And, on April 7, Mr. PULESTON and Mr. RYLANDS *added.*

House adjourned at a quarter after One o'clock till Monday next.

[INDEX.

INDEX

TO

HANSARD'S PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES,

VOLUME CCXLIV.

SECOND VOLUME OF SESSION 1879.

EXPLANATION OF THE ABBREVIATIONS.

In Bills, Read 1°, 2°, 3°, or 1ª, 2ª, 3ª, Read the First, Second, or Third Time.—In Speeches, 1R., 2R., 3R., Speech delivered on the First, Second, or Third Reading.—*Amendt.*, Amendment.—*Res.*, Resolution.—*Comm.*, Committee.—*Re-Comm.*, Re-Committal.—*Rep.*, Report.—*Consid.*, Consideration.—*Adj.*, Adjournment or Adjourned.—*cl.*, Clause.—*add. cl.*, Additional Clause.—*neg.*, Negatived.—*M. Q.*, Main Question.—*O. Q.*, Original Question.—*O. M.*, Original Motion.—*P. Q.*, Previous Question.—R. P., Report Progress.—*A.*, Ayes.—*N.*, Noes.—*M.*, Majority.—*1st. Div.*, *2nd. Div.*, First or Second Division.—*l.*, Lords.—*c.*, Commons.

When in this Index a * is added to the Reading of a Bill, it indicates that no Debate took place upon that stage of the measure.

When in the Text or in the Index a Speech is marked thus *, it indicates that the Speech is reprinted from a Pamphlet or some authorized Report.

When in the Index a † is prefixed to a Name or an Office (the Member having accepted or vacated office during the Session) and to Subjects of Debate thereunder, it indicates that the Speeches on those Subjects were delivered in the speaker's private or official character, as the case may be.

Some subjects of debate have been classified under the following "General Headings:"—ARMY — NAVY — INDIA — IRELAND — SCOTLAND — PARLIAMENT — POOR LAW—POST OFFICE—METROPOLIS — CHURCH OF ENGLAND — EDUCATION — CRIMINAL LAW — LAW AND JUSTICE — TAXATION, under WAYS AND MEANS.

ABERCORN, Duke of
West Donegal Railway, 2R. 622

ABERDARE, Lord
Disqualification by Medical Relief, 2R. 1417, 1420
Intemperance, Report of the Select Committee, 625
Railways (Ireland)—Letterkenny Railway and West Donegal Railway, Res. 997
West Donegal Railway, 2R. 622

ABINGER, Lord
Army — Desertions — Report of the Inspector General of Recruiting, 1878, 118

ACLAND, Sir T. D., *Devonshire, N.*
Agricultural Holdings Act, 1875, Motion for a Select Committee, 1730

ADAM, Right Hon. W. P., *Clackmannan, &c.*
Supply—Home and Colonial Offices, &c. 319

ADVOCATE, The Lord (Right Hon. W. WATSON), *Glasgow, &c. Universities*
Criminal Law—Stevenson, Case of, 131
Hypothec Abolition (Scotland), 2R. 1258, 1275

Afghanistan

Lords—

Further Papers—Address of General Roberts to the Chiefs of Kurram, Questions, Observations, Earl Granville, The Marquess of Ripon; Reply, Viscount Cranbrook; short debate thereon *Mar* 10, 511

Negotiations with Yakoob Khan, Question, The Marquess of Ripon; Answer, Viscount Cranbrook *Mar* 28, 196

Commons—

Reported Death of Shere Ali, Question, Mr. Onslow; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Mar* 3, 16

Operations in Khost Valley, Question, Mr. Onslow; Answer, Mr. E. Stanhope *Mar* 6, 282

The North-Western Frontier—The Occupation of Quettah, Question, Mr. Dillwyn; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Mar* 6, 279

Yakoob Khan, Questions, Mr. Onslow, The Marquess of Hartington; Answers, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Mar* 10, 517

Afghanistan and Khelat—Treaties, &c., Questions, General Sir George Balfour; Answers, Mr. E. Stanhope *Mar* 10, 518; *Mar* 13, 816

The Afghan War—Newspaper Correspondents, Question, Mr. Anderson; Answer, Mr. E. Stanhope *Mar* 18, 1159

Military Operations

Address of General Roberts to the Chiefs of Kurram, Question, Mr. O'Reilly; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Mar* 14, 927

Rumoured Advance on Cabul, Question, Mr. W. E. Forster; Answer, Mr. E. Stanhope *Mar* 28, 1990

Africa—South Africa

Lords—

Sir Bartle Frere and Mr. Joubert, Question, Observations, The Earl of Carnarvon; Reply, Earl Cadogan *Mar* 6, 264

The Zulu War

The Re-inforcements, Observations, Earl Cadogan *Mar* 13, 789

The Defeat at Isandlana, Question, Observations, Lord Thurlow, The Earl of Longford, Lord Truro, Lord Stanley of Alderley; Reply, Viscount Bury *Mar* 14, 886

The Queen's Message of Sympathy, Question, Observations, Lord Truro; Reply, The Earl of Beaconsfield *Mar* 18, 1144

Lord Chelmsford, Personal Explanation, The Duke of Cambridge *Mar* 24, 1494; Statement, Earl Cadogan *Mar* 25, 1605

Sir Bartle Frere, Notices of Motion, The Marquess of Lansdowne, Viscount Cranbrook *Mar* 21, 1404; Alteration of Resolution, The Earl of Camperdown; Observations, Viscount Cranbrook *Mar* 24, 1494

Africa—South Africa—The Zulu War—Sir Bartle Frere

Moved to resolve, That this House, while willing to support Her Majesty's Government in all necessary measures for defending the possessions of Her Majesty in South Africa, regrets that the ultimatum which was calculated to produce immediate war should have been presented to the Zulu King without authority from the responsible Advisers of the Crown, and that an offensive War should have been commenced without imperative and pressing necessity or adequate preparation; and the House regrets that after the censure passed upon the High Commissioner by Her Majesty's Government in the despatch of the 19th of March 1879, the conduct of affairs in South Africa should be retained in his hands (*The Marquess of Lansdowne*) *Mar* 25, 1606; after long debate, on Question? Cont. 61, Not-Cont. 156; M. 95

Div. List, Cont. and Not-Cont., 1695

Resolved in the negative

Africa—South Africa

Commons—

The Zulu War—Military Operations

The Defeat at Isandlana, Question, Dr. Kenealy; Answer, Lord Eustace Cecil *Mar* 13, 821; Question, Sir Robert Peel; Answer, Colonel Stanley *Mar* 18, 1158;—*General Lord Chelmsford,* Notice of Question, Mr. Rylands; Observations, Colonel Stanley *Mar* 14, 933

The Re-inforcements

Question, Colonel Muro; Answer, Colonel Stanley *Mar* 6, 281

Coaling of Transports, Questions, Mr. Gourley; Answers, Mr. A. F. Egerton *Mar* 13, 821; Question, Mr. Boord; Answer, Mr. A. F. Egerton *Mar* 14, 929

The Papers, Correspondence, and Despatches

Question, Mr. Chamberlain; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *Mar* 3, 12

Sir Bartle Frere's Despatch, Question, Mr. Chamberlain; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *Mar* 11, 629

Telegraphic Despatches, Question, Mr. Otway; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *Mar* 14, 928

Papers and Despatches, Questions, Sir Alexander Gordon, Mr. Milbank; Answers, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach, Colonel Loyd Lindsay, Colonel Stanley *Mar* 27, 1859

Despatch of September 14, 1878, Question, Mr. Shaw Lefevre; Answer, Colonel Stanley *Mar* 18, 1159

Despatches—Sir Bartle Frere, Question, Mr. Chamberlain; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *Mar* 20, 1313; Question, Lord Colin Campbell; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *Mar* 27, 1852

War Office Papers, Question, Mr. Shaw Lefevre; Answer, Colonel Stanley *Mar* 22, 1493

[*cont.*

Africa—South Africa—COMMONS—*cont.*

MISCELLANEOUS QUESTIONS

The Zulu War

Questions, Mr. Sullivan, Mr. Chamberlain; Answers, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *Mar* 14, 907; Moved, "That this House do now adjourn" (*Mr. Edward Jenkins*); after short debate, Motion withdrawn

Officers' Baggage, Question, Colonel Tottenham; Answer, Colonel Stanley *Mar* 4, 129

The Marines, Questions, Mr. Goschen, Mr. A. Mills; Answers, Mr. W. H. Smith *Mar* 10, 526

Export of Munitions of War for Mozambique, Question, Mr. Ritchie; Answer, Mr. Bourke *Mar* 13, 818; Observations, Mr. Bourke, Mr. Mac Iver *Mar* 14, 930

The Cape Colony—Military Expenditure, Question, General Sir George Balfour; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Mar* 14, 906

Manufacture of Arms, Question, Mr. Ritchie; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Mar* 14, 929

Naval Coaling Depôts, Question, Mr. Gourley; Answer, Mr. W. H. Smith *Mar* 17, 1031

Shipment of Arms, Question, Mr. Ritchie; Answer, Lord Eustace Cecil *Mar* 20, 1307

Lord Chelmsford, Withdrawal of Notice of Motion, Mr. E. Jenkins *Mar* 22, 1493; Question, Sir Robert Peel; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Mar* 24, 1508

Sir Bartle Frere—Lord Chelmsford, Questions, Mr. Ernest Noel, Colonel Mure, Mr. Otway; Answers, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach, Colonel Stanley *Mar* 25, 1700

The Orange Free State, Question, Mr. Otway; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *Mar* 25, 1700

Rewards for Service at Rorke's Drift, Question, Mr. Osborne Morgan; Answer, Colonel Loyd Lindsay *Mar* 27, 1855

The Command, Questions, Mr. Otway, Mr. Arthur Moore; Answers, Colonel Loyd Lindsay *Mar* 27, 1858

Africa—South Africa—The Zulu War—Sir Bartle Frere

Sir Charles W. Dilke's Motion, Questions, Sir Charles W. Dilke; Answers, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Mar* 14, 931; *Mar* 17, 1038

Sir Bartle Frere, Alteration of Resolution, Sir Charles W. Dilke *Mar* 24, 1503

Moved, "That the Orders of the Day be postponed until after the Notice of Motion relating to the Zulu War" (*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer*) *Mar* 27, 1864; after short debate, Motion agreed to

Moved, "That this House, while willing to support Her Majesty's Government in all necessary measures for defending the possessions of Her Majesty in South Africa, regrets that the ultimatum which was calculated to produce immediate war should have been presented to the Zulu King without authority from the responsible advisers of the Crown, and that an offensive war should have been commenced without imperative and pressing necessity or adequate preparation; and this House further regrets that, after the censure passed upon the High Commissioner by Her Majesty's Government in the despatch of the 19th day of March 1879, the conduct of affairs in South Africa should be retained in his hands" (*Sir Charles W. Dilke*), 1865

Amendt. at end of Question add "and that a war of invasion was undertaken with insufficient forces, notwithstanding the full information in the possession of Her Majesty's Government of the strength of the Zulu Army, and the warnings which they had received from Sir Bartle Frere and Lord Chelmsford that hostilities were unavoidable" (*Colonel Mure*); Question proposed, "That those words, &c.;" after long debate, Debate adjourned

Debate resumed *Mar* 28, 1991; after long debate, Debate further adjourned

AGNEW, Mr. R. Vans, *Wigton Co.*

Hypothec Abolition (Scotland), 2R. 1222, 1243, 1282, 1287, 1288

Navy Promotion, Res. 533

Agricultural Holdings Act, 1875

Moved, "That a Select Committee be appointed to inquire into the operation of the Agricultural Holdings Act, 1875, and into the conditions of Agricultural Tenancies in England and Wales" (*Mr. Bernhard Samuelson*) *Mar* 25, 1705

Amendt. to leave out from "That," and add "there can be no adequate remedy for the agricultural depression existing throughout the country and severely affecting also the interests of town labour, which does not, especially at this period of increasing Foreign Competition, protect the application of skill and capital to the soil by the establishment of compensation for unexhausted improvements, equitable appeal against exorbitant rents, and substantial security of tenure for the agricultural classes both in Great Britain and Ireland" (*Mr. O'Donnell*) *v.*; Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after long debate, Question put; A. 115, N. 166; M. 51

Div. List, A. and N., 1762

Question proposed, "That those words be added" *v.*; after short debate, Debate adjourned

Agriculture and Trade

Question, Observations, The Marquess of Huntly, Lord Norton; Reply, The Earl of Beaconsfield *Mar* 28, 1967

ALEXANDER, Colonel C., *Ayrshire, S.*

Army—Linked Battalions, 817

Army Estimates—Land Forces, 1064, 1069

Egyptian Finance, 838

Alkali Acts—Report of Inspector

Questions, Mr. Rathbone; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth *Mar* 10, 518

Anderson, Mr. G., *Glasgow*

- Army—Newspaper Correspondents in the Field, 1318, 1436
- Blind and Deaf-Mute Children (Education), Comm. 1962
- India—Afghan War—Newspaper Correspondents, 1159
- Malta—Recent Riots, 1318
- Married Women's Property (Scotland), 2R. 257, 263
- Parliamentary Elections and Corrupt Practices, 2R. 1375
- Parliament—Business of the House—Counts-out, 14, 15
  - Orders of the Day—Postponement, 1865
- Post Office (West India Mail Contract), Res. 1198
- Prosecution of Offences, Comm. 967
- Racecourses (Metropolis), Comm. *cl.* 8, 366; Consid. 1491, 1492
- Supply—Civil Service and Revenue Departments, 1597
  - Stationery, &c. 351
- Valuation of Property, Comm. *cl.* 6, 1486

Arbuthnot, Colonel G., *Hereford*

- Army—Rorke's Drift, Defence of—Brevet-Major Chard, 1858
- Army—Retirement of Officers, Res. 16, 25
- Army—Scientific Corps, Res. 934, 951, 963, 1505
- France, English Subjects in—Consular Convention, 523, 524

Army

Miscellaneous Questions

- *Army Discipline (Annual) Act*, Question, Sir Alexander Gordon; Answer, Colonel Stanley *Mar* 20, 1315
- *Army (India)—Pay of Lieutenants*, Question, Colonel Naghten; Answer, Mr. E. Stanhope *Mar* 13, 819
- *Army Regulations—Non-commissioned Officers*, Question, The Earl of Galloway; Answer, Viscount Bury *Mar* 6, 273
- *Artillery and Engineer Officers*, Question, Major O'Beirne; Answer, Colonel Loyd Lindsay *Mar* 27, 1855
- *Deputy Assistant Quarter Master General—The Staff College*, Question, Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice; Answer, Colonel Stanley *Mar* 21, 1434
- *Desertions—Report of the Inspector General of Recruiting*, 1878, Question, Observations, Lord Abinger, Lord Truro; Reply, Viscount Bury; short debate thereon *Mar* 4, 118
- *Employment of Indian Native Troops*, Question, Sir George Campbell; Answer, Colonel Stanley *Mar* 10, 519
- *Half-pay Service*, Question, Sir Eardley Wilmot; Answer, Colonel Stanley *Mar* 6, 278
- *Linked Battalions*, Question, Colonel Alexander; Answer, Lord Eustace Cecil *Mar* 13, 817
- *Newspaper Correspondents in the Field*, Question, Mr. Anderson; Answer, Colonel Stanley *Mar* 20, 1318; Question, Mr. Anderson; Answer, Mr. E. Stanhope *Mar* 21, 1436
- *Officers' Travelling Expenses*, Question, Major O'Beirne; Answer, Lord Eustace Cecil *Mar* 13, 818

[*cont.*

Army—*cont.*

- *Out-Pensioners*, Question, Mr. Barran; Answer, Colonel Loyd Lindsay *Mar* 17, 1037
- *Portable Intrenching Tools*, Question, Sir Baldwyn Leighton; Answer, Colonel Loyd Lindsay *Mar* 27, 1863
- *Sixteen-Shooter Rifles*, Question, Colonel Barne; Answer, Lord Eustace Cecil *Mar* 20, 1317
- *Staff Officers of Artillery*, Questions, Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice, Major Nolan; Answers, Colonel Stanley *Mar* 17, 1029
- *Surgeons at Depôt Centres*, Question, Mr. Leveson Gower; Answer, Colonel Stanley *Mar* 21, 1435
- *The Consolidated Ration—Erbswürst*, Question, Sir Henry Havelock; Answer, Colonel Stanley *Mar* 18, 1157
- *The Defence of Rorke's Drift—Brevet-Major Chard*, Question, Colonel Arbuthnot; Answer, Colonel Loyd Lindsay *Mar* 27, 1858
- *The Indian Contingent—Cost of Transport*, Question, Mr. Mundella; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Mar* 18, 1150
- *The Staff College—Vacancies*, Question, Major Nolan; Answer, Lord Eustace Cecil *Mar* 13, 817
- *War Office Contracts*, Question, Mr. Macdonald; Answer, Colonel Stanley *Mar* 6, 276

The Auxiliary Forces

- *The Militia*, Question, Earl Percy; Answer, Colonel Stanley *Mar* 11, 628
- *The Yeomanry*, Question, Observations, The Marquess of Bath; Reply, Viscount Bury *Mar* 4, 127

Army—First Class Army Reserve

Amendt. on Committee of Supply *Mar* 3, To leave out from "That," and add "this House having regard to the response made by the men of the First Class Army Reserve when called out last year, is of opinion that that Force should be increased by at least 10,000 men during the present year, with a view to a reduction of the Army Estimates" (*Mr. John Holms*) *v.*, 26; Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after short debate, Amendt. withdrawn

Army (Medical Department)

Moved, "That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, praying that She will be graciously pleased to give directions that there be laid before this House a Copy of Correspondence which took place in the year 1876, between Surgeon Major P. J. Clarke and Sir W. Muir, M.D., Director General of the Medical Department of the Army, and between Surgeon Major P. J. Clarke and the Military Secretary to His Royal Highness the Field Marshal Commanding in Chief, on the subject of the Supersession of Surgeon Major P. J. Clarke" *Mar* 25, 1767; after short debate, Question put; A. 26, N. 76; M. 50 (D. L. 53)

Army—Retirement of Officers
Amendt. on Committee of Supply *Mar* 3, To leave out from "That," and add "in the opinion of this House, it is desirable that the paragraphs numbered 86, 87, and 88 of Clause 124 of the Army Circular of 1st September 1877, and Clause 92 of the Army Circular of 1st May 1878, should be modified" (*Colonel Arbuthnot*) *v.*; Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after short debate, Amendt. withdrawn

Army—The Scientific Corps
Amendt. on Committee of Supply *Mar* 14, To leave out from "That," and add "an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, praying Her Majesty to be pleased to order the issue of a Royal Commission to inquire into and to report whether any and what alterations of the Military system now in force are desirable, as regards the pay, promotion, employment, and conditions of service and retirement of the officers of the Ordnance Corps" (*Colonel Arbuthnot*) *v.*; Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after debate, Question put; A. 68, N. 69; M. 1 (D. L. 44)
Words added; main Question, as amended, put, and agreed to
Question, Colonel Arbuthnot; Answer, Colonel Loyd Lindsay *Mar* 24, 1565

Army—The Volunteer Force—Courts of Inquiry
Moved that an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty for Return showing the number of courts of inquiry ordered by the War Office in each year in the Volunteer Force since its establishment; the number of volunteers of all ranks, the number of adjutants, and the number of instructors in each year on whom such were held, and the several offences charged (*The Lord Truro*) *Mar* 14, 882; after short debate, on Question? resolved in the negative

Army Discipline and Regulation Bill
(*Mr. Secretary Stanley, Mr. Secretary Cross, Mr. William Henry Smith, The Judge Advocate General*)
c. Observations, Colonel Stanley *Mar* 6, 283
2R. deferred, after short debate *Mar* 13, 881

ASHLEY, Hon. A. Evelyn M., *Poole*
Africa, South—Zulu War—Sir Bartle Frere, Res. 2028
Kew Gardens, Res. 294

Asia, Central
Khan of Khelat — Treaties, &c., Question, General Sir George Balfour; Answer, Mr. E. Stanhope *Mar* 10, 518
Reported Russian Operations against Merv, Questions, Lord Robert Montagu; Answers, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Mar* 18, 1160; *Mar* 20, 1313

Assessed Rates Act Amendment Bill
(*Mr. Marten, Sir Henry James, Mr. Torr*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *Mar* 25 [Bill 113]

Assizes Bill (*The Lord Chancellor*)
l. Read 1ª* *Mar* 3 (No. 17)
Read 2ª* *Mar* 4
Committee*; Report *Mar* 6
Read 3ª* *Mar* 7
Royal Assent *Mar* 14 [42 *Vict.* c. 1]

ATTORNEY GENERAL, The (Sir J. HOLKER), *Preston*
Administration of Justice, Res. 1474, 1488
Convention (Ireland) Act Repeal, 2R. 1808, 1821
Cyprus, 1571, 1578
Employers' Liability, Leave, 1135, 1143
Parliamentary Elections and Corrupt Practices, 2R. 1363
Patents for Inventions (No. 2), 1150
Prosecution of Offences, Comm. 980, 981
Railway Passenger Duty—Wantage Tramway Company, 130

BALFOUR, Major-General Sir G., *Kincardineshire*
Africa, South—Cape Colony—Military Expenditure, 906
Army—First Class Army Reserve, Res. 31
Army—Retirement of Officers, Res. 25
Army—Scientific Corps, Res. 956
Army Estimates—Land Forces, 1044, 1049, 1065, 1068, 1069, 1071, 1076, 1103
Cyprus, 1542;—Pioneer Regiment, 1857
Hypothec Abolition (Scotland), 2R. 1262
India—Financial Statement, 1036
Khan of Khelat—Treaties, &c. 518, 816, 817
Public Works Loan Commissioners—Loans for Public Works, 14
Supply—Legal Charges, Ireland, 1334

Bankers' Books (Evidence) Bill
(*Sir John Lubbock, Mr. Herschell, Sir Charles Mills, Mr. Rodwell*)
c. Committee*; Report *Mar* 3 [Bill 65]
Considered* *Mar* 7
Read 3°* *Mar* 11
l. Read 1ª* (*Lord Selborne*) *Mar* 13 (No. 24)

Banking Legislation
Question, Mr. Heygate; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Mar* 21, 1429

Bankruptcy Law Amendment Bill [H.L.]
(*The Lord Chancellor*)
l. Read 2ª, after short debate *Mar* 3, 1 (No. 8)
Committee *Mar* 13, 790
Report *Mar* 20, 1304
Read 3ª* *Mar* 24
c. Read 1°* (*Mr. Attorney General*) *Mar* 28 [Bill 114]

BARCLAY, Mr. A. C., *Taunton*
Cyprus, Island of—Health of the Troops, 1318

BARCLAY, Mr. J. W., *Forfarshire*
Agricultural Holdings Act, 1875, Motion for a Select Committee, 1719; Motion for Adjournment, 1765
Contagious Diseases (Animals) Act, 1878—Cattle Disease in the United States, 10
Hypothec Abolition (Scotland), 2R. 1266

Bar Education and Discipline Bill
Question, Dr. Kenealy; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Mar* 27, 1852

BARNE, Lt.-Colonel F. St. John N., *Suffolk, E.*
Army—Sixteen-Shooter Rifles, 1317
Supply—Public Education, England and Wales, 1338

BARRAN, Mr. Alderman J., *Leeds*
Army—Out-Pensioners, 1037
Prosecution of Offences, Comm. 991
Supply—Stationery, &c. 349
Vaccination Acts—The Bingley Magistrates' Orders, 1432

BARTTELOT, Colonel Sir W. B., *Sussex, W.*
Army—Scientific Corps, Res. 959
Army Estimates—Land Forces, 78, 79, 102, 103, 105
Men and Boys, &c. 578
Household Suffrage (Counties), Res. 203
Lower Thames Valley Main Sewerage Board, 2R. 387

BASS, Mr. M. T., *Derby Bo.*
Imprisonment for Debt, 279

BATES, Mr. E., *Plymouth*
Mercantile Marine—Foreign Steamers, 632

BATH, Marquess of
Army—Auxiliary Forces—The Yeomanry, 127

BAXTER, Right Hon. W. E., *Montrose, &c.*
Navy Contracts—Peninsular and Oriental Company, 1028, 1504
Wine Duties, Res. 1175

BEACH, Right Hon. Sir M. E. HICKS- (Secretary of State for the Colonies), *Gloucestershire, E.*
Africa, South—Zulu War—Miscellaneous Questions
Despatches, 1314, 1852
Orange Free State, 1700
Papers and Despatches, 12, 629, 907, 908, 1859, 1860
Sir Bartle Frere—Lord Chelmsford, 1700, 1701
Telegraphic Despatches, 928
Africa, South—Zulu War—Sir Bartle Frere, Res. 1876, 1892, 1916, 1932, 1933
Canada, Dominion of—The New Tariff, 1312, 1313
Colonial Possessions—Jamaica, 12
Malta—Recent Riots, 1318
Mauritius—Emigration of Coolies, 1851

[cont.

BEACH, Right Hon. Sir M. E. HICKS-—*cont.*
New Guinea—Italian Colonists, 1505
Straits Settlements—Instructions to British Residents, 1025
West Indies—Grenada—Protector of Immigrants, 905, 1027
Jamaica—Flogging for Libel, 1309

BEACONSFIELD, Earl of (First Lord of the Treasury)
Africa, South—Zulu War—Queen's Message, 1146
Africa, South—Zulu War—Sir Bartle Frere, Res. 1684
Agriculture and Trade, 1976, 1985
India—Afghanistan—Papers—General Roberts' Proclamation, 516

BEAUCHAMP, Earl (Lord Steward of the Household)
Cremation, 1408
Street Accidents—Address for a Return, 367

BEAUMONT, Colonel F. E. B., *Durham, S.*
Army—Scientific Corps, Res. 957

BELMORE, Earl of
Divinity School (Church of Ireland), 1R. *1822
Railways—Continuous Brakes, 266

BENTINCK, Mr. G. W. P., *Norfolk, W.*
Navy Estimates—Men and Boys, &c. 601, 613

BERESFORD, Lord C. W. D., *Waterford Co.*
Navy—H.M.S. "Boadicea," 1315
Men of War's Men, 544

BERESFORD, Colonel F. M., *Southwark*
London and North-Western Railway (Additional Powers), 2R. 896, 902
Thames River (Prevention of Floods), Nomination of Committee, 801, 815

BIGGAR, Mr. J. G., *Cavan Co.*
Africa, South—Zulu War, 912, 913
Army Estimates—Land Forces, 1057, 1060, 1094, 1099, 1100, 1109, 1120, 1125
Pay of General Officers, 1127
Pensions for Wounds, 1130, 1134
Mixed Colleges, Instruction in, 871
Parliamentary Elections and Corrupt Practices, 2R. 1387, 1401
Prosecution of Offences, Comm. 992; Motion for reporting Progress, 994
Specie and Paper Currency, Res. 1191
Supply—Civil Contingencies Fund, 1362
Consular Services, 1359
Legal Charges, Ireland, 1332, 1334
Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Household of, &c. 356
Reformatory and Industrial Schools, 1331
Stationery, &c. Amendt. 351, 352, 353
Temporary Commissions, 1360
Wine Duties, Res. 1183

Birley, Mr. H., *Manchester*
  Intoxicating Liquors (Licences), Res. 651

Blachford, Lord
  Africa, South—Zulu War—Sir Bartle Frere, Res. 1634

Blake, Mr. T., *Leominster*
  Inland Revenue—Income Tax—Co-operative Stores, 132
  Intemperance, Lords Committee on—Report and Evidence, 1817

Blennerhassett, Mr. R. P., *Kerry*
  Convention (Ireland) Act Repeal, 2R. 1796
  Electoral Disabilities of Women, Res. 431
  Household Suffrage (Counties), Res. Amendt. 216

Blind and Deaf-Mute Children (Education) Bill (*Mr. Wheelhouse, Sir Andrew Lusk, Mr. Scott, Mr. Isaac, Mr. Benjamin Williams*)
  c. Ordered; read 1° * *Mar* 4 [Bill 93]
  Read 2° * *Mar* 26
  Order for Committee read; Moved, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair" *Mar* 27, 1961
  Moved, "That the Debate be now adjourned" (*Mr. Monk*); after short debate, [House counted out]

Board of Trade Returns
  Question, Mr. Mac Iver; Answer, Mr. J. G. Talbot *Mar* 10, 519

Bourke, Hon. R. (Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs), *Lynn Regis*
  Africa, South—Export of Munitions of War for Mozambique, 818, 930
  Criminal Law—Theodoridi, Case of, 402
  Cyprus, Island of—Miscellaneous Questions 1521, 1522, 1524, 1527, 1529, 1532, 1536, 1538, 1540, 1541, 1551, 1570, 1577
    Consular Jurisdiction, 10
    Enforced Labour, 1025, 1026
    Greek Language, 1156
    Pioneer Regiment, 1857
  Egypt—British Consul General, 1161
  France—Commercial and Manufacturing Distress, 1506
    English Subjects in—Consular Convention, 524
  Japan—Medicinal Opium, 1314
  Mercantile Marine—David Julian, Case of, 907
  Supply—Consular Services, 1351, 1352
    Diplomatic Services, 1346, 1349, 1350
  Treaty of Berlin—Despatch in "The Times" of March 12th, 820
    Eastern Roumelia, 280, 281
  Turkey—Finance Commissioner, Appointment of, 278
    Papers, 1038
  Wine Duties, Res. 1169

Bowyer, Sir G., *Wexford Co.*
  County Boards, Leave, 1213
  Cyprus, 1549, 1550
  Electoral Disabilities of Women, Res. 423
  Parliamentary Elections and Corrupt Practices, 2R. 1377, 1384

Brady, Dr. J., *Leitrim Co.*
  Medical Act (1858) Amendment, 2R. Motion for Adjournment, 780

Brand, Right Hon. H. B. W., (*see* Speaker, The)

Brassey, Mr. T., *Hastings*
  Cyprus, 1553
  Navy—Coaling at St. Vincent, 1853
  Navy Estimates — Departmental Statement, 567
    Men and Boys, &c. 572

Brentford, Isleworth, and Twickenham Tramways Bill (by Order)
  c. Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *Mar* 21, 1421
  Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day six months" (*Mr. Bristowe*); Question proposed, "That 'now,' &c.;" after short debate, Question put; A. 112, N. 86; M. 26 (D. L. 51)
  Main Question put, and agreed to; Bill read 2°

Bright, Right Hon. J., *Birmingham*
  Canada, Dominion of—The New Tariff, 1160, 1311, 1312

Bright, Mr. J., *Manchester*
  Wine Duties, Res. 1182

Brise, Colonel S. B. Ruggles-, *Essex, E.*
  Agricultural Holdings Act, 1875, Motion for a Select Committee, 1717

Bristowe, Mr. S. B., *Newark*
  Brentford, Isleworth, and Twickenham Tramways, 2R. Amendt. 1421
  Electoral Disabilities of Women, Res. 449
  Household Suffrage (Counties), Res. 188
  Supply—Natural History Museum, 320
    Public Buildings, 318
    Stationery, &c. 336
    Treasury, 321

British Museum—The Natural History Collection
  Question, Lord Arthur Russell; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Mar* 20, 1308

Brooks, Mr. M., *Dublin*
  Brentford, Isleworth, and Twickenham Tramways, 2R. 1429
  Ireland—Dublin Port and Docks Board, 1024
  Supply—Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Household of, &c. 356
    Public Works Office, Ireland, 359

BUCCLEUCH, Duke of
  Medical Act, 1858, Amendment, Comm. 1293; *cl.* 15, Amendt. 1301

BULWER, Mr. J. R., *Ipswich*
  Administration of Justice, Res. 1455
  Prosecution of Offences, Comm. 968

Burmah
  Disturbances in Burmah, Questions, The Marquess of Hartington; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Mar* 6, 282; Question, Earl Granville; Answer, Viscount Cranbrook *Mar* 7, 367; Explanation, Mr. E. Stanhope *Mar* 7, 404; Question, Mr. Richard; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Mar* 27, 1856
  Reported Ultimatum to the King, Question, Mr. Richard; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Mar* 18, 1152
  The Re-inforcements, Questions, Mr. Richard, Mr. W. E. Forster; Answers, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Mar* 14, 905

BURT, Mr. T., *Morpeth*
  Medical Act (1858) Amendment, 2R. 762
  Mercantile Marine—Breach of Contract by Seamen, 298
  Supply—Home Office, 333

BURY, Viscount (Under Secretary of State for War)
  Africa, South—Zulu War—Defeat at Isandlana, 890
  Army—Auxiliary Forces—The Yeomanry, 128
  Army—Desertions—Report of the Inspector General of Recruiting, 1878, 120
  Army Regulations—Non-commissioned Officers, 273
  Volunteer Force, Address for a Return, 883, 884

CADOGAN, Earl (Under Secretary of State for the Colonies)
  Africa, South—Zulu War—Miscellaneous Questions
    Lord Chelmsford—Statement, 1605
    Re-inforcements, 789
    Sir Bartle Frere and Mr. Joubert, 265, 266
  Africa, South—Zulu War—Sir Bartle Frere, Res. 1662
  Navy—H.M.S. "Boadicea," 1290

CAIRNS, Earl (*see* CHANCELLOR, The Lord)

CALLAN, Mr. P., *Dundalk*
  Criminal Law—Theodoridi and Gorlero, Cases of, 629, 1862, 1989
  Household Suffrage (Counties), Res. 250
  Mixed Colleges, Instruction in, 880
  Parliamentary Elections and Corrupt Practices, 2R. 1388, 1400
  Racecourses (Metropolis), Comm. *cl.* 2, Motion for reporting Progress, 364, 365
  Scotch Banks — Extraordinary Directors — Scotch Judges, 631

[*cont.*

CALLAN, Mr. P.—*cont.*
  Supply—Civil Service and Revenue Departments, 1598
    Public Works Office, Ireland, 359, 360
  University Education (Ireland), 924

CAMBRIDGE, Duke of (Field Marshal Commanding-in-Chief)
  Africa, South—Lord Chelmsford, Personal Explanation, 1494
  Army—Desertions—Report of the Inspector General of Recruiting, 1878, 121
  Volunteer Force, Address for a Return, 884

CAMERON, Dr. C., *Glasgow*
  Habitual Drunkards, Consid. *cl.* 9, 754, 755
  Medical Act (1858) Amendment, 2R. 765
  Parliamentary Reporting, Select Committee on, 520

CAMPBELL, Lord C., *Argyll*
  Africa, South—Sir Bartle Frere—The Despatches, 1852
  Africa, South—Zulu War—Sir Bartle Frere, Res. *2058
  Treaty of Berlin—British Fleet, 1499

CAMPBELL, Sir G., *Kirkcaldy, &c.*
  Agricultural Holdings Act, 1875, Motion for a Select Committee, 1762
  Army—Employment of Indian Native Troops, 519
  Consolidated Fund (No. 2), 3R. 1704
  District Auditors, Comm. 963, 965
  East India [Loan], Comm. Motion for reporting Progress, 1957
  Egypt—Miscellaneous Questions
    British Consul General, 1161
    Egyptian Finance, 830
    Ministerial Crisis, 1702, 1703
    Mr. Rivers Wilson, 823
  Intoxicating Liquors (Licences), Res. Motion for Adjournment, 753
  Parliament—Public Business, 1320
  Supply—Stationery, &c. 342
  Valuation of Property, Comm. *cl.* 6, 1487
  West India Islands—Coolies in Grenada, 1027, 1028

CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN, Mr. H., *Stirling, &c.*
  Army—First Class Army Reserve, Res. 34
  Army—Scientific Corps, Res. 958
  Army Estimates—Land Forces, 71, 1043, 1068, 1115

CAMPERDOWN, Earl of
  Africa, South—Zulu War—Sir Bartle Frere—Alteration of Res. 1494

Canada, Dominion of
  The New Tariff, Notice of Question, Mr. John Bright *Mar* 18, 1160; Question, Mr. John Bright; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *Mar* 20, 1311

Canal Boats Act, 1877
  Question, Mr. Price; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth *Mar* 4, 134

CARDWELL, Viscount
- Army—Desertions—Report of the Inspector General of Recruiting, 1878, 224
- Navy—H.M.S. "Thunderer," Explosion on Board, 1017

CARLINGFORD, Lord
- West Donegal Railway, 2R. 622

CARNARVON, Earl of
- Africa, South—Sir Bartle Frere and M. Joubert, 264, 266
- Africa, South—Zulu War—Sir Bartle Frere, Res. 1645, 1692

CARTWRIGHT, Mr. W. C., *Oxfordshire*
- Customs—Wines of Spain and Portugal, 1435
- Egyptian Finance, 839
- Wine Duties, Res. 1162

CAVE, Mr. T., *Barnstaple*
- Kew Gardens, Res. 288

CAVENDISH, Lord F. C., *Yorkshire, W.R., N. Div.*
- Army Estimates—Land Forces, 1048
- Cyprus, 1588
- Prosecution of Offences, Comm. 969
- Vaccination Acts—Case of Mr. Hawley, 1853

CECIL, Lord E. H. B. G. (Surveyor General of Ordnance), *Essex, W.*
- Africa, South—Zulu War—Defeat at Isandlana, 821
  - Shipment of Arms, 1307
- Army—Miscellaneous Questions
  - Linked Battalions, 817
  - Officers' Travelling Expenses, 818
  - Sixteen-Shooter Rifles, 1317
  - Staff College—Vacancies, 817
- Army Estimates—Land Forces, 1046

CHAMBERLAIN, Mr. J., *Birmingham*
- Africa, South—Zulu War—Miscellaneous Questions
  - Despatches, 1313
  - Papers, 12, 908
  - Sir Bartle Frere's Despatch, 629
- Africa, South—Zulu War—Sir Bartle Frere, Res. 1906
- Elementary Education Act, 1870—Inspection of Board Schools—Holbeach, 8
- Public Loans—Public Works Loans, 1308
- Supply—Public Education, England and Wales, 1335, 1338
  - Stationery, &c. 336, 346, 348, 350, 353

CHANCELLOR, The LORD (Lord CAIRNS)
- Bankruptcy Law Amendment, 2R. 5; Comm. *cl.* 4, 791; *cl.* 6, 792; *cl.* 7, 793; *cl.* 21, *ib.*; Report, 1305
- City of Glasgow Bank, 2R. 111
- Divinity School (Church of Ireland), 1R. *1845
- Railways (Ireland)—Letterkenny Railway and West Donegal Railway, Res. 997
- Supreme Court of Judicature Acts Amendment, 2R. 117; Comm. 794
- Workmen's Compensation, 2R. Motion for Adjournment, 1965, 1966

CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER (Right Hon. Sir S. H. NORTHCOTE), *Devon, N.*
- Africa, South—Cape Colony—Military Expenditure, 906
- Africa, South—Zulu War—Miscellaneous Questions
  - 908, 921
  - Lord Chelmsford, 1508
  - Manufacture of Arms, 929
  - Sir C. W. Dilke's Motion, 931, 1038
- Agricultural Holdings Act, 1875, Motion for a Select Committee, 1758, 1766
- Army—Indian Contingent—Cost of Transport, 1150
- Army Estimates—Land Forces, 1046, 1048, 1121, 1122
  - Pensions for Wounds, 1132
- Asia, Central—Reported Russian Operations against Merv, 1161, 1313
- Banking Legislation, 1429
- Bar Education and Discipline, 1853
- British Museum—Natural History Collection, 1308
- Consolidated Fund (No. 2), Consid. 1509
- Contagious Diseases Acts—Select Committee, 1506
- Customs—Wines of Spain and Portugal, 1435
- Cyprus, 1580, 1592
- District Auditors, Comm. 964
- East India [Loan], Comm. 1960, 1990
- Eastern Question—Treaty of Berlin—Miscellaneous Questions
  - Despatch in "The Times" of March 12th, 821
  - Lord Salisbury's Despatch of January 26, 926
  - Roumelia, Eastern, 1864
  - Servia and Roumania, 133
- Egypt—Miscellaneous Questions
  - Finance, 523, 842, 850, 852, 1858;—Identic Note, 1508
  - Mr. Rivers Wilson, 823
  - Ministerial Crisis, 1703
- Electoral Disabilities of Women, Res. 426
- Exchequer Bonds (No. 1), 2R. 363
- France—Commercial Treaty, 1861
- Household Suffrage (Counties), Res. 239, 256
- India—Miscellaneous Questions
  - Exchanges, 1154, 1155
  - Indian Budget, 1306
  - North-Western Frontier—Occupation of Quettah, 279
- India—Afghanistan—Miscellaneous Questions
  - Address of General Roberts, 927
  - Burmah, Disturbances in, 282, 1856;—Re-inforcements, 906
  - Burmah, King of—Reported Ultimatum, 1152
  - Shere Ali, Reported Death of, 16
  - Yakoob Khan, 517
- Inland Revenue—Income Tax—Co-operative Stores, 132
  - Legacy and Succession Duty, 133, 521
- Intemperance, Lords' Committee on—The Report and Evidence, 1317, 1851
- Intoxicating Liquors (Licences), Res. 751, 753
- Ireland—Catholic University—Speech of Mr. W. Johnston, 274, 1698
- Law and Justice—"Martin *v.* Mackonochie," 1151
- Mercantile Marine—Breach of Contract by Seamen, 298

[*cont.*

CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER—*cont.*
Parliament—Miscellaneous Questions
Business of the House—Counts-out, 15
Easter Recess, 1508
Orders of the Day—Postponement, 1864
Public Business, 136, 1319, 1437
Vacant Seats—Dissolution of Parliament, 1151
Parliaments, Duration of, 1316
Parliamentary Elections and Corrupt Practices, 2R. 1385
Poor Law Amendment Act (1876) Amendment, 1436
Prosecution of Offences, Comm. 994
Public Loans—Public Works Loans, 1308
Royal Journeys, Expenses of, 1435
Specie and Paper Currency, Res. 1187
Supply—Civil Service and Revenue Departments, 1598
Consular Services, 1355, 1359
Diplomatic Services, 1347
Paris International Exhibition, 1345
Public Works Office, Ireland, 358, 362
Turkish Guaranteed Loan, 1855, 1433, 1434
University Education (Ireland), 925
Valuation of Property, Comm. *cl.* 6, 1483
Victoria Embankment—New Mint, 12
Ways and Means, Report, 107
Wine Duties, Res. 1183

CHAPLIN, Lieut.-Colonel E., *Lincoln*
Africa, South—Zulu War—Sir Bartle Frere, Res. 2031

CHAPLIN, Mr. H., *Lincolnshire, Mid.*
Africa, South—Zulu War, 917
Agricultural Holdings Act, 1875, Motion for a Select Committee, 1727, 1757

CHARLEY, Mr. W. T., *Salford*
Franchise and the City Guilds, Res. 827

CHILDERS, Right Hon. H. C. E., *Pontefract*
India—Exchanges, 1155
Lower Thames Valley Main Sewerage Board, 2R. 397
Navy Promotion, Res. 542
Ways and Means, Report, 107

Christ's Hospital and School
Question, Sir Charles W. Dilke; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *Mar* 28, 1987

City of Glasgow Bank Bill
c. Order for 2R. discharged, after short debate *Mar* 4, 109

Clerical Disabilities Bill (*Mr. Goldney, Mr. Hibbert, Sir Windham Anstruther*)
c. Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *Mar* 12, 780
Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day six months" (*Mr. Beresford Hope*); Question proposed, "That 'now' &c.;" after short debate, Question put; A. 66, N. 135; M. 69 (D. L. 42)

[*cont.*

Clerical Disabilities Bill—cont.
Words added; main Question, as amended, put, and agreed to; 2R. put off for six months [Bill 18]

COBBOLD, Mr. T. C., *Ipswich*
Wine Duties, Res. 1168

COCHRANE, Mr. A. D. W. R. Baillie-*Isle of Wight*
Hypothec Abolition (Scotland), 2R. 1243, 1288

COGAN, Right Hon. W. H. F., *Kildare*
Inspectors of Irish Prisons, 1988
Ireland—Resident Magistrates at Petty Sessions, Attendance of, 277
Parliamentary Elections and Corrupt Practices, 1399
Turkey—Finance Commissioner, Appointment of, 278

COLE, Mr. H. T., *Penryn, &c.*
Administration of Justice, Res. 1457
Law and Justice—Criminal Assizes, 1310

COLEBROOKE, Sir T. E., *Lanarkshire, N.*
Brentford, Isleworth, and Twickenham Tramways, 2R. 1427
Hypothec Abolition (Scotland), 2R. 1250

COLLINS, Mr. E., *Kinsale*
Electoral Disabilities of Women, Res. 457

COLMAN, Mr. J. J., *Norwich*
Household Suffrage (Counties), Res. 185
Parliamentary Elections and Corrupt Practices, 2R. 1375

Colonial Marriages Bill
Question, Mr. Beresford Hope; Answer, Mr. Knatchbull-Hugessen *Mar* 10, 528

COLTHURST, Colonel D. La Zouche, *Cork Co.*
Army Estimates—Land Forces, 67
Mixed Colleges, Instruction in, 879
Supply—Reformatory and Industrial Schools, 1329

COLVILLE of CULROSS, Lord
Navy—H.M.S. "Boadicea," 1289

Commons
Nomination of Select Committee, *Mar* 6 [House counted out]
Select Committee nominated; List of the Committee *Mar* 12, 788

Companies Acts Amendment Bill (*Sir John Lubbock, Mr. Coope, Mr. Herschell, Sir Charles Mills*)
c. Considered in Committee; Resolution agreed to, and reported; Bill ordered; read 1°* *Mar* 14 [Bill 102]

Consolidated Fund (No. 1) Bill
(*Mr. Raikes, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson*)
c. Resolution in Committee* *Feb* 28
Resolution reported, and agreed to; Bill ordered* *Mar* 3
Read 1°* *Mar* 4
Read 2°* *Mar* 5
Committee*; Report *Mar* 6
Read 3°* *Mar* 7
l. Read 1ª* (*Earl of Beaconsfield*) *Mar* 10
Read 2ª*; Committee negatived *Mar* 11
Read 3ª* *Mar* 13
Royal Assent *Mar* 14 [42 *Vict.* c. 2]

Consolidated Fund (No. 2) Bill
(*Mr. Raikes, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson*)
c. Resolutions in Committee *Mar* 19
Resolutions reported, and agreed to; Bill ordered; read 1°* *Mar* 20
Read 2°* *Mar* 21
Committee*; Report *Mar* 22
Considered *Mar* 24, 1509
Read 3°, after short debate *Mar* 25, 1704
l. Read 1ª* (*Earl of Beaconsfield*) *Mar* 25
Read 2ª*; Committee negatived; read 3ª *Mar* 26
Royal Assent *Mar* 28 [42 *Vict.* c. 7]

Contagious Diseases (Animals) Act, 1878
Cattle Disease in the United States, Question, Mr. J. W. Barclay; Answer, Lord George Hamilton *Mar* 3, 10
Dairies and Cowsheds, Question, Mr. Clare Read; Answer, Lord George Hamilton *Mar* 4, 135

Contagious Diseases Acts — The Select Committee
Question, Sir Harcourt Johnstone; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Mar* 24, 1506

Convention (Ireland) Act Repeal Bill
(*Sir Joseph M'Kenna, Mr. P. J. Smyth, Mr. Downing*)
c. Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *Mar* 26, 1772
Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day six months" (*Mr. Marten*); Question proposed, "That 'now,' &c.;" after long debate, Amendt. and Motion withdrawn; Bill withdrawn [Bill 4]

Convention (Ireland) Act Repeal (No. 2) Bill (*Sir Joseph M'Kenna, Mr. Patrick Smyth, Mr. O'Shaughnessy*)
c. Ordered* *Mar* 28

Co-operative Stores
Select Committee appointed, "to inquire into the constitution and operations of certain trading societies, trading under the name of Co-operative Stores, and to ascertain whether they are exempted from taxes and imposts to which the trading community are liable" (*Sir Charles Russell*) *Mar* 11

CORK, Earl of
Army—Auxiliary Forces—The Yeomanry, 128

Corn—The Official Returns
Question, Mr. Clare Read; Answer, Mr. J. G. Talbot *Mar* 4, 134

Coroners Bill (*Mr. Secretary Cross, Mr. Attorney General, Mr. Solicitor General, Sir Matthew Ridley*)
c. Select Committee nominated; List of the Committee *Mar* 18, 1222

COTTON, Mr. Alderman W. J. R., *London*
Franchise and the City Guilds, Res. 826
London and North Western Railway (Additional Powers), 2R. Amendt. 893

County Boards Bill
(*Mr. Sclater-Booth, Mr. Secretary Cross, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer*)
c. Motion for Leave (*Mr. Sclater-Booth*) *Mar* 18, 1199; after debate, Question put, and agreed to; Bill ordered; read 1°* [Bill 105]

County Courts Bill [H.L.]
(*The Lord Chancellor*)
l. Read 2ª*, and referred to a Select Committee *Mar* 4

COURTNEY, Mr. L. H., *Liskeard*
Africa, South—Zulu War—Sir Bartle Frere, Res. 2021; Motion for Adjournment, 2090
Cyprus, 1586
East India [Loan], Comm. 1959
Electoral Disabilities of Women, Res. 405, 422, 467, 488, 490
Employers' Liability, Leave, 1141
Household Suffrage (Counties), Res. 227, 235
Poor Law Amendment Act (1876) Amendment, Comm. *cl.* 1, Amendt. 1601
Ways and Means, Report, 107

COWEN, Mr. J., *Newcastle-on-Tyne*
Africa, South—Zulu War, 913
Convention (Ireland) Act Repeal, 2R. 1803
County Boards, Leave, 1214
Law Courts — Ventilation in the Court of Queen's Bench, 518
Quarantine Act—Cargo of Rags from Russia, 1157
Railway Passenger Duty—Wantage Tramway Company, 130
Supply—Home Office, 332
Stationery, &c. 341, 345

COWPER, Earl
Rivers Conservancy, 1019

CRANBROOK, Viscount (Secretary of State for India)
Africa, South—Zulu War—Sir Bartle Frere, 1405; Alteration of Res. 1494; Res. 1620
British Burmah, 367
India—Scarcity of Grain in the Punjab, 126
India—Afghanistan—Negotiations with Yakoob Khan, 1963
Papers—General Roberts' Proclamation, 512

Cremation
Question, Observations, The Earl of Onslow; Reply, Earl Beauchamp *Mar* 21, 1406

CRIMINAL LAW
MISCELLANEOUS QUESTIONS
Case of James Swanton, Question, Mr. Sullivan; Answer, Mr. J. Lowther *Mar* 20, 1316
Case of Michael Gilmore, Question, Mr. Mitchell Henry; Answer, Mr. J. Lowther *Mar* 18, 1149
Case of Seth Evans, Question, Mr. Hopwood; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *Mar* 7, 401
Case of Stevenson, Question, Mr. P. A. Taylor; Answer, The Lord Advocate *Mar* 4, 130
Case of the Rev. H. J. Dodwell, Question, Dr. Kenealy; Answer, Sir Matthew White Ridley *Mar* 13, 821
Case of William Habron, Convicted of Murder, Question, Mr. Mitchell Henry; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *Mar* 17, 1035; Questions, Mr. Mitchell Henry, Dr. Kenealy; Answers, Mr. Assheton Cross *Mar* 21, 1430; Question, Mr. Mitchell Henry; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *Mar* 25, 1702
Penal Servitude Acts, Question, Mr. O'Connor Power; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *Mar* 3, 13
The Convicts Theodoridi and Gorlero, Question, Mr. P. A. Taylor; Answer, Mr. Bourke *Mar* 7, 402; Questions, Mr. Callan; Answers, Mr. Assheton Cross *Mar* 11, 629; *Mar* 27, 1862; *Mar* 28, 1989
The Devonport Watch Committee, Question, Sir Wilfrid Lawson; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *Mar* 20, 1310

CROSS, Right Hon. R. A. (Secretary of State for the Home Department), *Lancashire, S. W.*
Administration of Justice, Res. 1480
Christ's Hospital and Schools, 1988
Clare County Writ, Re-appointment of Select Committee, 616
Clerical Disabilities, 2R. 783
Criminal Law—Miscellaneous Questions
Devonport Watch Committee, 1310
Penal Servitude Acts, 13
Seth Evans, Case of, 402
Theodoridi and Gorlero, Cases of, 630, 1862, 1989
William Habron, Case of, 1035, 1430, 1431, 1432, 1702
Gas and Water Supply (Metropolis), 1315
Imprisonment for Debt, 279
Inspectors of Mines Reports, 1878, 402
Intoxicating Liquors (Licences), Res. 751
Law and Justice—Criminal Assizes, 1311
Licensing Laws Amendment, 926

[*cont.*

CROSS, Right Hon. R. A.—*cont.*
Mines—Abercarne Colliery Explosion, 520
Wakefield, Accident at, 629
Mines Act, 1872—Mining Explosions, &c. 1859
Parochial Charities of the City of London—Royal Commission, 1702
Poor Law (Scotland), 1506
Prison Labour—Competition with Trades and Industries, 1855
Prosecution of Offences, Comm. 972, 991, 995
Racecourses (Metropolis), Comm. *cl.* 2, 364; *cl.* 8, Amendt. 366; Consid. 1491, 1492
Scotch Banks—Extraordinary Directors—The Scotch Judges, 631
Supply—Home Office, 328, 330
Vaccination Acts—Mr. Hawley, Case of, 1853
The Bingley Magistrates' Orders, 1432

CROSS, Mr. J. K., *Bolton*
India—Exchanges, 1154

CUBITT, Mr. G., *Surrey, W.*
Kew Gardens, Res. 296
Thames River (Prevention of Floods), Nomination of Committee, Motion for Adjournment, 795, 809

CUNINGHAME, Sir W. J. M., *Ayr, &c.*
Hypothec Abolition (Scotland), 2R. 1268

Customs
Report of Committee—Official Statistics, Question, Sir Henry Peek; Answer, Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson *Mar* 3, 13
Customs Re-organization, Question, Mr. Ritchie; Answer, Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson *Mar* 27, 1850
Wines of Spain and Portugal, Question, Mr. W. Cartwright; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Mar* 21, 1435

Cyprus
Observations, Sir Charles W. Dilke *Mar* 24, 1509; after long debate, Moved, "That the Debate be now adjourned" (*Mr. Dillwyn*); after further short debate, Motion withdrawn
Consular Jurisdiction, Question, Sir Charles W. Dilke; Answer, Mr. Bourke *Mar* 3, 10
Enforced Labour, Questions, Mr. H. Samuelson, Mr. W. E. Forster; Answers, Mr. Bourke *Mar* 17, 1025
Greek Language, The, Questions, Mr. H. Samuelson; Answers, Mr. Bourke *Mar* 18, 1156
Harbour of Famagousta, Question, Observations, The Duke of Somerset; Reply, The Marquess of Salisbury; Observations, Earl Granville *Mar* 21, 1409
Health of the Troops, Question, Mr. A. C. Barclay; Answer, Colonel Stanley *Mar* 20, 1318
The Pioneer Regiment, Question, General Sir George Balfour; Answer, Mr. Bourke *Mar* 27, 1857

DALRYMPLE, Mr. C., *Buteshire*
Africa, South—Zulu War, 917
Habitual Drunkards, Consid. *cl.* 9, 754

Davenport, Mr. W. Bromley-, *Warwickshire, N.*
Agricultural Holdings Act, 1875, Motion for a Select Committee, 1742

Davies, Mr. D., *Cardigan*
Intoxicating Liquors (Licences), Res. 721

Debtors Act, 1869, Amendment Bill [H.L.]
(*The Lord Chancellor*)
l. Read 2ª* *Mar* 3 (No. 9)
Committee; Report *Mar* 13, 794
Read 3ª* *Mar* 24
c. Read 1°* (*Mr. Attorney General*) *Mar* 28 [Bill 115]

Delahunty, Mr. J., *Waterford Co.*
Specie and Paper Currency, Res. 1185, 1191

De La Warr, Earl
Highways Act, 1878—Disturnpiked Roads, 1497
Railways—Continuous Brakes, 272
Workmen's Compensation, 2R. 1964, 1966

Denison, Mr. C. Beckett-, *Yorkshire, W.R., E. Div.*
Brentford, Isleworth, and Twickenham Tramways, 2R. 1428
Parliament—Questions—The Hon. Member for Meath, 1437, 1438

Dilke, Sir C. W., *Chelsea, &c.*
Africa, South—Zulu War—Sir Bartle Frere, Alteration of Res. 1503; Res. 1865
Africa, South—Zulu War—Sir C. W. Dilke's Motion, 931, 1038
Christ's Hospital and School, 1987
Cyprus, Island of, 1509, 1522, 1527;—Consular Jurisdiction, 10
District Auditors, 1155
Franchise and the City Guilds, Res. 828
Household Suffrage (Counties), Res. 151
Parliament—Public Business, 1320
Parliamentary Elections and Corrupt Practices, 2R. Amendt. 1371
Public Works (India)—Construction of Indian Railways, 274
Straits Settlements—Instructions to British Residents, 1024
Supply—Mediterranean Extension Telegraph Company (Guarantee), 1361

Dillwyn, Mr. L. L., *Swansea*
Army Estimates—Land Forces, 105
Cyprus, Motion for Adjournment, 1586
East India [Loan], Comm. 1960
Habitual Drunkards, Consid. *cl.* 9, Amendt. 754, 755
India—North-Western Frontier—Occupation of Quettah, 279
Lunacy Law Amendment, Leave, 1403
Parliament—Public Business, 1321, 1437
Supply—Civil Service and Revenue Departments, 1600
  Home and Colonial Offices, &c. 319
  Law Officers, Salaries of, &c. Motion for reporting Progress, 362

[*cont.*

Dillwyn, Mr. L. L.—*cont.*
  Public Buildings, 317, 318, 319
  Public Education, England and Wales, 1338
  Stationery, &c. 336, 343, 345, 351
  Treasury, 324, 325
Ways and Means, Report, 106

Disqualification by Medical Relief Bill
(*Mr. Rathbone, Sir John Kennaway, Sir Charles W. Dilke, Mr. Ritchie*)
c. 2R. put off *Mar* 17, 1023
Read 2ª, after debate *Mar* 21, 1417 [Bill 6]

District Auditors Bill (*Mr. Sclater-Booth, Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson, Mr. Salt*)
c. Order for Committee read; Moved, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair" *Mar* 14, 963
Moved, "That the Debate be now adjourned" (*Mr. Parnell*); after short debate, Motion withdrawn
Original Question, "That Mr. Speaker, &c.," put, and agreed to; Committee; Report Considered* *Mar* 17 [Bill 79]
Question, Sir Charles W. Dilke; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth *Mar* 18, 1155
Read 3°* *Mar* 19
l. Read 1ª* (*Lord President*) *Mar* 20 (No. 30)
Read 2ª*; Committee negatived *Mar* 24
Read 3ª* *Mar* 25
Royal Assent *Mar* 28 [42 *Vict.* c. 6]

Divinity School (Church of Ireland) Bill [H.L.] (*The Earl of Belmore*)
l. Presented *Mar* 27, 1822; read 1ª, after debate (No. 36)

Dodson, Right Hon. J. G., *Chester*
Cyprus, 1558
Intoxicating Liquors (Licences), Res. 745, 750
Turkish Guaranteed Loan, 1855, 1433, 1434

Douglas, Sir G. H. S., *Roxburghshire*
Hypothec Abolition (Scotland), 2R. 1249

Drainage and Improvement of Land (Ireland) Act, 1878
Question, Major O'Beirne; Answer, The Attorney General for Ireland *Mar* 24, 1506

Drainage and Improvement of Lands (Ireland) Provisional Order Confirmation Bill (*Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson, Mr. James Lowther*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *Mar* 4 [Bill 94]
Read 2°* *Mar* 11
Committee*; Report *Mar* 20
Read 3°* *Mar* 21
l. Read 1ª* (*Lord Henniker*) *Mar* 24 (No. 32)

Duff, Mr. R. W., *Banffshire*
Hypothec Abolition (Scotland), 2R. 1275

East India Loan Bill
Question, Mr. Fawcett; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Mar* 28, 1990

East Indian Railway Bill
c. Select Committee nominated; List of the Committee *Mar* 19, 1222

Edmonstone, Admiral Sir W., *Stirlingshire*
Clerical Disabilities, 2R. 785

Education Department
Miscellaneous Questions
Education (Scotland) Act, 1878—*Examination of Higher Class Schools*, Question, Mr. Lyon Playfair; Answer, Lord George Hamilton *Mar* 14, 927
Elementary Education Acts—School Boards, Question, Viscount Emlyn; Answer, Lord George Hamilton *Mar* 3, 11
Elementary Education Act, 1870—*Inspection of Board Schools—Holbeach*, Question, Mr. Chamberlain; Answer, Lord George Hamilton *Mar* 3, 8
Elementary Education Act, 1876—*Drummer Boys*, Question, Mr. Simonds; Answer, Colonel Stanley *Mar* 17, 1033
Instructions in Mixed Colleges, Observations, Mr. O'Donnell; debate thereon *Mar* 13, 852
The London School Board, Question, Mr. Heygate; Answer, Lord George Hamilton *Mar* 10, 525

Egerton, Hon. A. F. (Secretary to the Board of Admiralty), *Lancashire, S.E.*
Africa, South—Zulu War—Re-inforcements—Coaling of Transports, 822, 929
Navy—Naval Discipline Act, 1866, 554
Navy Estimates—Men and Boys, &c. 590

Egypt
Miscellaneous Questions
British Consul General, The, Question, Sir George Campbell; Answer, Mr. Bourke *Mar* 18, 1161
Finance, Question, Mr. Puleston; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Mar* 10, 523; Observations, Sir George Campbell; debate thereon *Mar* 13, 830; Question, Mr. Errington; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Mar* 27, 1857:—*The Identic Note*, Question, Sir Julian Goldsmid; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Mar* 24, 1508
Mr. Rivers Wilson, Question, Sir George Campbell; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Mar* 13, 823
The Ministerial Crisis, Questions, Sir George Campbell; Answers, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Mar* 25, 1702

Elcho, Lord, *Haddingtonshire*
Army Estimates—Land Forces, 1068, 1075, 1093, 1097
Hypothec Abolition (Scotland), 2R. 1229; Amendt. 1232, 1242, 1255

Electoral Disabilities of Women
Amendt. on Committee of Supply *Mar* 7, To leave out from "That," and add "in the opinion of this House, it is injurious to the best interests of the Country that women who are entitled to vote in municipal, parochial, and school board elections, when possessed of the statutory qualifications, should be disabled from voting in Parliamentary elections, although possessed of the statutory qualifications; and that it is expedient that this disability should be forthwith repealed" (*Mr. Courtney*) *v.*, 405; Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after long debate, Question put; A. 217, N. 103; M. 114
Div. List, A. and N., 505

Elliot, Sir G. *Durham, N.*
Cyprus, 1552

Elliot, Mr. G. W., *Northallerton*
Household Suffrage (Counties), Res. 188

Elphinstone, Lord
Navy—H.M.S. "Thunderer," Explosion on Board, 1007

Emly, Lord
Medical Act, 1858, Amendment, Comm. 1291; *cl.* 15, Amendt. 1298

Emlyn, Viscount, *Carmarthen*
Elementary Education Acts—School Boards, 11

Employers' Liability Bill
(*Mr. Attorney General, Mr. Solicitor General, The Lord Advocate, Mr. Attorney General for Ireland*)
c. Motion for Leave (*Mr. Attorney General*) *Mar* 17, 1135; after short debate, Motion agreed to; Bill ordered; read 1° * [Bill 103]

Errington, Mr. G., *Longford Co.*
Egypt—Finances, 1857
Jamaica—Flogging for Libel, 1309
Medical Act (1858) Amendment, 2R. 763
Model Schools, Ireland—Discontinuance, 1507
Navy—Roman Catholic Chaplains, 1034

Exchequer Bonds (No. 1) Bill
(*Mr. Raikes, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson*)
c. Resolutions in Committee * *Feb* 28
Resolutions agreed to, and reported; Bill ordered * *Mar* 3
Read 1° * *Mar* 4 [Bill 92]
Read 2, after short debate *Mar* 6, 362
Committee *; Report *Mar* 7
Read 3° * *Mar* 10
l. Read 1ª * (*Earl of Beaconsfield*) *Mar* 11
Read 2ª *; Committee negatived; read 3ª *Mar* 13
Royal Assent *Mar* 14 [42 *Vict.* c. 3]

Exchequer, Chancellor of the (*see* Chancellor of the Exchequer)

Fawcett, Mr. H., *Hackney*
Civil Service (India)—Admission of Natives, 522
East India [Loan], Comm. 1955, 1990
India—Exchanges, 1155
Indian Budget, 1306
Kew Gardens, Res. 294
Metropolis—Parochial Charities of the City of London, 1038;—Royal Commission, 1702

Fitzmaurice, Lord E. G., *Calne*
Army—Deputy Assistant Quartermaster General—Staff College, 1434
Staff Officers of Artillery, 1029
County Boards, Leave, 1211

Floyer, Mr. J., *Dorsetshire*
County Boards, Leave, 1210
Prosecution of Offences, Comm. 984

Forbes, Lord
Agriculture and Trade, 1975

Forster, Right Hon. W. E., *Bradford*
Africa, South—Zulu War—Sir Bartle Frere, Res. 1994
Cyprus, 1524, 1535, 1537, 1538, 1540, 1541
Cyprus—Enforced Labour, 1025, 1026
Electoral Disabilities of Women, Res. 499, 501
"General Statistical Abstract"—Foreign Tariffs on British Produce, 277
Household Suffrage (Counties), Res. 237
India—Afghanistan—The War—Advance on Cabul, 1990
British Burmah—Re-inforcements, 906
Intoxicating Liquors (Licences), Res. 674
Kew Gardens, Res. 296
Valuation of Property, Comm. *cl.* 5, 1482; *cl.* 6, 1486, 1489
Wine Duties, Res. 1179, 1180

France
Commercial and Manufacturing Distress, Question, Mr. Mundella; Answer, Mr. Bourke *Mar* 24, 1506
English Subjects in France—Consular Convention, Question, Colonel Arbuthnot; Answer, Mr. Bourke *Mar* 10, 523
The Commercial Treaty, Question, Mr. Newdegate; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Mar* 27, 1861

Fraser, Sir W. A., *Kidderminster*
New Guinea—Italian Colonists, 1505

Friendly Societies Act (1875) Amendment Bill
(*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson*)
c. Read 2°* *Mar* 10 [Bill 85]
Committee; Report *Mar* 11, 755
Read 3°* *Mar* 12
l. Read 1ª* (*Earl of Beaconsfield*) *Mar* 13 (No. 25)

Galloway, Earl of
Army Regulations—Non-commissioned Officers, 273

General Police and Improvement (Scotland) Provisional Order (Inverness) Bill
(*The Lord Advocate, Mr. Secretary Cross*)
c. Ordered* *Mar* 24
Read 1°* *Mar* 25 [Bill 112]

General Police and Improvement (Scotland) Provisional Order (Paisley) Bill
(*The Lord Advocate, Mr. Secretary Cross*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *Mar* 20 [Bill 110]

"*General Statistical Abstract*"—*Foreign Tariffs on British Produce*
Question, Mr. W. E. Forster; Answer, Mr. J. G. Talbot *Mar* 6, 277

Gibson, Right Hon. E., (Attorney General for Ireland), *Dublin University*
Drainage and Improvement of Land (Ireland) Act, 1878, 1506
Ireland—Miscellaneous Questions
Cork and Macroom Railway Accident, 137
Dublin Port and Docks Board, 1024
Registrars of County Courts, 403
Waterford Harbour Board, 283
Mixed Colleges, Instruction in, 861
Supply—Legal Charges, Ireland, 1333, 1335

Giffard, Sir H. S. (see Solicitor General, The)

Giles, Mr. A., *Southampton*
Lower Thames Valley Main Sewerage Board, 2R. 385

Gladstone, Right Hon. W. E., *Greenwich*
Household Suffrage (Counties), Res. 235

Goldney, Mr. G., *Chippenham*
Clerical Disabilities, 2R. 780, 788

Goldsmid, Sir J., *Rochester*
Consolidated Fund (No. 2), 3R. 1705
Cyprus, 1517, 1529, 1532
Egyptian Finance, 841, 850;—Identic Note, 1508
Supply—Diplomatic Services, 1346, 1349
Paris International Exhibition, 1339, 1346
Thames River (Prevention of Floods), Nomination of Committee, 796; Amendt. 810, 815

Gordon, Sir A., *Aberdeenshire, E.*
Africa, South—Papers and Despatches, 1859, 1860
Africa, South—Zulu War—Sir Bartle Frere, Res. 1897

[*cont.*

Gordon, Sir A.—*cont.*
Army Discipline (Annual) Act, 1315
Army—Retirement of Officers, Res. 22
Army—Scientific Corps, Res. 960
Army Estimates—Land Forces, 1042, 1049, 1070, 1075, 1076, 1089, 1102
Army Estimates, 1879-80—Regimental Establishments at Home and Abroad, 9
Friendly Societies Act (1875) Amendment, Comm. *cl.* 2, Amendt. 755, 756

Gorst, Mr. J. E., *Chatham*
Lower Thames Valley Main Sewerage Board, 2R. 375
Mercantile Marine—Breach of Contract by Seamen, 297
Navy—Ship Carpenters, 532
Parliamentary Elections and Corrupt Practices, 2R. 1373

Goschen, Right Hon. G. J., *London*
Africa, South—Zulu War—Marines, 526, 527
County Boards, Leave, 1219, 1220
East India [Loan], Comm. 1954, 1960
Navy—Men-of-War's Men, 548
Naval Discipline Act, 1866, 555
Navy Estimates—Men and Boys, &c. 602
Seamen and Marines, 614
Poor Law Amendment Act (1876) Amendment, Comm. *cl.* 1, 1601, 1602, 1604
Racecourses (Metropolis), Comm. *cl.* 2, 365

Gourley, Mr. E. T., *Sunderland*
Africa, South—Zulu War—Re-inforcements—Coaling of Transports, 821, 822, 1031
Mercantile Marine—Buoyage, 521
Navy—H.M.S. "Thunderer," Explosion on Board, 529

Gower, Hon. E. F. L., *Bodmin*
Army—Surgeons of Depôt Centres, 1435

Grantham, Mr. W., *Surrey, E.*
Administration of Justice, Res. 1459

Granville, Earl
Africa, South—Sir Bartle Frere and M. Joubert, 266
Africa, South—Zulu War—Sir Bartle Frere, Res. 1691, 1692
British Burmah, 367
Cyprus—Harbour of Famagousta, 1416
India—Afghanistan—Papers—General Roberts' Proclamation, 511, 516
Spain—Slavery in Cuba, 1405

Gregory, Mr. G. B., *Sussex, E.*
Administration of Justice, Res. 1447
County Boards, Leave, 1209
Hypothec Abolition (Scotland), 2R. 1265
Parliamentary Elections and Corrupt Practices, 2R. 1376, 1396
Railways—Continuous Footboards, 905
Supply—Treasury, 325

Grosvenor, Lord R., *Flintshire*
London and North-Western Railway (Additional Powers), 2R. 896, 899

Habitual Drunkards Bill.
(*Dr. Cameron, Mr. Clare Read, Mr. Ashley, Sir Henry Jackson, Mr. Edward Jenkins, Mr. William Holms, Mr. O'Shaughnessy*)
c. Considered *Mar* 11, 753 [Bill 47]
Read 3º * *Mar* 12
l. Read 1ª * (*E. of Shaftesbury*) *Mar* 13 (No. 26)

Hamilton, Lord C. J., *Lynn Regis*
Household Suffrage (Counties), Res. Amendt. 158, 198

Hamilton, Lord G. F. (Vice President of the Committee of Council on Education), *Middlesex*
Contagious Diseases (Animals) Act, 1878—Cattle Disease in the United States—Dairies and Cowsheds, 11, 135
Education Department—London School Board, 525
Education (Scotland) Act, 1878—Examination of Higher Class Schools, 927
Elementary Education Act, 1870—Inspection of Board Schools—Holbeach, 9
Elementary Education Acts—School Boards, 11
Lower Thames Valley Main Sewerage Board, 2R. 398
Medical Act (1858) Amendment, 2R. 772
Quarantine Act—Cargo of Rags from Russia, 1157
Science and Art Department—Agricultural Science, 1988
Supply—Public Education, England and Wales, 1336, 1339

Hamilton, Mr. B., *Berwickshire*
Hypothec Abolition (Scotland), 2R. 1283

Hanbury, Mr. R. W., *Tamworth*
Africa, South—Zulu War—Sir Bartle Frere, Res. Motion for Adjournment, 1950, 1991, 1994, 2006
Electoral Disabilities of Women, Res. 428

Hankey, Mr. T., *Peterborough*
London and North-Western Railway (Additional Powers), 2R. 902

Harcourt, Sir W. G. V., *Oxford City*
Army Estimates—Land Forces, 82, 104
Cyprus, 1564, 1565, 1569, 1572
Mixed Colleges, Instruction in, 877, 878
Prosecution of Offences, Comm. 977, 981
Turkey—Papers, 1038

Hardy, Mr. A. Gathorne-, *Canterbury*
Racecourses (Metropolis), 3R. Amendt. 1821

Hartington, Right Hon. Marquess of, *New Radnor*
Africa, South—Zulu War, 922
Agricultural Holdings Act, 1875, Motion for a Select Committee, 1750, 1755, 1757, 1766
Household Suffrage (Counties), Res. 245

[*cont.*

HARTINGTON, Right Hon. Marquess of—*cont.*
- India—Afghanistan—Burmah, Disturbances in, 282
  - Yakoob Khan, 517
- Intoxicating Liquors (Licences), Res. 737
- Parliament—Public Business, 136
- Treaty of Berlin—Eastern Roumelia, 1863
  - Lord Salisbury's Despatch of Jan. 26, 926

HATHERLEY, Lord
- Bankruptcy Law Amendment, 2R. 1
- City of Glasgow Bank, 2R. 115

HAVELOCK, Sir H. M., *Sunderland*
- Army—Consolidated Ration—Erbswürst, 1157
- Army—First Class Army Reserve, Res. 35
- Army Estimates—Land Forces, 44, 89, 92, 1080, 1089, 1104
- Railways (India)—Indus and Bolan Pass, 817

HAY, Admiral Sir J. C. D., *Stamford*
- Africa, South—Zulu War, 911
- Army—Scientific Corps, Res. 955
- Cyprus, 1557
- Navy Promotion, Res. 536

HAYTER, Colonel Sir A. D., *Bath*
- Army Estimates—Land Forces, 1061

HENNIKER, Lord
- Railways—Continuous Brakes, 270
- Railways (Ireland), 374

HENRY, Mr. Mitchell, *Galway Co.*
- Agricultural Holdings Act, 1875, Motion for a Select Committee, 1740
- Criminal Law—Michael Gilmore, Case of, 1149
  - William Habron, Case of, 1035, 1036, 1430, 1432, 1702
- Cyprus, 1589
- Kew Gardens, Res. 293
- Medical Act (1858) Amendment, 2R. 778
- Mixed Colleges, Instruction in, 869
- Parliament—Questions—The hon. Member for Meath, 1438
- Post Office—Book Post, 276
- Prosecution of Offences, Comm. Motion for Adjournment, 985, 994, 995
- Supply—Civil Service and Revenue Departments, 1597
  - Public Works Office, Ireland, 357, 358
  - Stationery, &c. 345

HERMON, Mr. E., *Preston*
- Brentford, Isleworth, and Twickenham Tramways, 2R. 1427
- Supply—Stationery, &c. 337

HERSCHELL, Mr. F., *Durham*
- Cyprus, 1584
- Franchise and the City Guilds, Res. 829
- Lower Thames Valley Main Sewerage Board, 2R. 390
- Prosecution of Offences, Comm. 969

HERVEY, Lord F., *Bury St. Edmunds*
- Intoxicating Liquors (Licences), Res. Amendt. 696

HEYGATE, Mr. W. U., *Leicestershire, S.*
- Banking Legislation, 1429
- Education Department—London School Board, 525
- Electoral Disabilities of Women, Res. 445
- Intoxicating Liquors (Licences), Res. Motion for Adjournment, 750
- Irish Church Temporalities Commissioners—Report for 1878, 1307

HIBBERT, Mr. J. T., *Oldham*
- Clerical Disabilities, 2R. 784
- County Boards, Leave, 1215
- Parliament — Vacant Seats — Dissolution of Parliament, 1150
- Supply—Reformatory and Industrial Schools, 1530

HICK, Mr. J., *Bolton*
- County Boards, Leave, 1214

Highways Act, 1878
- Question, Observations, The Earl of Kimberley; Reply, The Duke of Richmond and Gordon *Mar* 14, 884
- *Forms of Accounts*, Question, Mr. Clare Read; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth *Mar* 11, 631
- *Disturnpiked Roads*, Motion for a Return, Earl De La Warr; after short debate, Motion amended, and agreed to *Mar* 24, 1497

HOGG, Lt.-Colonel Sir J. M'GAREL-, *Truro*
- Thames River (Prevention of Floods), Nomination of Committee, 813, 815

HOLKER, Sir J. (*see* ATTORNEY GENERAL, The)

HOLLAND, Sir H. T., *Midhurst*
- Africa, South—Zulu War—Sir Bartle Frere, Res. 2035
- West Indies—Grenada—Protector of Immigrants, 905

HOLMS, Mr. J., *Hackney*
- Army—First Class Army Reserve, Res. 26, 33, 36
- Army Estimates—Land Forces, 1049

HOPE, Mr. A. J. B. Beresford, *Cambridge University*
- Africa, South—Zulu War, 914
- Clerical Disabilities, 2R. Amendt. 782
- Colonial Marriages, 528
- Electoral Disabilities of Women, Res. 438
- Medical Act (1858) Amendment, 2R. 779

HOPWOOD, Mr. C. H., *Stockport*
- Criminal Law—Seth Evans, Case of, 401
- Electoral Disabilities of Women, Res. 469
- Navy—Naval Discipline Act, 1866, 549
- Specie and Paper Currency, Res. 1187

Household Suffrage (Counties)
Moved, "That, in the opinion of this House, it would be desirable to establish throughout the whole of the United Kingdom a Household Franchise similar to that now established in the English boroughs" (*Mr. Trevelyan*) *Mar* 4, 137
Amendt. to leave out from "That," and add "this House is of opinion that it is inexpedient to reopen the question of Parliamentary Reform at the present time" (*Lord Claud Hamilton*) *v.*; Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after long debate, Question put; A. 226, N. 291; M. 65
Div. List, A. and N., 252
Question proposed, "That the words 'this House is of opinion that it is inexpedient to reopen the question of Parliamentary Reform at the present time' be there added"
Amendt. to the said proposed Amendt. to leave out "at the present time" (*Mr. Lowe*); Question, "That the words 'at the present time' stand part of the said proposed Amendt. put, and negatived
Words, as amended, added: main Question, as amended, put, and agreed to
Resolved, That this House is of opinion that it is inexpedient to reopen the question of Parliamentary Reform.

HUBBARD, Right Hon. J. G., *London*
Franchise and the City Guilds, **Res.** 829
Supply—Stationery, &c. 338

HUNTLY, Marquess of
Agriculture and Trade, 1967, 1973, 1985

Hypothec Abolition (Scotland) Bill
(*Mr. Vans Agnew, Mr. Baillie Hamilton, Sir George Douglas, Colonel Alexander*)
c. Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *Mar* 19, 1222
Amendt. to leave out from "That," and add "inasmuch as the Law of Hypothec is the equivalent in Scotland of the English and Irish Law of distress, and inasmuch as many other examples of preferential security over property being given in certain circumstances to particular creditors are to be found in the commercial Law of this and other Nations, this subject, if dealt with at all by Parliament, should be considered as a whole, and not be treated locally and exceptionally as in the present Bill; and in dealing with this subject due consideration should be given to the fact that the preferential security for payment of rent which landlords have from time immemorial enjoyed at Common Law, regulated by Statute, has, to the great advantage of the Nation, enabled many industrious and enterprising men of small means to obtain farms and rise in the world, which otherwise they could not have done" (*Lord Elcho*) *v.*; Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after long debate, Question put; A. 204, N. 77; M. 127 (D. L. 48)
Main Question put, and agreed to; Bill read 2°
[Bill 3]

Imprisonment for Debt—Legislation
Question, Mr. M. T. Bass; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *Mar* 6, 279

INDIA
MISCELLANEOUS QUESTIONS
Civil Service—Admission of Natives, Question, Mr. Fawcett; Answer, Mr. E. Stanhope *Mar* 10, 522
East India Freight, Question, Mr. E. Jenkins; Answer, Mr. E. Stanhope *Mar* 10, 528
Public Works—Construction of Indian Railways, Question, Sir Charles W. Dilke; Answer, Mr. E. Stanhope *Mar* 6, 274
Railway from the Indus to the Bolan Pass, Question, Sir Henry Havelock; Answer, Mr. E. Stanhope *Mar* 13, 817
Scarcity of Grain in the Punjab, Question, Observations, Lord Walsingham; Reply, Viscount Cranbrook *Mar* 4, 125
The Afghan War—Newspaper Correspondents, Question, Mr. Anderson; Answer, Mr. E. Stanhope *Mar* 18, 1159
The Financial Statement, Question, General Sir George Balfour; Answer Mr. E. Stanhope *Mar* 17, 1036
The Indian Budget, Question, Notice of Resolutions, Mr. Fawcett; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Mar* 20, 1306
The Exchanges, Questions, Mr. J. K. Cross; Mr. Childers, Mr. Fawcett; Answers, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Mar* 18, 1154
The North-Western Frontier—The Occupation of Quettah, Question, Mr. Dillwyn; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Mar* 6, 279

India—East India [Loan]
Considered in Committee; Moved, "That it is expedient to authorize the Secretary of State in Council of India to raise in the United Kingdom any sum or sums of money not exceeding £10,000,000, for the service of the Government of India on the security of the Revenues of India" (*Mr. E. Stanhope*) *Mar* 27, 1951; after short debate, Moved to report Progress (*Sir George Campbell*); after further short debate, Question put, and agreed to

Intemperance—Report of the Lords' Select Committee
Question, The Earl of Wharncliffe; Answer, Lord Aberdare *Mar* 11, 625; Question, Mr. Blake; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Mar* 20, 1317; Question, Sir Wilfrid Lawson; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Mar* 27, 1851

Intoxicating Liquors (Licences)
Moved, "That, inasmuch as the ancient and avowed object of licensing the sale of intoxicating liquor is to supply a supposed public want without detriment to the public welfare, this House is of opinion that a legal power of restraining the issue or renewal of licences should be placed in the hands of the persons most deeply interested and affected—namely, the inhabitants themselves—who are

[*cont.*

Intoxicating Liquors (*Licences*)—cont.

entitled to protection from the injurious consequences of the present system by some efficient measure of local option" (*Sir Wilfrid Lawson*) *Mar* 11, 632

Amendt. to leave out from "That," and add "it would be most undesirable and inopportune to change the arrangements now legislatively provided for the regulation of the trade carried on by the Licensed Victuallers of this Country, because any tribunal subject to periodical election by popular canvas and vote might, and in all probability would, lead to repeated instances of turmoil, and thus be detrimental to the peace and quietude of every neighbourhood in England" (*Mr. Wheelhouse*) *v.*; after long debate, Question put, "That the words, &c.;" A. 164, N. 252; M. 88

Div. List, A. and N., 746

Question, "That the words 'it would be most undesirable, &c.' be there added" put, and negatived, 750

Amendt. to add, after "That" in the original Question, "it is undesirable for this House to commit itself to legislation on the subject of licensing till the Select Committee of the House of Lords on Intemperance have published their final Report" (*Lord Francis Hervey*); Question put, "That those words be there added;" A. 121, N. 169; M. 48 (D. L. 41)

Amendt. to add, after "That" in the original Question, "in the opinion of this House, among the conditions prescribed by Law for the granting of new Licences for the Sale of Intoxicating Liquors, it should be expressly provided that the licensing authority shall take into consideration the population and the number of existing licences in the district, and shall find as a fact, upon sworn evidence, that new licences are required for the necessary convenience of the public" (*Mr. Serjeant Simon*); Question proposed, "That those words be there added;" after short debate, Debate adjourned

Question, Sir Wilfrid Lawson; Answer, Mr. Serjeant Simon *Mar* 17, 1039

Order for resuming Adjourned Debate read, and discharged *Mar* 24, 1509

IRELAND

MISCELLANEOUS QUESTIONS

Attendance of Resident Magistrates at Petty Sessions, Question, Mr. Cogan; Answer, Mr. J. Lowther *Mar* 6, 277

Catholic University—Speech of Mr. W. Johnston (*Commissioner of Irish Fisheries*) *at Belfast*, Questions, Mr. Sullivan; Answers, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Mar* 6, 273; *Mar* 25, 1697

Cork and Macroom Railway Accident, Question, Major O'Gorman; Answer, The Attorney General for Ireland *Mar* 4, 136

Coroners, Question, Mr. O'Shaughnessy; Answer, Mr. J. Lowther *Mar* 20, 1307

Departmental Administration, Observations, Mr. O'Shaughnessy; Reply, Mr. J. Lowther; short debate thereon *Mar* 6, 299

[cont.

IRELAND—*cont.*

Election Petitions Return—Irish Cases, Question, Mr. O'Conor; Answer, Mr. J. Lowther *Mar* 17, 1031

Glengariff Dispensary District, Question, Mr. Sullivan; Answer, Mr. J. Lowther *Mar* 27, 1849

Grand Jury Laws—Legislation, Question, Mr. O'Shaughnessy; Answer, Mr. J. Lowther *Mar* 13, 819

Irish Branch of the Treasury, Question, Mr. O'Shaughnessy; Answer, Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson *Mar* 17, 1028

Model Schools—Discontinuance, Question, Mr. Errington; Answer, Mr. J. Lowther *Mar* 24, 1507

National Teachers, Question, Mr. Meldon; Answer, Mr. J. Lowther *Mar* 7, 404

Poor Law Guardians, Question, Mr. O'Connor Power; Answer, Mr. J. Lowther *Mar* 6, 278

Poor Law—Removal of Irish Paupers, Question, Major Nolan; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth *Mar* 6, 275

Post Office Letter Carriers, Question, Mr. P. Martin; Answer, Lord John Manners *Mar* 25, 1698

Prisons — Inspectors, Question, Mr. Cogan; Answer, Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson *Mar* 28, 1988; — *Medical Officers*, Question, Mr. Macartney; Answer, Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson *Mar* 27, 1851

Public Peace—Riots at Belfast and Outrage at Derry, Questions, The O'Donoghue, Mr. Sullivan; Answers, Mr. J. Lowther *Mar* 18, 1161

Registrars of County Courts, Questions, Mr. Meldon; Answers, The Attorney General for Ireland *Mar* 7, 403

The Dublin Port and Docks Board, Question, Mr. M. Brooks; Answer, The Attorney General for Ireland *Mar* 17, 1024

The Game Laws—Case of the Hagneys, Question, Mr. Alexander M'Arthur; Answer, Mr. J. Lowther *Mar* 27, 1850

Town Inspectorship of Belfast, Question, Major Nolan; Answer, Mr. J. Lowther *Mar* 13, 819

Trinity College, Dublin—The Divinity School, Question, Mr. Plunket; Answer, Mr. J. Lowther *Mar* 10, 526

University Education, Question, Mr. Callan; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Mar* 14, 924

Waterford Harbour Board, Question, Major O'Gorman; Answer, The Attorney General for Ireland *Mar* 6, 283

Irish Church Commission—Date of Expiration

Question, Sir Harcourt Johnstone; Answer, Mr. J. Lowther *Mar* 24, 1503

Irish Church Temporalities Commissioners—The Report for 1878

Question, Mr. Heygate; Answer, Mr. J. Lowther *Mar* 20, 1307

ISAAC, Mr. S., *Nottingham*

Lower Thames Valley Main Sewerage Board, 2R. Amendt. 379

Jackson, Sir H. M., *Coventry*
Electoral Disabilities of Women, Res. 503
Employers' Liability, Leave, 1142

Jamaica
Reports on Colonial Possessions, Question, Mr. Knatchbull-Hugessen; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *Mar* 3, 11
Flogging for Libel, Question, Mr. Errington; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *Mar* 20, 1309

James, Sir H., *Taunton*
Administration of Justice, Res. 1438, 1480
Cyprus, 1577, 1578
Electoral Disabilities of Women, Res. 481, 488, 490, 492
Parliamentary Elections and Corrupt Practices, 2R. 1383

James, Mr. W. H., *Gateshead*
Africa, South—Zulu War—Sir Bartle Frere, Res. 2033
Franchise and the City Guilds, Res. 823
Parliament, Duration of, 1316
Supply—Diplomatic Services, 1349
Stationery, &c. 352, 353
Valuation of Property, Comm. *cl.* 5, 1482; *cl.* 6, 1488

Japan—Medicinal Opium
Question, Mr. Mark Stewart; Answer, Mr. Bourke *Mar* 20, 1314

Jenkins, Mr. D. J., *Penryn, &c.*
Navy—H.M.S. "Vanguard," 1033

Jenkins, Mr. E., *Dundee*
Africa, South—Zulu War, 908, 909, 910, 911, 912, 913, 914; Motion for Adjournment, 915, 920, 924;—Lord Chelmsford, Withdrawal of Motion. 1493
Egyptian Finance, 835
Treaty of Berlin—Eastern Roumelia, 281

Jervis, Colonel H. J. W., *Harwich*
Army—Scientific Corps, Res. 962

Johnstone, Sir H., *Scarborough*
Contagious Diseases Acts—Select Committee, 1506
Irish Church Commission—Date of Expiration, 1503

Kay-Shuttleworth, Sir U. J., *Hastings*
Gas and Water Supply (Metropolis), 1314
Law and Justice —"Martin v. Mackonochie," 1151
Public Health—Death-rate of the Metropolis, 1153
Thames River (Prevention of Floods), Nomination of Committee, 802

Kenealy, Dr. E. V., *Stoke-upon-Trent*
Administration of Justice, Res 1465, 1473
Africa, South—Zulu War—Defeat at Isandlana, 821
Bar Education and Discipline, 1852
Criminal Law—Rev. H. J. Dodwell, Case of, 821
William Habron, Case of, 1430
Intoxicating Liquors (Licences), Res. 692
Navy—The Royal Yacht "Osborne," 1311
Royal Journeys, Expenses of, 1435

Kennaway, Sir J. H., *Devon, E.*
Agricultural Holdings Act, 1875, Motion for a Select Committee, 1722
Army Estimates—Land Forces, 88
Intoxicating Liquors (Licences), Res. Amendt. 713

Kimberley, Earl of
Africa, South—Zulu War—Sir Bartle Frere, Res. 1670
Highways Act, 1878, 884;—Disturnpiked Roads, 1499
Railways (Ireland)—Letterkenny Railway and West Donegal Railway, Res. 998
West Donegal Railway, 2R. 622

Knatchbull-Hugessen, Right Hon. E. H., *Sandwich*
Africa, South—Zulu War—Sir Bartle Frere, Res. 1939, 1994
Colonial Marriages, 528
Colonial Possessions—Jamaica, 11

Knowles, Mr. T., *Wigan*
Household Suffrage (Counties), Res. 214

Land Drainage Provisional Order (Bispham, &c.) Bill
(*Sir Matthew Ridley, Mr. Secretary Cross*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *Mar* 17 [Bill 104]

Land Tax Commissioners' Names Bill
(*Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *Mar* 20 [Bill 109]
Read 2°* *Mar* 24

Lansdowne, Marquess of
Africa, South—Zulu War—Sir Bartle Frere, 1404; Res. 1606

Law and Justice
Case of "Martin v. Mackonochie," Question, Sir Ughtred Kay-Shuttleworth; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Mar* 18, 1151
Criminal Assizes, Question, Mr. Cole; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *Mar* 20, 1310

Law and Justice — Administration of Justice
Amendt. on Committee of Supply *Mar* 21, To leave out from "That," and add "in the opinion of this House, it is expedient that measures should be adopted to provide a more speedy and efficient and less expensive mode of administering justice than now prevails" (*Sir Henry James*) *v.*, 1438; Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after long debate, Amendt. withdrawn

Law Courts, The—Ventilation in the Court of Queen's Bench
Question, Mr. J. Cowen; Answer, Mr. Gerard Noel *Mar* 10, 518

LAWRENCE, Lord
India—Afghanistan—Papers—General Roberts' Proclamation, 513

LAWRENCE, Sir J. J. T., *Surrey, Mid.*
Franchise and the City Guilds, Res. 830
Kew Gardens, Res. 284

LAWSON, Sir W., *Carlisle*
Criminal Law—Devonport Watch Committee, 1310
Franchise and the City Guilds, Res. 826
Intemperance, Report of the Lords' Committee, 1851
Intoxicating Liquors (Licences), Res. 632, 664, 745, 753; Order for resuming Adjourned Debate discharged, 1509
Parliament—Business of the House, 1030

LEATHAM, Mr. E. A., *Huddersfield*
Household Suffrage (Counties), Res. 194, 198, 235

LECHMERE, Sir E., *Worcestershire, W.*
Cyprus, 1545

LEFEVRE, Mr. G. J. Shaw, *Reading*
Africa, South—War Office Papers, 1493
  Zulu War—Despatch of September 14, 1878, 1159
Convention (Ireland) Act Repeal, 2R. 1813
Cyprus, 1587
Egyptian Finance, 852
Employers' Liability, Leave, 1141
Lower Thames Valley Main Sewerage Board, 2R. 388
Married Women's Property (Scotland), 2R. 264
Naval Expenditure—Vote of Credit, 1878, 133
Navy Estimates—Men and Boys, &c. 579, 612
Parliamentary Elections and Corrupt Practices, 2R. 1398
Supply—Civil Service and Revenue Departments, 1599
  Consular Services, 1350, 1357, 1359
  Public Works Office, Ireland, 362

LEGARD, Sir C., *Scarborough*
Household Suffrage (Counties), Res. 173
Intoxicating Liquors (Licences), Res. 665

LEIGHTON, Sir B., *Shropshire, S.*
Army—Portable Intrenching Tools, 1863

LEIGHTON, Mr. S., *Shropshire, N.*
Household Suffrage (Counties), Res. 191

Letterkenny Railway and West Donegal Railway Bills—see *Railways (Ireland)*

Libel
Select Committee appointed, "to inquire into the Law in relation to Libels in newspapers and journals, and as to the mode of proving the publication of such Libels, and the means of rendering the proprietors and publishers of newspapers and journals responsible civilly and criminally for the Libels contained therein; with power to make any proposals for the alteration of the Law with regard to the above matters, or any of them" (*Mr. Attorney General*) *Mar* 4

Libel Law Amendment Bill
(*Mr. Hutchinson, Dr. Cameron, Mr. Joseph Cowen, Mr. Puleston, Mr. Morley, Mr. Waddy, Mr. Edward Jenkins, Mr. Gourley, Mr. Sullivan*)
c. Bill withdrawn* *Mar* 4 [Bill 43]

Licensing Act (1872) Amendment Bill
(*Mr. Rodwell, Mr. Serjeant Simon, Mr. Arthur Mills, Mr. Leatham, Mr. Mark Stewart*)
c. Considered in Committee; Resolution agreed to, and reported; Bill ordered; read 1°* *Mar* 19 [Bill 108]

Licensing Laws Amendment Bill
Question, Mr. Mundella; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *Mar* 14, 926

LIFFORD, Viscount
Railways (Ireland), 374
West Donegal Railway, 2R. 616

Lighting by Electricity
Select Committee appointed, "to consider whether it is desirable to authorise Municipal Corporations or other local authorities to adopt any schemes for Lighting by Electricity; and to consider how far, and under what conditions, if at all, Gas or other Public Companies should be authorised to supply Light by Electricity" (*Viscount Sandon*) *Mar* 28
And, on April 3, Committee nominated; List of the Committee, 2090

LINDSAY, Colonel R. J. Loyd (Financial Secretary for War), *Berkshire*
Africa, South—Zulu War—Miscellaneous Questions
  Papers and Despatches, 1860
  Rewards for Services at Rorke's Drift, 1855
  The Command, 1858, 1859

[*cont.*

Lindsay, Colonel R. J. Loyd—*cont.*
- Army—Miscellaneous Questions
  - Artillery and Engineer Officers, 1856
  - Out-Pensioners, 1057
  - Portable Intrenching Tools, 1863
  - Rorke's Drift, Defence of—Brevet-Major Chard, 1858
  - Scientific Corps, 1505
- Army Estimates—Land Forces, 1103
- Friendly Societies Act (1875) Amendment, Comm. *cl.* 2, 756
- War Office Locks, 1152

Liverpool Lighting Bill (by Order)

c. Read 2°, after short debate *Mar* 11, 626
- Moved, "That the Bill be committed to a Select Committee of Seven Members, Four to be appointed by the House and Three by the Committee of Selection" (*Mr. Raikes*); Motion agreed to
- Moved, "That it be an Instruction to the Committee that they have power to inquire whether it is desirable to authorise any schemes for lighting by Electricity or other improved methods; to consider how far and under what conditions, if at all, the use of such modes of lighting should be sanctioned by Parliament in the case of Municipal Corporations, other local authorities, or Public Companies, and to report their opinion to the House; and that such of the Petitioners against the Bill as pray to be heard by themselves, their Counsel, or Agents be heard upon their Petitions (if presented on or before the 17th day of March), and Counsel heard in favour of the Bill against such Petitions:—That the Committee have power to send for persons, papers, and records:—That Four be the quorum of the Committee" (*Mr. Raikes*); Motion agreed to
- And, on *Mar* 13, Committee nominated; List of the Committee, 628
- Moved, "That the Order [11th March] that the Liverpool Lighting Bill be committed to a Select Committee of Seven Members, Four to be appointed by the House and Three by the Committee of Selection, be read, and discharged" (*The Chairman of Ways and Means*) *Mar* 24, 1502; Motion agreed to

Lloyd, Mr. M., *Beaumaris*
- Convention (Ireland) Act Repeal, 2R. 1817
- Intoxicating Liquors (Licences), Res. 753
- Parliamentary Elections and Corrupt Practices, 2R. 1376
- Prosecution of Offences, Comm. 968, 991, 995
- Supply—Stationery, &c. 352

Lloyd, Mr. S. S., *Plymouth*
- Navy—Officers of the Royal Marines, 524
- Post Office (West India Mail Contract), Res. 1199
- Prosecution of Offences, Comm. 969
- Supply—Paris International Exhibition, 1343
- Valuation of Property, Comm. *cl.* 6, 1488
- Wine Duties, Res. 1181

Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders (Cashel, &c.) Bill [H.L] (*The Lord President*)

l. Presented; read 1^{a}*, and referred to the Examiners *Mar* 10 (No. 22)
- Read 2^{a}* *Mar* 28

Local Government Provisional Order (Ireland) Confirmation (Downpatrick) Bill [H.L] (*The Lord President*)

l. Presented; read 1^{a}*, and referred to the Examiners *Mar* 10 (No. 21)
- Read 2^{a}* *Mar* 28

Locke, Mr. J., *Southwark*
- Thames River (Prevention of Floods), Nomination of Committee, 812

London and North Western Railway (Additional Powers) Bill (by Order)

c. Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" (*Sir Charles Forster*) *Mar* 14, 893
- Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day six months" (*Mr. Alderman Cotton*); Question proposed, "That 'now,' &c.;" after short debate, Amendt. withdrawn
- Main Question put, and agreed to; Bill read 2°
- Moved, "That the Bill be committed to a Select Committee of Five Members, Three to be nominated by the House, and Two by the Committee of Selection" (*Viscount Sandon*); Motion agreed to
- Moved the following Instruction to the Committee:—"That they have power to inquire and report as to the expediency of authorizing the said Company from time to time to purchase by agreement or take on lease or otherwise provide, and to establish and hold booking and receiving offices and other premises for the collection, reception, and booking and delivery of goods, parcels, and other matters and things intended to be carried upon or over their Railway, and to collect, receive, book, and invoice any such goods, parcels, and other matters and things; and to make and carry into effect any such contracts or agreements with any other Railway Company or Companies with regard to the collection, reception, booking, or invoicing of any goods, parcels, and other matters and things intended to be carried upon or over the Railways of the respective Companies so contracting, or any or either of them" (*Viscount Sandon*); Power to send for persons, papers, and records; Three to be the quorum;" Motion agreed to
- And, on *Mar* 21, Committee nominated; List of the Committee, 904

Longford, Earl of
- Africa, South—Zulu War—Defeat at Isandlana, 887
- Army—Desertions—Report of the Inspector General of Recruiting, 1878, 225

Lopes, Sir M., *Devonshire, S.*
- Navy Promotion, Res. 536

Lothian, Marquess of
Medical Act, 1858, Amendment, Comm. *cl.* 15, 1301

Lowe, Right Hon. R., *London University*
Africa, South—Zulu War—Sir Bartle Frere, Res. 2001
Household Suffrage (Counties), Res. 208; Amendt. 256

Lower Thames Valley Main Sewerage Board Bill (by Order)
c. Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" (*Mr. Gorst*) *Mar* 7, 375
Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day six months" (*Mr. Isaac*); Question proposed, "That 'now,' &c.;" after debate, Question put; A. 146, N. 168; M. 22 (D. L. 38)
Words added; main Question, as amended, put, and agreed to; 2R. put off for six months

Lowther, Right Hon. J. (Chief Secretary for Ireland), *York City*
Convention (Ireland) Act Repeal, 2R. 1818
Criminal Law—James Swanton, Case of, 1316
  Michael Gilmore, Case of, 1149
Ireland—Miscellaneous Questions
  Belfast, Town Inspectorship of, 819
  Coroners, 1307
  Departmental Administration, 304, 316
  Election Petition Return—Irish Cases, 1031
  Game Laws—Case of the Hagneys, 1850
  Glengariff Dispensary District, 1849
  Grand Jury Laws, 819
  Model Schools—Discontinuance, 1507
  National Teachers, 404
  Poor Law Guardians, 278
  Public Peace—Riots at Belfast and Outrage at Derry, 1161
  Resident Magistrates at Petty Sessions, Attendance of, 277
  Trinity College, Dublin—The Divinity School, 526
Irish Church Commission—Date of Expiration, 1504
Irish Church Temporalities Commissioners, Report for 1878, 1307
Racecourses (Metropolis), 3R. 1821
Supply—Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Household of, &c. 355, 356
  Public Works Office, Ireland, 359
  Reformatory and Industrial Schools, 1330

Lubbock, Sir J., *Maidstone*
Prosecution of Offences, Comm. 989
Ways and Means, Report, 105

Lunacy Law Amendment Bill
(*Mr. Dillwyn, Sir George Balfour, Mr. Herschell*)
c. Motion for Leave (*Mr. Dillwyn*) *Mar* 20, 1403; Motion agreed to; Bill ordered; read 1°* [Bill 111]

Lush, Dr. J. A., *Salisbury*
Medical Act (1858) Amendment, 2R. 758, 780

Lusk, Sir A., *Finsbury*
Lower Thames Valley Main Sewerage Board, 2R. 368
Thames River (Prevention of Floods), Nomination of Committee, 804

McArthur, Mr. A., *Leicester*
Ireland—Game Laws—Case of the Hagneys, 1850
Kew Gardens, Res. 293
Mauritius—Emigration of Coolies, 1850
Prison Rules—Reporters of the Press, 816

Macartney, Mr. J. W. E., *Tyrone*
Prisons (Ireland)—Medical Officers, 1851
Supply—Reformatory and Industrial Schools, 1327

MacDonald, Mr. A., *Stafford*
Army—War Office Contracts, 276
Employers' Liability, Leave, 1139
Inspectors of Mines Reports, 1878, 402
Mercantile Marine—David Julian, Case of, 907
Mines—Abercarne Colliery Explosion, 520,
  Wakefield, Accident at, 629
Mines Act, 1872—Mining Explosions—Supervision of Managers, 1859
Supply—Civil Contingencies Fund, 1362
  Home Office, 327, 329, 333
  Stationery, &c. 340
War Office Locks, 1152

Macduff, Viscount, *Elgin and Nairn*
Hypothec Abolition (Scotland), 2R. 1245

Mac Iver, Mr. D., *Birkenhead*
Africa, South—Export of Munitions of War for Mozambique, 931
Board of Trade Returns, 519
Cyprus, 1562, 1564, 1565
Post Office—Pacific Mail Contracts, 1034
Post Office (West India Mail Contract), Res. 1193
Wine Duties, Res. 1177, 1180

McKenna, Sir J. N., *Youghal*
Army Estimates—Land Forces, 1049
Clerical Disabilities, 2R. 788
Convention (Ireland) Act Repeal, 2R. 1772, 1820, 1821
London and North-Western Railway (Additional Powers), 2R. 900
Medical Act (1858) Amendment, 2R. 763
Mixed Colleges, Instruction in, 862
Parliamentary Elections and Corrupt Practices, 2R. 1399
Specie and Paper Currency, Res. 1190
Thames River (Prevention of Floods), Nomination of Committee, 808
Wine Duties, Res. 1177

Mackintosh, Mr. C. F., *Inverness, &c.*
Poor Law (Scotland), 1506

McLagan, Mr. P., *Linlithgowshire*
Agricultural Holdings Act, 1878, Motion for a Select Committee, 1723
Hypothec Abolition (Scotland), 2R. 1287
Intoxicating Liquors (Licences), Res. 686
Married Women's Property (Scotland), 2R. 263

McLaren, Mr. D., *Edinburgh*
Hypothec Abolition (Scotland), 2R. 1278
Married Women's Property (Scotland), 2R. 263
Mixed Colleges, Instruction in, 857
Parliamentary Elections and Corrupt Practices, 2R. 1382
Supply — Public Education, England and Wales, 1337

Makins, Lieut.-Colonel W. T., *Essex, S.*
Franchise and the City Guilds, Res. 829

Malta—The Recent Riots
Question, Mr. Anderson ; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *Mar* 20, 1318

Manchester, Duke of
Rivers Conservancy, 2R. 1018

Manners, Right Hon. Lord J. J. R. (Postmaster General), *Leicestershire, N.*
Navy Contracts — Peninsular and Oriental Company, 1029, 1504
Post Office—Book Post, 276
Ireland—Letter Carriers, 1699]
Pacific Mail Contracts, 1034
Post Office (West India Mail Contracts), Res. 1198

Marine Mutiny Act (Temporary) Continuance Bill (*Mr. William Henry Smith, Mr. Algernon Egerton, Sir Massey Lopes*)
c. Ordered ; read 1° * *Mar* 11 [Bill 98]
Read 2° * *Mar* 13
Committee * ; Report ; read 3° *Mar* 14
l. Read 1ª * (*Lord Elphinstone*) *Mar* 17
Read 2ª * ; Committee negatived *Mar* 18
Read 3ª * *Mar* 20
Royal Assent *Mar* 21 [42 *Vict.* c. 5]

Marlborough, Duke of (Lord Lieutenant of Ireland)
West Donegal Railway, 2R. 622

Married Women's Property (Scotland) Bill (*Mr. Anderson, Sir Robert Anstruther, Mr. Orr Ewing, Mr. M'Laren, Mr. Lyon Playfair*)
c. Read 2°, after short debate *Mar* 5, 257 [Bill 1]

Marten, Mr. A. G., *Cambridge*
Administration of Justice, Res. 1452
Africa, South—Zulu War—Sir Bartle Frere, Res. 1900
Convention (Ireland) Act Repeal, 2R. Amendt. 1790

Martin, Mr. P., *Kilkenny Co.*
Post Office (Ireland) Letter-Carriers, 1698

Mauritius—Emigration of Coolies
Question, Mr. Alexander M'Arthur ; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *Mar* 27, 1850

Medical Act, 1858, Amendment Bill [H.L.]
(*The Lord President*)
l. Read 2ª, after debate *Mar* 11, 625 (No. 16)
Committee, after short debate *Mar* 20, 1291
Report *Mar* 28, 1986 (No. 31)

Medical Act (1858) Amendment Bill
(*Dr. Lush, Sir Trevor Lawrence, Sir Joseph M'Kenna*)
c. Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *Mar* 12, 758
Amendt. to leave out "now," and add "upon this day six months" (*Mr. Serjeant Simon*) ; Question proposed, "That 'now,' &c. ;" after debate, Moved, "That the Debate be now adjourned" (*Dr. Brady*) ; Motion agreed to ; Debate adjourned [Bill 2]

Meldon, Mr. C. H., *Kildare*
Army (Medical Department), Motion for an Address, 1767
Ireland—Miscellaneous Questions
Departmental Administration, 307
National Teachers, 404
Registrars of County Courts, 403
Supply—Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Household of, &c. 357
Stationery, &c. 344

Mellor, Mr. T. W., *Ashton-under-Lyne*
Poor Law Amendment Act (1876) Amendment, 1436 ; Comm. *cl.* 1, 1601

Mercantile Marine
Breach of Contract by Seamen—Legislation, Observations, Mr. Gorst, Mr. Burt ; Reply, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Mar* 6, 297
Buoyage, Question, Mr. Gourley ; Answer, Mr. J. G. Talbot *Mar* 10, 521
Case of David Julian, Question, Mr. Macdonald ; Answer, Mr. Bourke *Mar* 14, 907
Foreign Steamers, Question, Mr. Bates ; Answer, Mr. J. G. Talbot *Mar* 11, 632

Metropolis
Miscellaneous Questions
Gas and Water Supply, Question, Sir Ughtred Kay-Shuttleworth ; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *Mar* 20, 1314
National Gallery—Injury to the Pictures, Question, Mr. Ritchie ; Answer, Mr. Gerard Noel *Mar* 10, 525
Parochial Charities of the City of London, Question, Mr. Fawcett ; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *Mar* 17, 1038 ;—*The Royal Commission*, Question, Mr. Fawcett ; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *Mar* 25, 1702
Victoria Embankment—The New Mint, Question, Mr. Rylands ; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Mar* 3, 12

Metropolis—Kew Gardens
Amendt. on Committee of Supply *Mar* 6, To leave out from "That," and add "in the opinion of this House, it is desirable that the Royal Gardens at Kew should be opened to the public at 10 a.m. on week-days, with such reservations as may be found expedient" (*Sir Trevor Lawrence*) *v.*, 284; Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after short debate, Question put; A. 196, N. 94; M. 102 (D. L. 36)

Metropolis—Street Accidents
Moved, "That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty for a Tabular statement by months of the accidents which have occurred in the streets of the Metropolis and its suburbs referable to the passage of vehicles, bicycles, or horsemen from 1st January 1878 to 31st January 1879, showing the circumstances under which each accident has occurred, its issues, and results" (*Viscount Templetown*) *Mar* 7, 367; after short debate, Motion agreed to

Metropolis—The Franchise and the City Guilds
Amendt. on Committee of Supply *Mar* 13, To leave out from "That," and add "the sale of the Parliamentary Franchise by the City Guilds with the consent of the Court of Aldermen is an abuse and should be abolished" (*Mr. James*) *v.*, 823; Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after short debate, Question put; A. 153, N. 114; M. 39 (D. L. 43)

Midland Railway Bill (by Order)
c. Bill read 2° and committed to the Select Committee on the London and North Western Railway (Additional Powers) Bill, with Instruction to the same effect *Mar* 14, 904

MILBANK, Mr. F. A., *Yorkshire, N.R.*
Africa, South—Papers and Despatches, 1861

MILLS, Mr. A., *Exeter*
Africa, South—Zulu War—Marines, 527
Kew Gardens, Res. 295
Parliament—Easter Recess, 1507
State of Public Business—The Budget, 1437
Supply—Public Education, England and Wales, 1337

Mines Regulation Act, 1872
Abercarne Colliery Explosion, Question, Mr. Macdonald; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *Mar* 10, 520
Accident at Wakefield, The, Question, Mr. Macdonald; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *Mar* 11, 629
Inspectors of Mines Reports, 1878, Question, Mr. Macdonald; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *Mar* 7, 402; Question, Mr. Stevenson; Answer, Sir Matthew White Ridley *Mar* 13, 820
Mining Explosions—Supervision of Managers, Question, Mr. Macdonald; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *Mar* 27, 1859

MONK, Mr. C. J., *Gloucester City*
Blind and Deaf-Mute Children (Education), Comm. Motion for Adjournment, 1961

MONTAGU, Right Hon. Lord R., *Westmeath*
Asia, Central—Reported Russian Operations against Merv, 1160, 1313
Thames River (Prevention of Floods), Nomination of Committee, 806
Treaty of Berlin—Miscellaneous Questions
Despatch in "The Times" of March 12th, 820, 821
Eastern Roumelia, 1864
Lord Salisbury's Despatch of Jan. 26, 925, 926

MONTGOMERY, Sir G. G., *Peeblesshire*
Hypothec Abolition (Scotland), 2R. 1280

MOORE, Mr. A. J., *Clonmel*
Africa, South—Zulu War—The Command, 1858
Supply—Reformatory and Industrial Schools, 1328

MORGAN, Mr. G. Osborne, *Denbighshire*
Administration of Justice, Res. 1450
Africa, South—Zulu War—Rewards for Services at Rorke's Drift, 1855
Household Suffrage (Counties), Res. 178

MOWBRAY, Right Hon. J. R., *Oxford University*
Medical Act (1858) Amendment, 2R. 777

MUNDELLA, Mr. A. J., *Sheffield*
Army—Indian Contingent—Cost of Transport, 1150
France—Commercial and Manufacturing Distress, 1506
Licensing Laws Amendment, 926
Supply—Paris International Exhibition, 1344
Public Education, England and Wales, 1336

MUNTZ, Mr. P. H., *Birmingham*
Parliamentary Elections and Corrupt Practices, 2R. 1382
Supply—Stationery, &c. 335, 351

MURE, Colonel W., *Renfrew*
Africa, South—Zulu War—Miscellaneous Questions
910, 914, 918, 920
Re-inforcements, 281
Sir Bartle Frere—Lord Chelmsford, 1701
Africa, South—Zulu War—Sir Bartle Frere, Res. Amendt. 1886, 1932, 1933, 2070
Army—Retirement of Officers, Res. 21
Army Estimates—Land Forces, 61, 79

Mutiny Act (Temporary) Continuance Bill (*Mr. Secretary Stanley, The Judge Advocate, Colonel Loyd Lindsay*)
c. Resolution [4th March] read; Bill ordered; read 1° * *Mar* 11 [Bill 99]
Read 2° * *Mar* 12
Committee *; Report; read 3° *Mar* 13

[*cont.*

Mutiny Act (Temporary) Continuance Bill—cont.
l. Read 1a* (*Lord Ashford*) *Mar* 14
  Read 2a* *Mar* 17
  Committee*; Report *Mar* 18
  Read 3a* *Mar* 20
  Royal Assent *Mar* 21 [42 *Vict.* c. 4]

NAGHTEN, Colonel A. R., *Winchester*
  Army (India)—Pay of Lieutenants, 819

NAPIER OF MAGDALA, Lord
  India—Afghanistan—Papers—General Roberts' Proclamation, 514

NAVY
  MISCELLANEOUS QUESTIONS
    Coaling at St. Vincent, Question, Mr. T. Brassey; Answer, Mr. W. H. Smith *Mar* 27, 1853
    Explosion on Board H.M.S. "Thunderer," Questions, Observations, Mr. Gourley *Mar* 10, 529; Observations, The Duke of Somerset; short debate thereon *Mar* 17, 999
    H.M.S. "Boadicea," Question, Observations, Lord Colville of Culross; Reply, Earl Cadogan *Mar* 20, 1289; Question, Lord Charles Beresford; Answer, Mr. W. H. Smith *Mar* 20, 1315
    H.M.S. "Vanguard," Question, Mr. D. Jenkins; Answer, Mr. W. H. Smith *Mar* 17, 1033
    Men-of-War's Men, Observations, Lord Charles Beresford, Mr. Goschen *Mar* 10, 544
    Naval Discipline Act, 1866, Observations, Mr. Hopwood; Reply, Mr. A. F. Egerton; short debate thereon *Mar* 10, 549
    Navy Contracts—Transports—The Peninsular and Oriental Steam Navigation Company, Question, Mr. Baxter; Answer, Lord John Manners *Mar* 17, 1028
    Navy Estimates—Ships Building, Question, Mr. Samuda; Answer, Mr. W. H. Smith *Mar* 17, 1037
    Officers of the Royal Marines, Question, Mr. Sampson Lloyd; Answer, Mr. W. H. Smith *Mar* 10, 524
    Roman Catholic Chaplains, Question, Mr. Errington; Answer, Mr. W. H. Smith *Mar* 17, 1034
    Ship Carpenters, Observations, Mr. Samuda; short debate thereon *Mar* 10, 530
    The Royal Yacht "Osborne," Question, Dr. Kenealy; Answer, Mr. W. H. Smith *Mar* 20, 1311

Navy—Promotion
  Amendt. on Committee of Supply *Mar* 10, To leave out from "That," and add "the present and progressively increasing stagnation of promotion in the Royal Navy is injurious to the public service, and that the present system of retirement has failed to secure a sufficient amount of promotion, and ought to be extended" (*Mr. Vans Agnew*) *v.*, 533; Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after short debate, Question put, and agreed to

NEWDEGATE, Mr. C. N., *Warwickshire, N.*
  Agricultural Holdings Act, 1875, Motion for a Select Committee, 1732, 1735
  Clerical Disabilities, 2R. 786
  Electoral Disabilities of Women, Res. 422, 423
  France—Commercial Treaty, 1861
  Parliament—Public Business—Parliamentary Reporting, 136

New Guinea—Italian Colonists
  Question, Sir William Fraser; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *Mar* 24, 1505

NOEL, Right Hon. G. J. (First Commissioner of Works), *Rutland*
  Kew Gardens, Res. 289
  Law Courts — Ventilation in the Court of Queen's Bench, 378
  National Gallery—Injury to the Pictures, 525
  South Kensington—Natural History Museum, 280
  Supply—British Museum Buildings, 320
    Home and Colonial Offices, 319
    Natural History Museum, 320
    Public Buildings, 318, 319

NOEL, Mr. E., *Dumfries, &c.*
  Africa, South — Sir Bartle Frere — Lord Chelmsford, 1700
  Africa, South—Zulu War—Sir Bartle Frere, Res. 2081

NOLAN, Major J. P., *Galway Co.*
  Army—Staff College—Vacancies, 817
    Staff Officers of Artillery, 1031
  Army (Medical Department), Motion for an Address, 1770
  Army—Scientific Corps, Res. 961
  Army Discipline and Regulation, 881
  Army Estimates—Land Forces, 1061, 1098, 1120
    Pensions for Wounds, Motion for Adjournment, 1130
    Retired Full Pay, Half Pay Pensions, and Gratuities, &c. 1127
  Clare County Writ, Re-appointment of Select Committee, 616
  Convention (Ireland) Act Repeal, 2R. 1792
  Ireland—Belfast, Town Inspectorship of, 819
    Departmental Statement, 309
    Poor Law—Removal of Irish Paupers, 275
  Mixed Colleges, Instruction in, 860
  Navy Promotion, Res. 543
  Supply—Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Household of, &c. 356
    Public Works Office, Ireland, 359, 362
    Report, 509, 510
    Stationery, &c. 343, 345
    Treasury, 325

NORTH, Colonel J. S., *Oxfordshire*
  Army—Scientific Corps, Res. 957

NORTHCOTE, Right Hon. Sir S. H. (*see* Chancellor of the Exchequer)

NORTON, Lord
Agriculture and Trade, 1972, 1973
Railways—Continuous Brakes, 269

NORWOOD, Mr. C. M., *Kingston-upon-Hull*
Administration of Justice, Res. 1423
Navy—Ship Carpenters, 532
Wine Duties, Res. 1181

O'BEIRNE, Major F., *Leitrim*
Agricultural Holdings Act, 1875, Motion for a Select Committee, 1716
Army—Artillery and Engineer Officers, 1855
  Officers' Travelling Expenses, 818
Army (Medical Department), Motion for an Address, 1769
Army—Retirement of Officers, Res. 22
Army—Scientific Corps, Res. 957
Army Estimates—Land Forces, 60, 1042, 1069, 1070; Amendt. 1119, 1120
Drainage and Improvement of Land (Ireland) Act, 1878, 1506
Mixed Colleges, Instruction in, 869

O'BRIEN, Sir P., *King's Co.*
Agricultural Holdings Act, 1875, Motion for a Select Committee, 1765
Army (Medical Department), Motion for an Address, 1770
Army—Scientific Corps, Res. 960
Army Estimates—Land Forces, Amendt. 1077, 1084, 1085, 1086, 1089, 1092, 1095, 1101, 1103
Mixed Colleges, Instruction in, 876
Prosecution of Offences, Comm. 990

O'CLERY, Mr. K., *Wexford Co.*
Inland Revenue—Legacy and Succession Duty, 132, 521
Mixed Colleges, Instruction in, 874, 878

O'CONOR, Mr. D. M., *Sligo Co.*
Election Petition Return—Irish Cases, 1031
Parliamentary Elections and Corrupt Practices, 2R. 1388

O'DONNELL, Mr. F. H., *Dungarvan*
Agricultural Holdings Act, 1875, Motion for a Select Committee, Amendt. 1712, 1717, 1765
Army—First Class Army Reserve, Res. 36
Army Estimates—Land Forces, 94, 105, 1082, 1085, 1086, 1089, 1092, 1093, 1099, 1100, 1106, 1109, 1116
  Pensions for Wounds, 1131, 1133
Cyprus, 1591
Mixed Colleges, Instruction in, 852, 855, 856
Parliamentary Elections and Corrupt Practices, 2R. 1378; Amendt. 1391, 1396
Supply—Civil Service and Revenue Departments, 1599

O'DONOGHUE, The, *Tralee*
Public Peace (Ireland)—Riots at Belfast and Outrage at Derry, 1161

O'GORMAN, Major P., *Waterford*
Ireland—Cork and Macroom Railway Accident, 136
  Waterford Harbour Board, 283
Racecourses (Metropolis), Comm. *cl.* 2, 365
Supply—Public Works Office, Ireland, 360

O'HAGAN, Lord
Medical Act, 1858, Amendment, Comm. *cl.* 15, 1299, 1300

O'LEARY, Dr. W. H., *Drogheda*
Medical Act (1858) Amendment, 2R. 771
Mixed Colleges, Instruction in, 880
Prosecution of Offences, Comm. 993

ONSLOW, Earl of
Cremation, 1406

ONSLOW, Mr. D. R., *Guildford*
Africa, South—Zulu War—Sir Bartle Frere, Res. 2084
India—Afghanistan—Miscellaneous Questions
  Khost Valley, Operations in, 282
  Shere Ali, Reported Death of, 16
  Yakoob Khan, 517
Parliamentary Elections and Corrupt Practices, 2R. 1375
Racecourses (Metropolis), Comm. *cl.* 9, 366; Consid. 1490, 1491
Valuation of Property, Comm. *cl.* 6, 1483

O'REILLY, Mr. M. W., *Longford Co.*
Army—Scientific Corps, Res. 954
Egyptian Finance, 839
India—Afghanistan—The War—Address of General Roberts, 927
Supply—Reformatory and Industrial Schools, Great Britain, 1322, 1329

O'SHAUGHNESSY, Mr. R., *Limerick*
Convention (Ireland) Act Repeal, 2R. 1784
Coroners (Ireland), 1307
Ireland—Miscellaneous Questions
  Departmental Administration, 299, 304, 306
  Grand Jury Laws, 819
  Irish Branch of the Treasury, 1028
Supply—Stationery, &c. 337

OTWAY, Mr. A. J., *Rochester*
Africa, South—Miscellaneous Questions
  Sir Bartle Frere—Lord Chelmsford, 1701
  Telegraphic Despatches, 928
  The Orange Free State, 1700
  Zulu War—The Command, 1858, 1859

Oyster and Mussel Fisheries Order (Blackwater, Essex) Bill
(*Mr. J. G. Talbot, Viscount Sandon*)
c. Read 2°* *Mar* 3 [Bill 76]
Committee; Report *Mar* 13, 882
Considered* *Mar* 14
Read 3°* *Mar* 17
l. Read 1ª* (*Lord Henniker*) *Mar* 18 (No. 29)
Read 2ª* *Mar* 27

Paget, Mr. R. H., *Somersetshire, Mid*
Army—Retirement of Officers, Res. 22
Habitual Drunkards, Consid. *cl.* 9, 755

Parker, Mr. C. S., *Perth*
Intoxicating Liquors (Licences), Res. 753

Parker, Colonel W., *Suffolk, W.*
Army Estimates—Land Forces, 97

Parliament

Public Business
Army Discipline and Regulation Bill, Question, The Marquess of Hartington; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Mar* 4, 136
Counts Out, Question, Mr. Anderson; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Mar* 3, 14
County Courts Bill, Question, Mr. Clare Read; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth *Mar* 4, 135
Intoxicating Liquors (Licences)—The Adjourned Debate, Question, Sir Wilfrid Lawson; Answer, Mr. Serjeant Simon *Mar* 17, 1039
State of Public Business, Observations, The Chancellor of the Exchequer; short debate thereon *Mar* 20, 1319;—*The Budget*, Questions, Mr. A. Mills, Mr. Dillwyn; Answers, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Mar* 21, 1437
Select Committee on Parliamentary Reporting, Question, Mr. Newdegate; Answer, Mr. W. H. Smith *Mar* 4, 136; Question, Dr. Cameron; Answer, Mr. W. H. Smith *Mar* 10, 520

Duration of Parliaments, Question, Mr. W. H. James; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Mar* 20, 1316
Questions to a Private Member—The Hon. Member for Meath, Notice of Question, Mr. C. Beckett Denison; Questions, Mr. Mitchell Henry; Answers, Mr. C. Beckett Denison, Mr. Speaker *Mar* 21, 1437
The Vacant Seats—Dissolution of Parliament, Question, Mr. Hibbert; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Mar* 18, 1150

Private Bills (Lords)
Ordered, That no Private Bill brought from the House of Commons shall be read a second time after Tuesday the 10th of June next: [and other Orders] *Mar* 4, 117

Private Bills (Commons)
Canvassing of Members, Observations, Mr. Raikes; Reply, Mr. Speaker *Mar* 14, 932

The Easter Recess, Question, Mr. A. Mills; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Mar* 24, 1507

Parliament—Clare County Writ
Ordered, That a Select Committee be re-appointed to inquire whether Sir Bryan O'Loghlen, Member for the County of Clare, has, since his election, accepted an office or place of profit under or from the Crown, and that they be directed to report their opinion whether he has vacated his seat by the acceptance of the said office; List of the Committee *Mar* 10, 615

[cont.

Parliament—Clare County Writ—cont.
Moved, "That Mr. Butt be another Member of the Committee" (*Mr. Assheton Cross*); after short debate, Question put, and negatived; other Members nominated

Parliament—House of Lords
Representative Peer for Scotland (Certificate)
Mar 13—Earl of Dundonald, *v.* Earl of Lauderdale, deceased

Parliament—House of Commons
New Writs Issued
Mar 10—*For* East Somerset, *v.* Major Ralph Shuttleworth Allen, Manor of Northstead
Mar 28—*For* Longford County, *v.* Myles William O'Reilly, esquire, Assistant Commissioner of Intermediate Education in Ireland

New Member Sworn
Mar 20—Lord Brooke, *Somerset County* (Eastern Division)

Parliamentary Burghs (Scotland) Bill (*Mr. James Cowan, Mr. M'Laren, Mr. Trevelyan, Mr. John Holms*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Mar* 7 [Bill 97]
Read 2° * *Mar* 26

Parliamentary Elections and Corrupt Practices Bill (*Mr. Attorney General, Mr. Secretary Cross, Mr. Solicitor General*)
c. Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *Mar* 20, 1363
Amendt. to leave out from "That," and add "no Bill to amend the Acts relating to Election Petitions and to the prevention of Corrupt Practices at Parliamentary Elections will be satisfactory to the House which leaves the Law with regard to payments for the conveyance of Voters to the poll in its present condition" (*Sir Charles W. Dilke*) *v.*, 1371; Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after debate, Question put; A. 138, N. 89; M. 49 (D. L. 50)
Main Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read 2°;" after debate, Question put; A. 118, N. 6; M. 112 (D. L. 50); Bill read 2° [Bill 78]

Parnell, Mr. C. S., *Meath*
Army Discipline and Regulation, 881
Army Estimates—Land Forces, 96; Motion for reporting Progress, 104, 1039, 1041, 1049, 1059, 1061, 1073, 1074, 1086, 1087, 1090, 1091, 1094, 1100, 1101, 1103, 1104, 1105, 1108; Amendt. 1110, 1115, 1116, 1117, 1119; Motion for reporting Progress, 1120, 1122, 1124
Pensions for Wounds, Motion for reporting Progress, 1129, 1133, 1134
Rewards for Distinguished Services, &c. 1125

[cont.

PARNELL, Mr. C. S.—*cont.*
- Convention (Ireland) Act Repeal, 2R. 1814
- District Auditors, Comm. Motion for Adjournment, 964, 965
- Electoral Disabilities of Women, Res. 478
- Household Suffrage (Counties), Res. 206
- Ireland—Departmental Administration, 309
- Mixed Colleges, Instruction in, 865
- Navy Estimates—Men and Boys, &c. 614
  - Seamen and Marines, Motion for reporting Progress, 614
- Prosecution of Offences, Comm. 988, 994, 995
- Supply—British Museum Buildings, 320
  - Chief Secretary for Ireland, Offices, 357
  - Foreign Office, 334
  - Harbours, &c. 320
  - Home Office, 330
  - Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Household of, &c. Amendt. 354, 355, 356
  - Public Works Office, Ireland, 359
  - Stationery, &c. 348, 349, 353
  - Treasury, 326

Patents for Inventions (No. 2) Bill
- Question, Mr. Samuelson; Answer, The Attorney General *Mar* 18, 1150

PEEK, Sir H. W., *Surrey, Mid*
- Customs—Report of Committee—Official Statistics, 13
- Kew Gardens, Res. 297

PEEL, Right Hon. Sir R., *Tamworth*
- Africa, South—Zulu War—Miscellaneous Questions
  - 915, 917
  - Defeat at Isandlana, 1158
  - Lord Chelmsford, 1508
- Africa, South—Zulu War—Sir Bartle Frere, Res. 2005, 2007, 2021, 2027
- Supply—Paris International Exhibition, 1340

PEEL, Mr. A. W., *Warwick Bo.*
- Intoxicating Liquors (Licences), Res. 700

PELL, Mr. A., *Leicestershire, S.*
- Agricultural Holdings Act, 1875, Motion for a Select Committee, 1739
- Intoxicating Liquors (Licences), Res. 723
- Supply—Stationery, &c. 339

PERCY, Right Hon. Earl, *Northumberland, N.*
- Army—Militia, 628
- Electoral Disabilities of Women, Res. 465, 467
- Intoxicating Liquors (Licences), Res. Amendt. 689

Permissive Prohibitory Liquor Bill
(*Sir Wilfrid Lawson, Sir Thomas Bazley, Mr. Richard, Dr. Cameron, Mr. Dalway, Mr. Downing, Mr. Charles Lewis*)
- *c.* Bill withdrawn * *Mar* 10 [Bill 6]

Petty Customs (Scotland) Abolition Act Amendment Bill
(*Mr. James Barclay, Mr. Cowan*)
- *c.* Read 2°* *Mar* 12 [Bill 91]
  - Committee*; Report *Mar* 19
  - Read 3°* *Mar* 25
- *l.* Read 1^a* (*Earl of Airlie*) *Mar* 27 (No. 33)

PHIPPS, Mr. P., *Northampton*
- Agricultural Holdings Act, 1875, Motion for a Select Committee, 1711
- Science and Art Department—Agricultural Science, 1988

PLAYFAIR, Right Hon. Mr. Lyon, *Edinburgh and St. Andrew's Universities*
- Education (Scotland) Act, 1878—Examination of Higher Class Schools, 927
- Kew Gardens, Res. 295
- Medical Act (1858) Amendment, 2R. 775
- Supply—Paris International Exhibition, 1341

PLUNKET, Lord
- Divinity School (Church of Ireland), 1R.* 1837

PLUNKET, Hon. D. R., *Dublin University*
- Ireland—Trinity College, Dublin—The Divinity School, 526
- Medical Act (1858) Amendment, 2R. 778

PLUNKETT, Hon. R. E., *Gloucester, W.*
- Supply—Public Education, England and Wales, 1338

Poor Law Amendment Act (1876) Amendment Bill (*Mr. Mellor, Mr. Merewether, Sir Charles Forster, Mr. Mundella, Mr. Serjeant Simon, Mr. Hibbert, Mr. Torrens*)
- *c.* Question, Sir Charles W. Dilke; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth *Mar* 7, 404; Question, Mr. Mellor; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Mar* 21, 1436
  - Committee *—R P. *Mar* 21
  - Committee; Report *Mar* 24, 1600 [Bill 44]
  - Read 3°* *Mar* 25
- *l.* Read 1^a* (*The Lord Norton*) *Mar* 27 (No. 34)

Poor Removal
- Select Committee appointed, "to inquire into the operation of the existing Laws in the United Kingdom relating to the settlement and irremovability of Paupers, with special reference to the case of removals to Ireland, and with power to make any proposals for the alteration, repeal, or assimilation of such Laws;" Power to send for persons, papers, and records; Five to be the quorum (*Mr. Salt*) *Mar* 7, 511

POST OFFICE
- MISCELLANEOUS QUESTIONS
- *Post Office Contracts*
  - *The Pacific Mail Contracts*, Question, Mr. Mac Iver; Answer, Lord John Manners *Mar* 17, 1034

[*cont.*

POST OFFICE—*Mail Contracts—cont.*
The Peninsular and Oriental Steam Navigation Company, Question, Mr. Baxter; Answer, Lord John Manners *Mar* 24, 1504
The West India Mail Contract, Personal Explanation, Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson *Mar* 25, 1704
The Book Post, Question, Mr. Mitchell Henry; Answer, Lord John Manners *Mar* 6, 276

Post Office (West India Mail Contract)
Moved, "That the Contract entered into with the Royal Mail Steam Packet Company for the conveyance of Mails to and from the West Indies be approved" (*Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson*) *Mar* 18, 1191; after short debate, Motion agreed to

POWER, Mr. J. O'Connor, *Mayo*
Criminal Law—Penal Servitude Acts, 13
Ireland—Departmental Administration, 306
Mixed Colleges, Instruction in, 867
Poor Law Guardians (Ireland), 278

POWIS, Earl of
Bankruptcy Law Amendment, 2R. 5; Comm. *cl.* 4, Amendt. 790; *cl.* 17, 793

PRICE, Mr. W. E., *Tewkesbury*
Canal Boats Act, 1877, 134

Prison Labour—Competition with Trades and Industries
Question, Mr. Serjeant Simon; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *Mar* 27, 1854

Prison Rules—Reporters of the Press
Question, Mr. W. M'Arthur; Answer, Sir Matthew White Ridley *Mar* 13, 816

Prosecution of Offences Bill
(*Mr. Secretary Cross, Mr. Attorney General, Mr. Solicitor General, Sir Matthew Ridley*)
c. Order for Committee read; Moved, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair" *Mar* 14, 966
Amendt. to leave out from "That," and add "this House will, upon this day six months, resolve itself into the said Committee" (*Mr. Benjamin Williams*), *v.*; Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after debate, Moved, "That the Debate be now adjourned" (*Mr. Mitchell Henry*); after further short debate, Motion withdrawn; after further short debate, Amendt. withdrawn
Main Question, "That Mr. Speaker, &c.," put, and agreed to; Committee—R.P. [Bill 68]

Public Health Act (1875) Amendment Bill (*Mr. Alexander Brown, Mr. Whitwell, Mr. Ryder*)
c. Read 2° * *Mar* 6 [Bill 33]

Public Health—Death-Rate of the Metropolis
Question, Sir Ughtred Kay-Shuttleworth; Answer, Mr. Sclater-Booth *Mar* 18, 1153

Public Health (Scotland) Act (1867) Amendment Bill (*Dr. Cameron, Sir Wyndham Anstruther, Mr. M'Laren, Mr. Vans Agnew, Mr. Mackintosh*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Mar* 19 [Bill 107]

Public Works Loan Commissioners—Loans for Public Works
Question, General Sir George Balfour; Answer, Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson *Mar* 3, 14

Public Works Loans Bill
Question, Mr. Chamberlain; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Mar* 20, 1308

PULESTON, Mr. J. H., *Devonport*
Egypt—Finance, 523

Quarantine Act — Cargo of Rags from Russia
Question, Mr. J. Cowen; Answer, Lord George Hamilton *Mar* 18, 1157

Racecourses (Metropolis) Bill
(*Mr. Anderson, Sir Thomas Chambers, Sir James Lawrence*)
c. Committee *Mar* 3, 108 [Bill 48]
[House counted out]
Committee; Report *Mar* 6, 364
Considered *Mar* 21, 1490
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 3°" *Mar* 26, 1821; Moved, "That the Debate be now adjourned" (*Mr. Alfred Gathorne-Hardy*); after short debate, Debate adjourned

RAIKES, Mr. H. C. (Chairman of Committees of Ways and Means), *Chester*
Army Estimates—Land Forces, 1041, 1047, 1070, 1074, 1085, 1086, 1090, 1091, 1092, 1099, 1100, 1101, 1122
Brentford, Isleworth, and Twickenham Tramways, 2R. 1425
Electoral Disabilities of Women, Res. 473
Liverpool Lighting, 2R. 626; Amendt. 628, 1502
Lower Thames Valley Main Sewerage Board, 2R. 393
Navy Estimates—Men and Boys, &c. 614
Seamen and Marines, 615
Parliament — Private Bills — Canvassing of Members, 932
Poor Law Amendment Act (1876) Amendment, Comm. 1600
Supply—Diplomatic Services, 1346
Thames River (Prevention of Floods), Nomination of Comm. 795, 798, 811
Valuation of Property, Comm. *cl.* 6, 1488

Railway Passenger Duty—Wantage Tramway Company
Question, Mr. J. Cowen; Answer, The Attorney General *Mar* 4, 130

Railways
Continuous Brakes, Question, Observations, The Earl of Belmore, Lord Norton; Reply, Lord Henniker *Mar* 6, 266
Continuous Foot-boards, Question, Mr. Gregory; Answer, Viscount Sandon *Mar* 14, 905

Railways (*Ireland*)
Question, Viscount Lifford; Answer, Lord Henniker *Mar* 7, 374
Then—Copy of Letter respecting narrow gauge railways in Ireland from the Board of Trade to the Chairman of Committees: Ordered to be laid before the House

Railways (*Ireland*) — *The Letterkenny Railway and the West Donegal Railway Bills*
Moved to resolve, That it is desirable before the Letterkenny Railway and the West Donegal Railway Bills be further proceeded with that the Board of Trade should report to Parliament whether the character of the country through or of the traffic for which these lines are to be made renders it necessary or expedient that either or both of them should be constructed on a three feet gauge, with the reasons on which their Report is founded (*The Chairman of Committees*) *Mar* 17, 996; after short debate, on Question? Cont. 28, Not-Cont. 36; M. 8
Div. List, Cont. and Not-Cont., 999
Resolved in the negative

RAMSAY, Mr. J., *Falkirk, &c.*
Hypothec Abolition (Scotland), 2R. 1282
Prosecution of Offences, Comm. 994
Racecourses (Metropolis), Consid. 1491
Supply—Consular Services, 1358
Valuation of Property, Comm. *cl.* 6, Amendt. 1483, 1485; Motion for reporting Progress, 1489

RATHBONE, Mr. W., *Liverpool*
Alkali Acts—Report of Inspector, 518
County Boards, Leave, 1209
East India [Loan], Comm. 1959
London and North-Western Railway (Additional Powers), 2R. 898
Parliamentary Elections and Corrupt Practices, 2R. 1378
Post Office (West India Mail Contract), Res. 1196
Prosecution of Offences, Comm. 968

READ, Mr. Clare S., *Norfolk, S.*
Agricultural Holdings Act, 1875, Motion for a Select Committee, 1723
Contagious Diseases (Animals) Act, 1878—Dairies and Cowsheds, 135
Highways Act, 1878—Forms of Accounts, 631
Hypothec Abolition (Scotland), 2R. 1253
Official Corn Returns, 134
Parliament—Public Business, 135, 136

REDESDALE, Earl of (Chairman of Committees)
City of Glasgow Bank, 2R. 109
Railways (Ireland)—Letterkenny Railway and West Donegal Railway, Res. 996, 998
Rivers Conservancy, 2R. 1092
West Donegal Railway, 2R. 620

Registration of Births, Deaths, and Marriages (Army) Bill
(*Colonel Loyd Lindsay, Mr. Secretary Stanley, Lord Eustace Cecil*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *Mar* 4 [Bill 95]
Read 2°* *Mar* 10
Committee*; Report *Mar* 11
Read 3°* *Mar* 12
l. Read 1ª* (*Lord Ashford*) *Mar* 13 (No. 27)

RICHARD, Mr. H., *Merthyr Tydvil*
British Burmah—Re-inforcements, 905, 1856
Burmah, King of—Reported Ultimatum, 1152

RICHMOND AND GORDON, Duke of (Lord President of the Council)
Disqualification by Medical Relief, 2R. 1023, 1418
Highways Act, 1878, 885; — Disturnpiked Roads, 1499
Medical Act (1858) Amendment, 2R. 624; Comm. 1295; *cl.* 5, 1298; *cl.* 15, 1299; Amendt. 1300, 1302, 1303; *cl.* 19, Amendt. *ib.*, 1304; *cl.* 21, *ib.*; *cl.* 25, *ib.*
Railways (Ireland)—Letterkenny Railway and West Donegal Railway, Res. 997
Rivers Conservancy, 1R. 368, 374; 2R. 1022
West Donegal Railway, 2R. 621

RIDLEY, Sir M. W. (Under Secretary of State for the Home Department), *Northumberland, N.*
Coal Mines, Inspectors of—Reports, 820
Criminal Law—Rev. H. J. Dodwell, Case of, 821
Habitual Drunkards, Consid. Amendt. 753, 755
Intoxicating Liquors (Licences), Res. 665
Prison Rules—Reporters of the Press, 816
Supply—County Prisons, &c. Great Britain, 1322
Reformatory and Industrial Schools, 1331

RIDLEY, Mr. E., *Northumberland, S.*
Administration of Justice, Res. 1464
Mixed Colleges, Instruction in, 866

RIPON, Marquess of
India—Afghanistan—Negotiations with Yakoob Khan, 1963
Papers—General Roberts' Proclamation, 512
Medical Act (1858) Amendment, 2R. 623; Comm. *cl.* 5, 1295; *cl.* 15, 1298; *cl.* 19, 1304; *cl.* 21, Amendt. *ib.*
Rivers Conservancy, 1R. 373; 2R. 1020

Ritchie, Mr. C. T., *Tower Hamlets*
- Africa, South—Miscellaneous Questions
  - Export of Munitions of War for Mozambique, 818
  - Shipment of Arms, 1307
  - Zulu War—Manufacture of Arms, 929
- Army Estimates—Land Forces, 68, 71
- Customs Re-organization, 1850
- London and North-Western Railway (Additional Powers), 2R. 899
- National Gallery—Injury to the Pictures, 525
- Parliamentary Elections and Corrupt Practices, 2R. 1381
- Supply—Stationery, &c. 349
- Thames River (Prevention of Floods), Nomination of Committee, 814
- Wine Duties, Res. 1176

Rivers Conservancy Bill [H.L.]
(*The Lord President*)
l. Presented; read 1^a, after short debate *Mar* 7, 368 (No. 20)
Read 2^a, after short debate *Mar* 17, 1018

Rodwell, Mr. B. B. H., *Cambridgeshire*
- Intoxicating Liquors (Licences), Res. 704
- Prosecution of Offences, Comm. 968
- Thames River (Prevention of Floods), Nomination of Committee, 804

Rosebery, Earl of
- City of Glasgow Bank, 2R. 115

Royal Journeys, Expenses of
- Question, Dr. Kenealy; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Mar* 21, 1435

Russell, Lord A., *Tavistock*
- British Museum—Natural History Collection, 1308
- South Kensington—Natural History Museum, 280

Russell, Sir C., *Westminster*
- Africa, South—Zulu War—Sir Bartle Frere, Res. 2023, 2027

Rylands, Mr. P., *Burnley*
- Africa, South—Zulu War—Defeat at Isandlana —General Lord Chelmsford, 933
- Cyprus, 1590
- Exchequer Bonds (No. 1), 2R. 364
- Navy Estimates—Land Forces, 1046, 1047, 1060
  - Men and Boys, &c. 593
  - Seamen and Marines, 615
- Parliament—Orders of the Day—Postponement, 1864
- Supply—Public Buildings, 318
  - Stationery, &c. 338
  - Treasury, 323
- Victoria Embankment—New Mint, 12

Sale of Food and Drugs Act (1875) Amendment Bill
(*Mr. Anderson, Mr. P. A. Taylor, Mr. Whitwell*)
c. Select Committee nominated * *Mar* 24

Salisbury, Marquess of (Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs)
- Africa, South—Zulu War—Sir Bartle Frere, Res. 1678
- Cyprus—Harbour of Famagousta, 1412
- Spain—Slavery in Cuba, 1405
- Treaty of Berlin—British Fleet, 1500

Samuda, Mr. J. D'A., *Tower Hamlets*
- Navy—Ship Carpenters, 530
- Navy Estimates—Ships Building, 1037

Samuelson, Mr. B., *Banbury*
- Agricultural Holdings Act, 1875, Motion for a Select Committee, 1705, 1735, 1746, 1761
- Patents for Inventions (No. 2), 1150
- Wine Duties, Res. 1175

Samuelson, Mr. H. B., *Frome*
- Army Estimates—Land Forces, 1120
- Cyprus—Miscellaneous Questions 1532, 1547, 1550, 1551
  - Enforced Labour, 1025, 1026
  - Greek Language, 1156
- Intoxicating Liquors (Licences), Res. 744
- Supply—Consular Services, 1351, 1352, 1358
  - Diplomatic Services, 1346, 1350

Sandon, Right Hon. Viscount (President of the Board of Trade), *Liverpool*
- Agricultural Holdings Act, 1875, Motion for a Select Committee, 1742, 1746, 1755
- London and North-Western Railway (Additional Powers), 2R. 901; Amendt. 904
- Midland Railway, 2R. Amendt. 904
- Railways—Continuous Footboards, 905

Science and Art
- *British Museum—The Natural History Collection*, Question, Lord Arthur Russell; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Mar* 20, 1308
- *Science and Art Department—Agricultural Science*, Question, Mr. Phipps; Answer, Lord George Hamilton *Mar* 28, 1988
- *Natural History Museum*, Question, Lord Arthur Russell; Answer, Mr. Gerard Noel *Mar* 6, 280

Sclater-Booth, Right Hon. G. (President of the Local Government Board), *Hampshire, N.*
- Alkali Acts—Report of Inspector, 518
- Blind and Deaf-Mute Children (Education), Comm. 1961
- Canal Boats Act, 1877, 134
- County Boards, Leave, 1199, 1216, 1220
- District Auditors, Comm. 965; *cl.* 11, Amendt. *ib.*; *add. cl.* 966; Preamble, Amendt. *ib.*, 1156
- Highways Act, 1878—Forms of Account, 632
- Lower Thames Valley Main Sewerage Board, 2R. 389
- Parliament—Public Business, 136
- Poor Law Amendment Act (1876) Amendment, 404; Comm. *cl.* 1, 1602, 1604, 1605

[*cont.*

Sclater-Booth, Right Hon. G.—*cont.*
- Poor Law (Ireland)—Removal of Irish Paupers, 275
- Public Health—Death-rate of the Metropolis, 1153
- Valuation of Property, Comm. *cl.* 5, Amendt. 1482 ; *cl.* 6, 1485, 1487, 1489

Scotland
- *Poor Law—Legislation*, Question, Mr. Fraser Mackintosh ; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *Mar* 24, 1506
- *Scotch Banks—Extraordinary Directors—The Scotch Judges*, Question, Mr. Callan ; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *Mar* 11, 631

Selborne, Lord
- Bankruptcy Law Amendment, 2R. 4 ; Comm. *cl.* 4, 792 ; *cl.* 6, 793 ; *cl.* 21, *ib.*
- Cremation, 1409
- Highways Act, 1878, 886
- Supreme Court of Judicature Acts Amendment, 2R. 117 ; Comm. 794

Selwin-Ibbetson, Sir H. J. (Secretary to the Treasury), *Essex, W.*
- Consolidate [illegible] . 2), 3R. 1705
- Customs — [illegible] Committee — Official Statistics, 13
- Customs Re-organization, 1850
- Cyprus, 1588, 1590
- Intoxicating Liquors (Licences), Res. 733
- Ireland—Miscellaneous Questions
  - Inspectors of Irish Prisons, 1989
  - Irish Branch of the Treasury, 1028
  - Prisons—Medical Officers, 1852
- Post Office (West Indian Mail Contract), Res. 1191 ; Personal Explanation, 1704
- Public Works Loan Commissioners—Loans for Public Works, 14
- Supply—Civil Contingencies Fund, 1361, 1362
  - Civil Service and Revenue Departments, 1600
  - Legal Charges, Ireland, 1332, 1334
  - Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Household of, &c. 356
  - Mediterranean Extension Telegraph Company (Guarantee), 1361
  - Public Works Office, Ireland, 357, 359, 360
  - Reformatory and Industrial Schools, 1325, 1329
  - Report, 507, 509, 510
  - Stationery, &c. 335, 336, 337, 345, 347, 348, 352, 353
  - Temporary Commissions, 1360
  - Treasury, 322, 324, 326, 327
  - Treasury Chest, 1359
- Ways and Means, Report, 108

Shaw, Mr. W., *Cork Co.*
- Supply—Civil Service and Revenue Departments, 1596

Shute, Major-General C. C., *Brighton*
- Army—Retirement of Officers, Res. 22
- Army Estimates—Land Forces, 1094

Simon, Mr. Serjeant J., *Dewsbury*
- Administration of Justice, Res. 1461, 1480
- Convention (Ireland) Act Repeal, 2R. 1801
- Eastern Question—Treaty of Berlin—Servia and Roumania, 133
- Intoxicating Liquors (Licences), Res. 706, 746, 749, 750 ; Amendt. 751
- Medical Act (1858) Amendment, 2R. Amendt. 760
- Navy Promotion, Res. 535
- Parliament—Business of the House, 1030
- Parliamentary Elections and Corrupt Practices, 2R. 1391
- Prison Labour—Competition with Trades and Industries, 1854

Simonds, Mr. W. B., *Winchester*
- Elementary Education Act, 1876—Drummer Boys, 1033

Smith, Right Hon. W. H. (First Lord of the Admiralty), *Westminster*
- Africa, South — Zulu War — Navy Coaling Depôts, 1032
  - The Marines, 526, 527, 528
- Naval Expenditure—Vote of Credit, 1878, 133
- Navy—Miscellaneous Questions
  - Coaling at St. Vincent, 1854
  - H.M.S. " Boadicea," 1315
  - H.M.S. " Vanguard," 1033
  - Naval Discipline Act, 1866, 556
  - Officers of the Royal Marines, 524
  - Roman Catholic Chaplains, 1035
  - The Royal Yacht " Osborne," 1311
- Navy Promotion, Res. 537, 543
- Navy Estimates — Departmental Statement, 557, 567
  - Men and Boys, &c. 608, 614
  - Seamen and Marines, 615
  - Ships Building, 1037
- Parliamentary Reporting, Select Committee on, 136, 520

Solicitor General, The (Sir H. S. Giffard), *Launceston*
- Cyprus, 1585

Somerset, Duke of
- Africa, South—Zulu War—Sir Bartle Frere, Res. 1683
- Cyprus—Harbour of Famagousta, 1409
- Navy—H.M.S. "Thunderer," Explosion on Board, 999
- Rivers Conservancy, 1R. 378

Spain—Slavery in Cuba
- Question, Observations, Earl Granville ; Reply, The Marquess of Salisbury *Mar* 21, 1405

Speaker, The (Right Hon. H. B. W. Brand), *Cambridgeshire*
- Africa, South—Zulu War, 909, 911, 912, 913, 914, 915, 917
- Africa, South—Zulu War—Sir Bartle Frere, Res. 2007, 2021
- Blind and Deaf-Mute Children (Education), Comm. 1962
- Consolidated Fund (No. 2), 3R. 1705
- Cyprus, 1550, 1551, 1564

SPEAKER, The—*cont.*
District Auditors, Comm. 964
Electoral Disabilities of Women, Res. 405, 492
Hypothec Abolition (Scotland), 2R. 1242
Intoxicating Liquors (Licences), Res. 746, 749, 750
Parliament—Miscellaneous Questions
Business of the House—Counts-out, 15
Private Bills—Canvassing of Members, 933
Questions—The hon. Member for Meath, 1438
Parliamentary Elections and Corrupt Practices, 2R. 1384
Racecourses (Metropolis), Consid. 1490, 1491, 1492

Specie and Paper Currency
Moved, "That, in the opinion of this House, a free circulation of specie currency, together with a full and adequate circulation of paper currency, convertible into specie on demand, is essential and necessary for the promotion and development of manufactures, commerce, and trade" (*Mr. Delahunty*) *Mar* 18, 1165; after short debate, Motion agreed to

SPINKS, Mr. Serjeant F. L., *Oldham*
Lower Thames Valley Main Sewerage Board, 2R. 400

STANHOPE, Hon. E. (Under Secretary of State for India), *Lincolnshire, Mid.*
East India [Loan], Comm. 1951, 1958
India—Miscellaneous Questions
Afghanistan—Khost Valley, Operations in, 282;—Advance on Cabul, 1990
Army—Newspaper Correspondents, 1436;—Pay of Lieutenants, 819
Burmah, Disturbances in—Explanation, 404
Civil Services—Admission of Natives, 522
East Indian Freight, 528
Financial Statement, 1036
Khan of Khelat—Treaties, &c. 518, 817
Public Works—Construction of Indian Railways, 275
Railways—Indus and Bolan Pass, 818

STANHOPE, Mr. W. T. W. S., *Yorkshire, W.R.*
Parliamentary Elections and Corrupt Practices, 2R. 1378
Prosecution of Offences, Comm. 968

STANLEY OF ALDERLEY, Lord
Afghanistan—Negotiations with Yakoob Khan, 1963
Africa, South—Zulu War—Defeat at Isandlana, 889
Africa, South—Zulu War—Sir Bartle Frere, Res. 1657

STANLEY, Right Hon. Colonel F. A. (Secretary of State for War), *Lancashire, N.*
Africa, South—Zulu War—Miscellaneous Questions
Defeat at Isandlana—General Lord Chelmsford, 933, 1158
Despatch of September 14, 1878, 1160

[*cont.*

STANLEY, Hon. Colonel F. A.—*cont.*
Officers' Baggage, 129
Papers and Despatches, 1861
Re-inforcements, 281
Sir Bartle Frere—Lord Chelmsford, 1701
War Office Papers, 1493
Africa, South—Zulu War—Sir Bartle Frere, Res. 2066, 2070
Army—Miscellaneous Questions
Army Discipline (Annual) Act, 1315
Consolidated Ration—Erbswürst, 1157
Deputy Assistant Quartermaster General—Staff College, 1434
Half-Pay Service, 278
Indian Native Troops, Employment of, 519
Militia, 628
Newspaper Correspondents in the Field, 1318
Staff Officers of Artillery, 1030, 1031
Surgeons at Depôt Centres, 1436
War Office Contracts, 276
Army—First Class Army Reserve, Res. 31, 33
Army (Medical Department), Motion for an Address, 1769
Army—Retirement of Officers, Res. 23
Army—Scientific Corps, Res. 947, 951
Army Discipline and Regulation, 283, 881
Army Estimates—Contagious Diseases Acts, 1039
Land Forces, 37, 44, 70, 92, 98, 102, 1042, 1056, 1070, 1072, 1073, 1074, 1076, 1086, 1089, 1095, 1102, 1104, 1105, 1107, 1108, 1109, 1115, 1116, 1118, 1119, 1120, 1121, 1124
Pay of General Officers, 1127
Pensions for Wounds, 1129, 1131, 1134
Retired Full Pay, Half Pay Pensions, and Gratuities, &c. 1128
Rewards for Distinguished Services, &c. 1126
Army Estimates, 1879-80—Regimental Establishments at Home and Abroad, 9
Cyprus, 1569;—Health of the Troops, 1318
Elementary Education Act, 1876—Drummer Boys, 1033
India—Afghan War—Newspaper Correspondents, 1159

STANSFELD, Right Hon. J., *Halifax*
County Boards, Leave, 1207
Intoxicating Liquors (Licences), Res. 726

STEVENSON, Mr. J. C., *South Shields*
Coal Mines, Inspectors of—The Reports, 820

STEWART, Mr. M. J., *Wigton Bo.*
Intoxicating Liquors (Licences), Res. 680
Japan—Medicinal Opium, 1314
Thames River (Prevention of Floods), Nomination of Committee, 809

STORER, Mr. G., *Nottinghamshire, S.*
Electoral Disabilities of Women, Res. 456

Straits Settlements, The—Instructions to British Residents
Question, Sir Charles W. Dilke; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *Mar* 17, 1024

SUDELEY, Lord
Navy—H.M.S. "Thunderer," Explosion on Board, 1004

SULLIVAN, Mr. A. M., *Louth Co.*
Africa, South—Zulu War, 907
Army Estimates—Land Forces, 1123
Criminal Law—James Swanton, Case of, 1316
Electoral Disabilities of Women, Res. 492, 494, 591
Intoxicating Liquors (Licences), Res. 716
Ireland—Miscellaneous Questions
  Catholic University—Speech of Mr. W. Johnston (Commissioner of Irish Fisheries), 273, 1697
  Departmental Administration, 314, 316
  Glengariff Dispensary District, 1849
  Public Peace—Riots at Belfast and Outrage at Derry, 1161
Mixed Colleges, Instruction in, 863
Supply—County Prisons, &c. Great Britain, 1321
  Reformatory and Industrial Schools, Great Britain, 1328

Summary Jurisdiction Bill
(*Mr. Secretary Cross, Mr. Attorney General, Mr. Solicitor General, Sir Matthew Ridley*)
c. Select Committee nominated * *Mar* 18

SUPPLY
MISCELLANEOUS QUESTIONS
Army Estimates—Contagious Diseases Acts, Question, Mr. Hopwood; Answer, Colonel Stanley *Mar* 17, 1039
Army Estimates, 1879-80—*Regimental Establishments at Home and Abroad,* Question, Sir Alexander Gordon; Answer, Colonel Stanley *Mar* 3, 9
Naval Expenditure—The Vote of Credit, 1878, Question, Mr. Shaw Lefevre; Answer, Mr. W. H. Smith *Mar* 4, 133

SUPPLY
Considered in Committee *Mar* 3, 37—ARMY ESTIMATES—Resolution reported *Mar* 4
Considered in Committee *Mar* 6, 317—CIVIL SERVICE SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES, 1878-9—CLASS I.—PUBLIC WORKS AND BUILDINGS—CLASS II.—SALARIES AND EXPENSES OF PUBLIC DEPARTMENTS—CLASS III.—LAW AND JUSTICE—Committee—R.P.
  Resolutions reported *Mar* 7, 507
  Resolutions 1 to 12 agreed to
  Resolution 13; after short debate, Resolution agreed to
  Resolutions 14 to 16 agreed to
Considered in Committee *Mar* 10, 557—NAVY ESTIMATES—DEPARTMENTAL STATEMENT OF THE FIRST LORD OF THE ADMIRALTY—Resolutions reported *Mar* 11
Considered in Committee *Mar* 17, 1039—ARMY ESTIMATES—Resolutions reported *Mar* 18
Considered in Committee *Mar* 20, 1321—CIVIL SERVICE SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES, 1878-9—CLASS III.—LAW AND JUSTICE—CLASS IV.—EDUCATION, SCIENCE, AND ART—CLASS V. —COLONIAL, CONSULAR, AND OTHER FOREIGN SERVICES—CLASS VI.—SUPERANNUATION AND RETIRED ALLOWANCES, AND GRATUITIES FOR CHARITABLE AND OTHER PURPOSES—CLASS VII.—MISCELLANEOUS, SPECIAL, AND TEMPORARY OBJECTS—REVENUE DEPARTMENTS—Resolutions reported *Mar* 21

SUPPLY—*cont.*
Considered in Committee *Mar* 21, 1481—CIVIL SERVICE SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES, 1878-9 CLASS III.—LAW AND JUSTICE—Resolution reported *Mar* 22
Considered in Committee *Mar* 24, 1593—CIVIL SERVICE ESTIMATES—£4,109,067 ON ACCOUNT—CIVIL SERVICES—CLASSES I. to VII. and the REVENUE DEPARTMENTS—Resolution reported *Mar* 25

Supreme Court of Judicature Acts Amendment Bill (*The Lord Chancellor*)
l. Read 2ª *Mar* 4, 117 (No. 11)
Committee; Report *Mar* 13, 794

Supreme Court of Judicature (District Courts) Bill (*Mr. Joseph Cowen, Mr. Ripley, Mr. Eustace Smith, Mr. Rowley Hill*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Mar* 12 [Bill 100]

SUTHERLAND, Duke of
West Donegal Railway, 2R. 622

SYNAN, Mr. E. J., *Limerick Co.*
Convention (Ireland) Act Repeal, 2R. 1815

TALBOT, Mr. J. G. (Secretary to the Board of Trade), *Oxford University*
Board of Trade Returns, 519
"General Statistical Abstract"—Foreign Tariffs on British Produce, 277
Mercantile Marine—Buoyage, 522
  Foreign Steamers, 632
Official Corn Returns, 134
Oyster and Mussel Fisheries Order (Blackwater, Essex), Comm. Schedule, Amendt. 882
Supply—Harbours, &c. 321
Thames River (Prevention of Floods), Nomination of Committee, 805

TAYLOR, Mr. P. A., *Leicester Bo.*
Criminal Law—Stevenson, Case of, 130
  Theodoridi, Case of, 402

Teachers Organisation and Registration Bill (*Mr. Lyon Playfair, Mr. Arthur Mills, Sir John Lubbock, Lord Francis Hervey*)
c. Ordered; read 1° * *Mar* 13 [Bill 101]

TEMPLE, Right Hon. W. F. COWPER-, *Hants, S.*
Medical Act (1858) Amendment, 2R. 765

TEMPLETOWN, Viscount
Street Accidents, Address for a Return, 367

[*cont.*

Tenant Right (Ireland) Bill [H.L.]
(*The Earl of Belmore*)
l. Presented; read 1ª* *Mar* 27 (No. 35)

Thames River (Prevention of Floods) Bill (by Order)
c. Moved to nominate the Select Committee on this Bill" (*Mr. Raikes*) *Mar* 13, 795
Moved, "That Mr. Goldney be a Member of the Select Committee;" Moved, "That the Debate be now adjourned" (*Mr. Cubitt*); after short debate, Motion withdrawn
Original Question put, and agreed to
Mr. A. Brown, Sir Baldwyn Leighton, and Sir C. W. Dilke nominated other Members of the Committee
Moved, "That Sir James M'Garel Hogg be a Member of the Select Committee;" after short debate, Motion agreed to
Lord Robert Montagu to be another Member of the Committee
Committee to consist of Twelve Members; Sir Trevor Lawrence and Mr. Maurice Brooks added to the Committee; Lord Robert Montagu discharged from attendance; Five to be the quorum (*The Chairman of Ways and Means*) *Mar* 18

THURLOW, Lord
Africa, South—Zulu War—Defeat at Isandlana, 886

TOTTENHAM, Colonel C., *New Ross*
Africa, South—Zulu War—Officers' Baggage, 129

Treaty of Berlin
Eastern Roumelia, Questions, Mr. Whitwell; Mr. E. Jenkins; Answers, Mr. Bourke *Mar* 6, 280; Questions, The Marquess of Hartington, Lord Robert Montagu; Answers, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Mar* 27, 1863
Lord Salisbury's Despatch of January 26, Questions, Lord Robert Montagu, The Marquess of Hartington; Answers, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Mar* 14, 925
Servia and Roumania, Question, Mr. Serjeant Simon; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Mar* 4, 133
The British Fleet, Observations, Question, Lord Campbell; Reply, The Marquess of Salisbury *Mar* 24, 1499
The Despatch in the "Times" of March 12*th,* Questions, Lord Robert Montagu; Answers, Mr. Bourke, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Mar* 13, 820

TREVELYAN, Mr. G. O., *Hawick, &c.*
Household Suffrage (Counties), Res. 137

TRURO, Lord
Africa, South—Zulu War—Defeat at Isandlana, 888
Queen's Message, 1144, 1148
Army—Desertions—Report of the Inspector General of Recruiting, 1878, 119
Volunteer Force, Address for a Return, 882, 884

Trustees Acts Consolidation and Amendment Bill (*Mr. Osborne Morgan, Mr. Gregory, Mr. Alfred Marten, Sir Henry Jackson*)
c. Ordered; read 1º* *Mar* 19 [Bill 106]

Turkey
Appointment of a Finance Commissioner, Question, Mr. Cogan; Answer, Mr. Bourke *Mar* 6, 278
Guaranteed Loan, 1855, Questions, Mr. Dodson; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Mar* 21, 1433
Papers, Question, Sir William Harcourt; Answer, Mr. Bourke *Mar* 17, 1038

Vaccination Acts
Case of Mr. Hawley, Question, Lord Frederick Cavendish; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *Mar* 27, 1853
The Bingley Magistrates' Orders, Question, Mr. Barran; Answer, Mr. Assheton Cross *Mar* 21, 1432

Valuation of Property Bill
(*Mr. Sclater-Booth, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Salt*)
c. Committee—R.P. *Mar* 21, 1481 [Bill 71]

WADDY, Mr. S. D., *Barnstaple*
Administration of Justice, Res. 1472, 1473
Household Suffrage (Counties), Res. 189

WALSINGHAM, Lord
India—Scarcity of Grain in the Punjab, 125

War Office—Supply of Locks
Question, Mr. Macdonald; Answer, Colonel Loyd Lindsay *Mar* 18, 1152

WATNEY, Mr. J., *Surrey, E.*
Lower Thames Valley Main Sewerage Board, 2R. 399
Thames River (Prevention of Floods), Nomination of Committee, 807

WAYS AND MEANS
MISCELLANEOUS QUESTIONS
Inland Revenue—Legacy and Succession Duty, Questions, Mr. O'Clery; Answers, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Mar* 4, 132; *Mar* 10, 521
The Income Tax—Co-operative Stores, Question, Mr. Blake; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Mar* 4, 132
Wines of Spain and Portugal, Question, Mr. W. Cartwright; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Mar* 21, 1435

WAYS AND MEANS
Resolutions [February 28] reported *Mar* 3, 105; after short debate, Resolutions agreed to; Bills ordered thereon
[See titles *Consolidated Fund* (*No.* 1) *Bill*—*Exchequer Bonds* (*No.* 1) *Bill*]

[*cont.*

WAYS AND MEANS—*cont.*
Considered in Committee *Mar* 19
(1) Resolved, That, towards making good the Supply granted to Her Majesty for the service of the year ending on the 31st day of March 1879, the sum of £73,220 be granted out of the Consolidated Fund of the United Kingdom
(2) Resolved, That, towards making good the Supply granted to Her Majesty for the service of the year ending on the 31st day of March 1880, the sum of £8,494,195 be granted out of the Consolidated Fund of the United Kingdom
Resolutions reported *Mar* 20
Considered in Committee *Mar* 21
Resolved, That, towards making good the Supply granted to Her Majesty for the service of the years ending on the 31st day of March 1878 and 1879, the sum of £299,218 1*s.* 2*d.* be granted out of the Consolidated Fund of the United Kingdom
Resolution reported, and agreed to *Mar* 22
Instruction to the Committee on the Consolidated Fund (No. 2) Bill, That they have power to make provision therein pursuant to the said Resolution

WEDDERBURN, Sir D., *Haddington Burghs*
Hypothec Abolition (Scotland), 2R. 1256

West Donegal Railway Bill
l. Read 2ª, after short debate *Mar* 11, 616

West India Islands
Coolies in Grenada, Question, Sir George Campbell; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *Mar* 17, 1027
Protector of Immigrants, Question, Sir Henry Holland; Answer, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach *Mar* 14, 905

WHARNCLIFFE, Earl of
Intemperance, Report of the Select Committee, 625

WHEELHOUSE, Mr. W. St. James, *Leeds*
Army—Retirement of Officers, Res. 22
Blind and Deaf-Mute Children (Education), Comm. 1962
Household Suffrage (Counties), Res. 180
Intoxicating Liquors (Licences), Res. Amendt. 655, 664, 749, 750
Supply—Stationery, &c. 338

WHITBREAD, Mr. S., *Bedford*
County Boards, Leave, 1213

WHITWELL, Mr. J., *Kendal*
Exchequer Bonds (No. 1), 2R. 363
Prosecution of Offences, Comm. 983
Supply—British Museum Buildings, 319
Civil Contingencies Fund, 1361
Legal Charges, Ireland, 1332
Public Works, 319
Stationery, &c. 338
Treasury Chest, 1359
Treaty of Berlin—Eastern Roumelia, 280
Ways and Means, Report, 107
Wine Duties, Res. 1180

WILLIAMS, Mr. B. T., *Carmarthen*
Prosecution of Offences, Comm. Amendt. 966

WILMOT, Sir J. E., *Warwickshire, S.*
Army—Half-Pay Service, 278

Wine Duties
Moved, "That, in the opinion of this House, it is desirable that a Select Committee be appointed to inquire into the system under which Customs Duties are now levied in this Country on Wine, and into its results, fiscal and commercial" (*Mr. Cartwright*) *Mar* 18, 1162; after debate, Motion withdrawn

Wines of Spain and Portugal
Question, Mr. W. Cartwright; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Mar* 21, 1435

WOODD, Mr. B. T., *Knaresborough*
London and North-Western Railway (Additional Powers), 2R. 903

Workman's Compensation Bill [H.L.]
(*The Earl De La Warr*)
l. 2R., after short debate, Debate adjourned *Mar* 28, 1964 (No. 7)

Wormwood Scrubs Regulation Bill
(*Colonel Loyd Lindsay, Mr. Secretary Stanley, Lord Eustace Cecil*)
c. Ordered; read 1°* *Mar* 4 [Bill 96]
Read 2°*, and referred to a Select Committee *Mar* 18

YEAMAN, Mr. J., *Dundee*
Post Office (West India Mail Contract), Res. 1198
Valuation of Property, Comm. *cl.* 6, 1490
Wine Duties, Res. 1182

YORKE, Mr. J. R., *Gloucestershire, E.*
District Auditors, Comm. 965

END OF VOLUME CCXLIV., AND SECOND VOLUME OF SESSION 1879.

LONDON: CORNELIUS BUCK, 22, PATERNOSTER ROW, E.C.

Ways and Means—*cont.*
Considered in Committee *April* 11, 1105
Motion made, and Question proposed, "That, on and after the first day of June, one thousand eight hundred and seventy-eight, in lieu of the Annual Duty of Five Shillings imposed by the Act of the thirtieth and thirty-first years of Her Majesty's reign, chapter five, there shall be granted and charged the Annual Duty of Seven Shillings and Sixpence for and in respect of every Dog of the age of Two Months or upwards, for which a Licence to keep the same shall be taken out under the said Act, such Licence terminating on the thirty-first day of December following the day on which it is granted"
After debate, Amendt., to leave out "Two," and insert "Six" (*Mr. Monk*); Question proposed, "That 'Two,' &c.;" after further debate, Question put, and negatived; The word "Six" inserted
After further debate, Main Question, as amended, put, and agreed to
Resolution reported *April* 12, 1239
After short debate, Resolution agreed to
Instruction to the Committee on the Customs and Inland Revenue Bill, That they have power to make provision therein in pursuance of the said Resolution

Weights and Measures Bill
(*Mr. Edward Stanhope, Sir Charles Adderley, Mr. Attorney General*)
c. Report of Select Comm. * *April* 5 [No. 133]

Wellesley, Colonel
Question, Mr. Benett-Stanford; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *May* 13, 1714

Westminster, Duke of
National Museums and Galleries, Opening of, on a Sunday, 407

Wharncliffe, Earl of
Navy — H.M.S. "Eurydice," Foundering of, 646

Wheelhouse, Mr. W. St. James, *Leeds*
Blind and Deaf-Mute Children (Education), Comm. 1358
County Courts, 2R. Bill withdrawn, 1571
Elementary Education Act—Superior Elementary Education, 1371
Supply—Friendly Societies, 1628
  Local Government Board, &c. 1638
Ways and Means, Comm. 1160

Whitbread, Mr. S., *Bedford*
Prisons Act—Letters to Prisoners' Friends, 959

Whitwell, Mr. J., *Kendal*
County Courts, 2R. Bill withdrawn, 1577
Customs and Inland Revenue, 2R. 1186; Comm. *cl.* 12, Amendt. 1304, 1313, 1316; *cl.* 21, Amendt. 1348, 1350

[*cont.*

Whitwell, Mr. J.—*cont.*
Earl of Leitrim, Murder of, 1095
Egypt—Suez Canal—Return of the Rates, &c. 287
Military Forces of the Crown—The Indian Contingent, 1519
Mutiny, Comm. *cl.* 66, 149
South Africa—War Expenditure, 1373
Supply—Civil Service Commission, 1618
  Comptroller and Auditor General of the Exchequer, 1620, 1625
  Foreign Office, 1486, 1490
  Home Office, 1483
  House of Lords, Offices of the, 1455, 1459, 1463
  Local Government Board, &c. 1639
  Privy Council for Trade, &c., Committee of, 1608
  Privy Council Office, 1491, 1492
Ways and Means—Financial Statement, Comm. 562, 1163

Whitworth, Mr. B., *Kilkenny*
Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Ireland), Comm. 325

Williams, Mr. W., *Denbigh, &c.*
Bermondsey Vestry, 2R. 1515
Hertford College—University Tests Act, 1871, 1593

Wilmot, Sir J. E., *Warwickshire, S.*
County Courts, 2R. Bill withdrawn, 1575

Winmarleigh, Lord
Army—Marking Deserters, 110, 111

Wolff, Sir H. D., *Christchurch*
Eastern Question—Miscellaneous Questions
  Bulgaria—Election of a Prince, 1287, 1288
  Conference—Russia and Bessarabia, 476, 527
  Notice of Motion, 1592
  Treaty of San Stefano, 201
Message from the Queen — Army Reserve Forces, 292; Motion for an Address, 918, 1012
Supply—Stationery Office, 1781, 1782, 1798

Woodd, Mr. B. T., *Knaresborough*
Customs and Inland Revenue, Comm. 1292

Wyndham, Hon. P. S., *Cumberland, W.*
Metropolis—Union of Benefices Act, 1370

Yeaman, Mr. J., *Dundee*
Parliamentary and Municipal Elections (Hours of Polling), Nomination of Committee, 474

Young, Mr. A. W., *Helston*
Dublin Tramways, 2R. 24, 32, 34

ERRATUM.—Page 1904, line 14 from bottom, *for* (Mr. Gregory) *read* (Mr. Osborne Morgan.)

END OF VOL. CCXXXIX., AND THIRD VOLUME OF SESSION 1878.